



Ad Hoc Committee for the Board Self-Evaluation Process and the Director Performance Evaluation Process

May 12, 2022, 4:00 pm
Zoom Meeting

Members: Lynn Scott , Keith Penny, Justine Bell,
Wendy Hough

Staff Camille Williams-Taylor (Director of
Education), Michele Giroux (Executive
Officer, Corporate Services), Nicole
Guthrie (Manager, Board Services),
Rebecca Grandis (Senior Board
Coordinator)

Others Present Michael Naufal, Boyden Global Executive
Search and John Caminiti of Boyden
Global Executive Search

1. Call to Order

Executive Officer Giroux called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m.

2. Election of Chair of the Committee

Executive Officer Giroux opened the floor for nominations for the position of
Chair.

Trustee Scott self-nominated.

Moved by Trustee Penny that nominations be closed

Carried

Chair Scott was acclaimed Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee.

3. Approval of the Agenda

Moved by Trustee Hough,

That the agenda be approved

Carried

4. Matters for Action:

4.1 Report 22-042, Director of Education Performance Evaluation Process

Your Committee had before it Report 22-042, to recommend the evaluation process and assessment tools to be used for the 2021-2022 Director of Education Comprehensive Evaluation and to discuss the modernization of the evaluation process as outlined in Policy P.051.GOV, Evaluation of Directory of Education and Secretary of the Board (the Policy).

Executive Officer Giroux noted that under the Policy, the decision was made to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the performance of the Director of Education for the 2021-2022 school year. She noted the task of the Ad Hoc Committee is to approve an evaluation instrument to be used in the process. Executive Officer Giroux advised that upon review of the instrument used for an evaluation previously, the language contained in the tool was dated and did not reflect the COVID-19 reality or the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan and does not align with current trends. Executive Officer Giroux advised that the survey tool employed must align with the Director's job description and performance expectations. She noted that staff had a productive discussion with Michael Naufal and John Caminiti of Boyden Canada to discuss the evaluation process, to look at industry trends and to reflect on the last evaluation process that took place.

Through a presentation Mr. Naufal and Mr. Caminiti outlined the model for current and future performance reviews.

During the discussion and in response to questions, the following points were noted:

- The evaluation of the Director should include a perspective and retrospective view. Looking at how the Director performed against deliverables and key performance indicators and looking at future expectations, priorities and deliverables and what further professional development is recommended for continued success.
- A survey instrument is one tool for evaluation but there are other considerations such evaluating the financial health of the District, which would require consultation with the auditors;
- It is proposed that four key areas be evaluated: Educational Excellence; Organizational and Cultural Leadership; External Relations and Operational and Strategic Oversight; and the survey instrument be formulated within these key areas;
- Trustees Hough, Penny and Scott agreed that the four categories captured the key elements of the role of the Director and provide very solid direction for the survey;
- Director Williams-Taylor agreed that the key areas identified are reasonable and complete;

- Mr. Naufal highlighted the importance of an evaluation process that is sensible, credible and defensible;
- Trustee, administration and staff management questions would be organized under the category of Organizational and Cultural Leadership;
- In addition to the survey tools there are other tools such as staff, operational, financial reports and the Director's report that can provide data to be used for assessment;
- Changing the term of a survey instrument to an evaluation questionnaire might provide clarity for the purpose of the tool to inform feedback, rather than gather opinions;
- The framework used for the Director's reflection is still valid;
- The audited financial statements would continue to be an assessment mechanism and a conversation with the internal and external auditors would be conducted;
- Telephone calls to the Ottawa-Student Transportation Authority (OSTA), the Ottawa-Carleton Education Network (OCENET), the Education Foundation, and the Ministry would provide information on their relationship with the Director and would be better positioned than an evaluation questionnaire;
- Careful consideration should be given to the groups tasked with the completion of the evaluation questionnaire as some have a very limited interaction with the Director;
- In addition to telephone calls and the evaluation questionnaire, other groups may be asked to produce a report on the Director's performance;
- Director Williams-Taylor noted that she has been involved in committees within the Council of Director of Education (CODE) and the Public Council of Ontario Directors of Education (PCODE) and these groups might be considered as a source of feedback on the Director's performance;
- Trustees were supportive of the evaluation process outlined as tailoring the approach of questioning will produce more beneficial feedback;
- There may need to be more than one survey to allow for specific surveys for specific participants;
- A response rate of 60-70 % would be optimal;

- In the past the survey was distributed to approximately 250 people and historically there was a very low response rate;
- One evaluation tool that would work for as many participants as possible would provide better efficacy and a better response rate;
- The evaluation questionnaire should be sent to trustees, student trustees, senior staff, and federation representatives;
- The Director's work outside of the District at speaking engagements and presentations to organizations is a key area of her performance and will need to be considered; and
- Principals at schools that the Director has visited should be included as they can speak directly to her interaction with staff and students;

Executive Officer Giroux suggested that members of the committee take a few days to reflect on the information that was presented, and a timeline be established to provide any additional input which could be included in a final draft evaluation questionnaire to be circulated for comments.

