



Southwest Harbour Community Centre

Executive Director Self-Evaluation

This questionnaire has been developed for periods, every second year for instance, where the board decides it is not necessary to undertake its formal and detailed executive director evaluation. As an interim review this one is meant to encourage you to reflect on your staff leadership in light of the needs of the organization. Your written responses will to be discussed with you by two others that you have agreed upon, at least one of whom will be member of the board, in an a review meeting.

The completed form, and any written comments or agreements emerging from this review will be treated as confidential although the main learning and outcomes are to be shared with the board.

ED Name _____

Year (or period) of this review: From _____ To _____

You are asked to respond to each of the questions as fully as possible. Please reference your previous evaluation where relevant. You may use the back of the page if you need more space. Hand-written responses, if your script is clear, are welcome.

Questions

1. What do you believe has been your most significant leadership achievements during the past year?

8. How might the Board assist you in your further development as executive director?

9. Is there anything else you would like to discuss in your evaluation review meeting?

Signed: _____ Date: _____

ED Self Evaluation Review Meeting

Review meeting date and time: _____

Follow-up actions suggested for the ED and Board:

Reviewer's Signatures _____

Date: _____

NOTES

This resource may be adapted for use by a non-profit organization without acknowledgement. Credit for some of the ideas here, especially for Question 5, should be given to another resource, *Sample CEO Self Evaluation*, developed in 2010 by the National Council of Nonprofits (U.S.A).

This example lists nine questions. A non-profit board may wish to ask other questions but once the questionnaire goes beyond ten it will lose much of its reflective value. Six questions would be better.

Organizations may want to add a self-rating scale on overall performance to be completed by the ED and, at the end of the process, by the reviewers. Here is one.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Considerable improvement needed
3. Some improvement needed
4. Satisfactory
5. Good
6. Excellent

The ED should be given at least about two weeks to complete their reflections in advance of a review meeting. When completed the ED should supply a copy to those that have agreed to meet for the review. The reviewers should come prepared with some comments of their own.

The ideal review team would be the board chair and a senior staff person, or another person who has often seen the ED in action. The ED should be asked who they would like the second person to be. Getting a staff perspective, even with respect to a self-evaluation, is valuable. The issue with a staff person is of course that that staff person is under the direction of the ED.

It is up to individual boards to decide whether the entire completed review should be shared with all the directors. Although the board ought not be prohibited from seeing the completed review, the question of whether they want to read the whole thing or hear a summary of highlights is up to them. They should keep in mind the more personal nature of this kind of review and the importance of confidentiality even at this level. It should not be shared electronically.