POLICY

1.8 BOARD PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Supporting Procedure:	1.8.1 Board Performance Review	
Other Related Documents:	Policy 1.1 Board of Management Policy 1.2 Board Meetings Policy 1.5 Board Remuneration Policy 4.1 Code of Ethics PHCC Constitution (2018) PHCC Board Evaluation Survey	
Category:	Board	
Type:	Strategic	Dates:
1st Review By:	Jane O'Malley and Patricia Sutton	01/02/2018
2nd Review By:	Jane O'Malley and Patricia Sutton	23/05/2019
Issued By:	Chief Executive Officer	01/07/2019
Approved By:	Board of Management	20/06/2019

Introduction

The purpose of this Policy is to ensure that a consistent approach is followed for conducting Bi-Annual Board Performance Reviews, and that Board related skills and knowledge, and competencies and behaviours, are evaluated and compared against set standards and business objectives and meet the PHCC's legal obligations, and vision for the Peel-Harvey Catchment. The Review will also inform whether the CEO and operations team are providing the information and environment required for best Board performance.

Board Members, and nominated Agency and Corporation observers will complete a Bi-Annual Performance Review by way of a Board Evaluation Survey, with the results being presented to the Governance Steering Committee, and the Board to respond to the results of bi-annual reviews.

Definitions

'Board Member' means a member of the PHCC Board of Management

'CEO' means Chief Executive Officer

'Community' means any person in the broader community

'Observer' a person who can attend a Board meeting and can participate in discussion, but is not permitted to vote

'Stakeholder' means any person or entity with which PHCC interacts

1.8 BOARD PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Policy Statement

1 Board Performance Evaluation

The Board Performance Evaluation is part of the Australian Government's requirement under their Performance Expectation Framework "Regional NRM Organisation Governance", as shown below:

The regional NRM organisation has a process in place for formally reviewing the performance and composition of the regional NRM organisation's board of directors. This expected practice aims to demonstrate that a regional NRM organisation has a board of directors that are fully conversant with their responsibility as directors of a statutory or incorporated organisation and are representative of the demography of the region.
Documents and evidence requested • The various documents cited in the self-assessment for this expected practice. • Evidence demonstrating that a board review process is in place and is regularly undertaken. • Evidence demonstrating that recommendations from a board review process have been responded to and progress monitored. • Evidence demonstrating that an induction process is in place for new directors. • Evidence that the board of directors can demonstrate a full range of skills and knowledge that reflect the responsibilities of the regional NRM organisation and the interests of the local community.

2 Evaluation Design/Content

The Board Performance Evaluation will be undertaken via an on-line survey process, incorporating the needs of the Australian Government, and the PHCC, as endorsed by the Governance Steering Committee, and the PHCC. Note that the evaluation only deals with reviewing performance, not composition of the Board and that this is managed via the application process.

The Evaluation (self-assessment) questions are categorised under the following eight sections:

2.1 Strategy and purpose

2.2 Structure (including committees)

2.3 People

2.4 Processes

2.5 Dynamics

2.6 Stakeholders

2.7 Accountability and Results

2.8 Compliance and Reporting

Each of these topic areas are assessed by a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from one (strongly disagree with the particular statement) to seven (strongly agree).

In addition to the rating responses to each of the questions, for each of the eight categories there is a provision for open-ended, free text responses to provide an opportunity for Members and Observers to elaborate in their own words on performance in each area.

The intent of the review process, from the PHCC perspective is to ensure that:

a. Members are clear on expectations of their role and they can measure performance against a Board Charter and Constitution
b. PHCC have a high performing Board to add value to the organisation to achieve our vision
c. PHCC attract active, skilled and experienced members
d. Members are kept involved, where appropriate
e. Members skills/knowledge is best used
f. Members have a clear and consistent understanding of the organisation and industry knowledge
g. Members have a sound and productive relationship with the operations team (CEO)
h. Risk management is minimised and managed
i. Members are aware of and meeting legal/other obligations of the PHCC.

3 Results Review and Action

The Board Performance Evaluation will be undertaken via an on-line survey process, incorporating relevant questions under the eight (8) defined sections. The evaluation will be undertaken on a bi-annual basis, with the process managed by the CEO.

The evaluation questions will be reviewed by the Governance Steering Committee and any recommended changes will be made prior to the survey being sent to the Board for completion.

Members (and Observers) will be given a reasonable, e.g. 2 week period, to complete the survey.

An aggregated summary of all responses will be provided to the Governance Steering Committee, who will develop a Board action plan or work plan to ensure continuous improvement. Responses, and the Action/Work Plan will be presented to the Board for their consideration and action.