Chair Scott advised that the recommendations outlined in Report 22-042 do not require Board approval. She noted the recommendations are internal and can be approved by the Committee.

Director Williams-Taylor expressed the opinion that the most valuable, credible and meaningful feedback will come from those who are the most closely engaged with her and her work.

Staff have recommended that the Committee approve the current job description and performance assessment guide. Executive Officer Giroux noted that a review of Policy P.051.GOV, Evaluation of the Director of Education and Secretary of the Board be undertaken in the 2022-2023 school year, which will align with the cycle of an incoming board and the Director's contract. She advised a commitment must be made to undertake a review of the policy and the performance assessment guide in the 2022-2023 school year but that the Committee can work with the current framework for the evaluation for the 2021-2022 year.

Moved By Wendy Hough

- A. **THAT Staff be directed to work with the Boyden to finalize the survey instrument to be used for the 2021-2022 Director of Education Evaluation as outlined in Report 22-042;**
- B. **THAT the job description and performance assessment guide for the 2022-2023 evaluation cycle (Appendices A and B to Policy 051.GOV. Evaluation of Director of Education and Secretary of the Board) be approved; and**

C. THAT Staff be directed to work with the committee to undertake a review of Policy 051.GOV Evaluation of Director of Education and Secretary of the Board, including the job description and performance assessment guide in the 2022-2023 school year.

Carried

5. Matters for Discussion:

5.1 Report 22-041, 2021-2022 Board Annual Reflection

Your Committee had before it Report 22-041, 2021-2022 Board Annual Reflection to inform the discussion on the 2021-2022 annual reflection.

Executive Officer Giroux presented Report 22-041 and noted that staff are recommending an annual reflection for the 2021-2022 year, noting that the Board has passed the mid-year mark and advised against the investment in resources to undertake a comprehensive review in an election year.. Executive Officer Giroux expressed the opinion that the Board reflection could provide an opportunity to reflect on the evaluation process which may inform the practice for future Boards.

During the discussion, the following points were noted;

Trustee Hough expressed the opinion that the reflection should be an opportunity to assess the work of the current Board to inform the incoming Board. She added that a transition phase should be contemplated. She added that trustees should evaluate lessons learned and share best practices with the next Board.

Trustee Penny agreed that an annual reflection is appropriate and noted that a facilitated discussion would be beneficial.

Trustee Bell noted her agreement with the plan outlined in the report and agreed that Ms. Craig, Integrity Advisor, be invited to facilitate the discussion. She expressed the opinion that it is important to not only reflect on the past but create an empowering environment for the future and to ensure that the Board works together to ensure a trusted, respectful space.

Chair Scott noted her agreement with the comments of her colleagues and expressed the opinion that it will be important to include information gathered during the reflection discussion in the orientation for the incoming Board of Trustees.

Trustee Penny suggested that trustees may want to provide information, in writing, in advance of the facilitated conversation to frame the discussion in a meaningful way.

Executive Officer Giroux noted that Ms Craig will be presenting an annual report on the work of the Integrity Advisor to the Board in June 2022 and that this report could be used as a framework for the annual reflection.

In response to a comment about the safety of the space for open discussion considering the tone of some recent Board meetings, Chair Scott noted that Ms. Craig is a skilled facilitator and can ably navigate difficult conversations. Executive Officer Giroux expressed the opinion that the timing of the annual reflection will provide sufficient space and distance to allow trustees to be able to have a productive discussion.

Chair Scott requested that staff reach out to trustees to confirm their attendance for the annual reflection in late August or early September. Executive Officer Giroux noted that staff will look at a suitable date and present it to Agenda Planning for approval.

6. New Business -- Information and Inquiries

There were no items of new business.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

Lynn Scott, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee for Board and Director Evaluation Processes