

DIRECTOR EVALUATION PROCESS, CRITERIA AND TIMELINES

Features of the Evaluation Model

1. Provides for both growth and accountability and the strengthening of the relationship between the Board and the Director. The written report will affirm specific accomplishments and will identify growth areas. Some growth goals will address areas of weakness while others will identify areas where greater emphasis is required due to changes in the environment.
2. Recognizes that the Director is the Chief Executive Officer. The Director is held accountable for work performed primarily by other senior administrators, e.g., fiscal management.
3. Emphasizes the need for and requires the use of evidence for evaluation purposes. Evaluations are most helpful when the evaluator provides concrete evidence of strengths and/or weaknesses. The Performance Assessment Guide identifies the source of the evidence in advance, while the quality indicators describe expectations regarding that evidence.
4. Is aligned with and based upon the Director's roles and responsibilities. The Roles and Responsibilities statement is aligned with this evaluation document.
5. Is linked to the Division's goals.
6. Set out standards of performance. The quality indicators in the Performance Assessment Guide set out initial standards. When growth goals are identified, additional standards will need to be set to provide clarity of expectations and a means of assessing performance.
7. Is also a performance-based assessment system. Such an evaluation focuses on improvement over time. The second and subsequent evaluations take into consideration the previous evaluation and an assessment of the Director's success in addressing identified growth areas.
8. Uses multiple data sources. Objective data such as audit reports, Ministry of Education monitoring reports, and student achievement data are augmented with subjective data provided in division surveys.
9. Elicits evidence to support subjective assessments. This must be the case when the Board provides feedback regarding the CEO's work relative to Board agendas, committees, and Board meetings, etc.
10. Ensures Board feedback is provided at least bi-annually. Such feedback will be timely, supported by specific examples, and will focus on areas over which the Director has authority.

Process for Evaluations

It is the responsibility of the Director to provide evidence that each role expectation has been met during the evaluation period. This evidence portfolio must be provided to the Board at least one week in advance of the evaluation workshop, which will involve the Board, the Director, and an external facilitator. The Director will only be absent from the room for the period when the Board constructs the conclusion section. The evidence

examined will be in the form of an internal report or external report. The Board will review the indicated evidence and will determine whether, or to what extent, the quality indicators have been achieved. In addition, the corporate Board will supplement the evidence contained in the evidence portfolio with agreed-upon direct Board observations. For example, this would be most evident in the section Board/Director Relations.

During the evaluation workshop, a written evaluation report will be facilitated which will document:

- the evaluation process,
- evaluation context,
- assessments relative to each of the criteria noted in Appendix A,
- an examination of progress made relative to any growth goals or redirections identified in the previous year's evaluation,
- identification of any growth goals if deemed appropriate, and
- a conclusions section followed by appropriate signatures and dates.

The assessments contained in the evaluation report will reflect the corporate Board position. This report will be approved by Board motion. A signed copy will be provided to the Director and a second signed copy will be placed in his personnel file held by the Division.

Evaluation Criteria

The criteria for the evaluation will be those role expectations and quality indicators set out in Appendix B– Performance Assessment Guide, which is intended to clarify the Director performance expectations that are held by the corporate Board. This guide is also intended to be used by the Board to evaluate the performance of the Director regarding each job expectation. The Board will review the indicated evidence and will determine whether, or to what extent, the quality indicators have been achieved.

In subsequent evaluations, the criteria will be those defined by the Performance Assessment Guide as listed or revised after each evaluation, plus any growth goals provided by the Board in previously written evaluation report(s). Such growth goals may be areas requiring remediation or actions that must be taken to address trends, issues, or external realities such as an increased emphasis on capital construction due to an increased number of approvals.

Timelines for Evaluations

Evaluations will be conducted following this document, bi-annually in the spring.

Updated: January 19, 2017, March 15, 2018

Reviewed: April 2, 2020, May 6, 2021, March 28, 2024