**Artificial Intelligence Review Committee (AIRC)**

**Reviewer Feedback & Evaluation Form**

Purpose: To collect feedback from AIRC reviewers on the usability, clarity, and effectiveness of the rubrics.

Version: 1.0 (December 2025)

**Reviewer Information**

| **Field** | **Response** |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Name (Optional) | [blank line] |
| Reviewer Role/Discipline | [blank line] |
| Years of Experience with AI/ML | ☐ 0-2 years ☐ 3-5 years ☐ 6-10 years ☐ 10+ years |
| Date of Review | [blank line] |

**Protocol Information**

| **Field** | **Response** |
| --- | --- |
| Protocol Number | [blank line] |
| AI Tool Reviewed | [blank line] |
| Rubric Type Used | ☐ Human Subjects - Streamlined ☐ Human Subjects - Enhanced ☐ Animal - Streamlined ☐ Animal - Enhanced ☐ Analytic - Streamlined ☐ Analytic - Enhanced |
| Number of Protocols Reviewed Today | [blank line] |

**Section 1: Review Process & Efficiency**

| **Question** | **Response** |
| --- | --- |
| 1.1 How long did this review take (in minutes)? | [blank line] |
| 1.2 Was the time reasonable for the complexity of the protocol? | ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure |
| 1.3 Were you able to complete the rubric without returning it for additional information? | ☐ Yes ☐ No - had to request clarification |
| 1.4 If no, what information was missing? | [blank area for response] |

**Section 2: Rubric Clarity & Usability**

Rate each statement on a scale of 1-5 (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree):

| **Statement** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2.1 The rubric instructions were clear and easy to understand | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 2.2 The domains were well-defined and appropriate for this rubric type | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 2.3 The scoring criteria (4, 3, 2, 1) were specific enough to apply consistently | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 2.4 The N/A and "Insufficient Documentation" options were helpful | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 2.5 The checklist items within each domain were relevant and comprehensive | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 2.6 The format/layout of the rubric was easy to navigate | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**Section 3: Domain-Level Assessment**

Rate each domain on the dimensions below (1 = Poor, 5 = Excellent):

**Domain 1 (Data Quality/Privacy for Human; Data/Method Validity for Animal; Data Quality/Privacy for Analytic)**

| **Dimension** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Clarity of criteria | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |
| Relevance to AI review | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |
| Ease of scoring | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |

**Domain 2 (Fairness/Risk for Human; Justification for AI for Animal; Analytic Validity for Analytic)**

| **Dimension** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Clarity of criteria | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |
| Relevance to AI review | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |
| Ease of scoring | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |

**Domain 3 (Transparency for Human/Animal; Transparency for Analytic; or Animal Welfare for Animal; Group Harms for Analytic)**

| **Dimension** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Clarity of criteria | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |
| Relevance to AI review | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |
| Ease of scoring | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |

**Domain 4 (for Enhanced rubrics only)**

| **Dimension** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Clarity of criteria | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |
| Relevance to AI review | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |
| Ease of scoring | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |

**Domain 5 (for Enhanced rubrics only)**

| **Dimension** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Clarity of criteria | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |
| Relevance to AI review | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |
| Ease of scoring | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | [blank] |

**Section 4: Reviewer Experience**

Rate each statement (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree):

| **Statement** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4.1 I felt confident in my scoring decisions using this rubric | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4.2 The rubric helped me identify key ethical and technical risks | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4.3 The rubric's decision rules (e.g., critical deficiency rule) were appropriate | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4.4 The rubric would support consistent and fair decision-making across reviewers | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4.5 Overall, this rubric is effective for its intended purpose | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**Section 5: Suggested Improvements**

5.1 Which domain(s) need the most improvement?

[blank area for response]

5.2 What scoring criteria were most difficult to apply?

[blank area for response]

5.3 What checklist items were unclear or not relevant?

[blank area for response]

5.4 What additional guidance or examples would be helpful?

[blank area for response]

5.5 Any other suggestions for improving this rubric?

[blank area for response]

**Section 6: Consistency & Calibration**

| **Question** | **Response** |
| --- | --- |
| 6.1 Have you reviewed protocols using this rubric before? | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| 6.2 If yes, did you score this protocol similarly to previous ones (accounting for protocol differences)? | ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A |
| 6.3 Would you benefit from a calibration or training session on this rubric? | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| 6.4 Any specific topics for calibration? | [blank line] |

**Section 7: Overall Feedback**

Best aspects of this rubric:

[blank area for response]

Most challenging aspects:

[blank area for response]

Recommendations for next version:

[blank area for response]

**Completion Information**

| **Field** | **Response** |
| --- | --- |
| Date Form Completed | [blank line] |
| Reviewer Name (Optional) | [blank line] |
| Email (Optional) | [blank line] |