

MICs GROUP OF HEALTH SERVICES... MICs Board of Directors 	TOPIC: Chief of Staff Evaluation	NUMBER: GOV-012
	CATEGORY: Board of Directors	DATE: Aug. 10, 2015
	DEPARTMENT: Governance	REVISED DATE: April 11, 2016 May 17, 2016 October 5, 2017
	AUTHORITY: MICs Board Chairs	
	APPROVED SIGNATURES: <i>Robert Dennis</i> <i>Danielle Delaurier</i> <i>Patricia Duff</i>	LAST DATE REVIEWED: June 9, 2022

MICs CHIEF OF STAFF EVALUATION PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

Article 16 of the MICs Group of Health Services' by-laws outlines the appointment, role and responsibilities of the Chief of Staff. Evaluations of the Chief of Staff's performance ensures that performance expectations are mutually understood and that progress is being made towards attainment of the strategic goals of the MICs organization. The Chief of Staff's performance will be formally assessed on an annual OR biannual basis to determine continued re-appointment.

The Chief of Staff shall be accountable to the MICs Board of Directors as set out in the MICs by-laws. It is the expectation that the Chief of Staff will be proficient in his/her performance, meaning (s)he will be adept and skilled and able to demonstrate behaviour that supports all performance outcomes.

Four components will be considered in the formal assessment:

- (a) The results of a performance evaluation
- (b) The accomplishment of personal goals and objectives from the previous year
- (c) The results of a questionnaire circulated to key stakeholders
- (d) Input from any other relevant sources (e.g. Medical/Professional staff, CEO, CNO)

PROCESS

1. In May of each year, a performance evaluation of the Chief of Staff will be conducted. Participants will include the Board Chairs, board members and relevant feedback from Medical and Professional Staff who are granted special privileges to practice including physicians, dentists, nurses in the extended class and midwives. The results will be summarized by the Chairs or delegate and presented to the MICs Board of Directors.
2. In April of each year, the Chief of Staff will submit a self-assessment of the accomplishment of his/her personal goals and objectives, as agreed to by the MICs Board of Directors for the previous year.
3. The Chief of Staff is required to complete a self-evaluation of his/her performance (*Chief of Staff Evaluation Form*) and to submit the evaluation form to the MICs Board Chairs at the time of the performance appraisal.

4. A questionnaire requesting comments on various aspects of the Chief of Staff's performance in the previous year will be circulated to the MICs Board Chairs (see sample attached). This shall take place during the month of April.
5. A date in May will be established by the Chief of Staff and the MICs Board Chairs for the Chief of Staff's performance evaluation.
6. The Board Chairs shall seek input to the Chief of Staff's performance appraisal from other members of the respective Board and from the Medical and other Professional Staff, CEO and CNO and other relevant colleagues, using the *Chief of Staff Performance Evaluation form* and specific questions. The Chief of Staff Position Description and the previous year's goals and objectives, as outlined by the Chief of Staff, will be circulated with the evaluation form to all parties mentioned above in order to provide a context for evaluation. They need to be reminded that this is a confidential process.
7. The Board Chairs will then each complete the *Chief of Staff Performance Evaluation Form* incorporating feedback from board members, CEO, CNO, Medical and Professional Staff, where applicable, and determine achievement or non-achievement of goals and objectives.
8. The form should also include areas of strengths, areas for ongoing improvements or development and areas where performance outcomes have not been met.
9. The performance appraisal should incorporate additional examples or "evidence" provided by both the Chief of Staff and the Board Chairs. There is a section on the evaluation form for additional comments.
10. The Chief of Staff will separately complete the Appraisal Form and bring it with him/her to the evaluation meeting.
11. The Chief of Staff, CEO and Board Chairs will then meet to review and discuss the Chief of Staff's objectives from the previous year, his/her performance, using the data collected and documented on the *MICs Chief of Staff Performance Evaluation Form* (completed by both the Chief of Staff and Board Chairs).
12. At the end of the performance review meeting, the Chief of Staff and the Board Chairs will mutually establish priorities for the following year and performance goals to support ongoing development. Performance goals should be specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented and time-framed. These will be formalized, documented and approved at a later date.
13. Both parties will prioritize the Chief of Staff's objectives for the following year on the Form.
14. A copy of the performance appraisal is signed by the Board Chairs and the Chief of Staff, indicating the Chief of Staff has had an opportunity to provide input by way of a self-evaluation and a meeting with the Board. The performance evaluation is then placed in a confidential file.
15. A summary of the results will be reviewed by the MICs Board and presented to the MICs Board of Directors at the first business meeting in June. The report to the

Board will include a one-page summary of the process outcomes and recommendations.

Performance Evaluation Guidelines

1. The Board of Directors should provide the Chief of Staff with continuous feedback from the Board throughout the year and the Chief of Staff shall keep the Board Chairs informed of major issues or concerns from the Medical Advisory Committee and Medical/Professional Staff that are relevant to MICs. Regular meetings with the Chairs shall be arranged prior to Board meetings.
2. The Board Chairs will discuss performance and goal progress regularly with the Chief of Staff and document specific examples or “evidence” of behaviour during the year.
3. The Board Chairs and Chief of Staff are responsible for arranging times to discuss performance issues; the Chief of Staff will provide written reports of his/her progress to the Chairs prior to such meetings.
4. Performance problems, inappropriate conduct and/or behaviour must be addressed at the time of occurrence.
5. In completing the self-evaluation, the Chief of Staff is required to identify examples, thus providing evidence of areas (s)he believes his/her behaviour has exceeded or is below proficient.
6. Guidelines for the Chief of Staff’s self-evaluation and evaluation by the MICs Board of Directors:
 - a) Review the position description to establish a clear understanding of the position role, responsibilities and behavioural expectations.
 - b) If the Chief of Staff has achieved proficiency in an area of performance, an example of the behaviour should be provided to clarify or support the rating.
 - c) Examples of performance or “feedback” provided should be concrete, specific and timely and should focus on performance or the specific behaviour and not the personality of the Chief of Staff.
 - d) Feedback should provide the Chief of Staff with clear information regarding what the Chief of Staff is achieving and what (s)he is not achieving, and constructive criticism regarding areas where performance requires ongoing development or is not acceptable.
 - f) Specific statements or “feedback” used in discussions with the Chief of Staff regarding his/her performance should:
 - i. Deal with facts
 - ii. Refer to a particular behaviour or event
 - i. The event or behaviour should be described so the Chief of Staff understands what the MICs Board is referring to
 - ii. The consequences of the event or behaviour should be indicated, explaining if and why this is a problem

- iii. The Board should seek a commitment from the Chief of Staff to agree to change or improve situation or behaviour
- iv. The Board should focus on what the Chief of Staff has done or not done
- v. Evidence to support feedback should be obtained by the Board to avoid second-hand information and
- vi. The Chief of Staff can provide evidence to support his/her ratings or to seek a change in rating from the Board.