Tennessee Highway Safety Office

FFY20 On-Site Shadow Monitoring

Feedback Survey

Shadow Monitor (SM) (program manager being reviewed)

Agency

Quarter Reviewed 1st X 2nd □ 3rd □ 4th □

***Pre-monitoring***

1. PM provided pre-visit materials to agency in advance of the visit?
2. PM provided SM proper location, time, and any additional logistical details?
3. PM arrived on time?
4. PM was dressed professionally/ appropriately for the visit?
5. PM brought necessary resources, i.e. Wi-Fi, computer, files, etc.?

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

***During Monitoring***

1. PM informed the agency why the SM was present?
2. PM provided agency with an overview of the day’s expectations?
3. PM demonstrated a good rapport with the agency?
4. PM allowed ample time for questions from the agency?
5. PM shows good general knowledge of the project?
6. PM was well organized?
7. PM specifically asked for the following:
8. Visual inspection of the Title VI posters in English and Spanish?
9. Visual inspection of the small equipment purchased in the current year?
10. Visual inspection of capital purchases being tracked for 3 year?
11. PM retained good control of the meeting?
12. PM read questions from the monitoring report rather than utilizing documentation?

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

 □n/a □ Yes □ No

 □n/a □ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

***Conclusion of Monitoring***

1. PM allotted sufficient time for the on-site review of the project?
2. PM had a well-documented/complete report at the end of the review?
3. The overall experience provided value?

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

□ Yes □ No

***Final Comments:***

|  |
| --- |
|  |