



STATE OF WASHINGTON
RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE

October 2009

TO: Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members

FROM: Bill Chapman, Chair

SUBJECT: Proposed Process for Annual Performance Evaluation of the Recreation and Conservation Office Director

In November 2008, members of the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) conducted the annual performance review of the director of the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). I suggest that we keep with that practice, and conduct an annual performance review of the director each November.

Proposed Process (Overview)

As the chair of the board, I propose the following process for the annual evaluation of RCO's director.

1. Establish a subcommittee of the board to work with the board liaison and the RCO's human resources manager to set criteria and solicit feedback from board members, chairs of other RCO-supported boards and councils, and key stakeholders about the performance of the director.
2. In executive session of the entire board, discuss the results of the subcommittee's gathered information and reach a conclusion on the director's performance for the preceding year.
3. In executive session present the board's findings to the director with an opportunity for response.
4. The chair will then verbally discuss the results of the performance evaluation with our designated liaison in the Governor's office.

Next Steps

If the board agrees to this approach, we need to take the following steps to complete this evaluation by our November 2009 meeting.

Late September

1. The chair will work with the board liaison and human resources manager to compile:
 - Current strategic plans for the agency and board;



- The RCO management team's 2008 annual work plan;
 - Job description;
 - List of chairs of other RCO-supported boards and councils
 - List of key stakeholders for potential consultation regarding the director's performance; and
 - Criteria for evaluating the director's performance.
2. The chair will appoint two members of the board to serve on the subcommittee with him.

October

3. By mid-month, the subcommittee will review the information they have collected. They will ask the director to: 1) assess her performance, including a discussion of appropriate metrics and any trends, issues or opportunities illustrated by those metrics, and 2) propose her priorities for the next year, including a proposal for appropriate metrics for use in the next year's evaluation.
4. By the end of the month, the subcommittee will review and discuss the following:
- The director's self assessment and priorities.
 - The performance assessments from board members, key stakeholders, and staff based on the expectations (e.g., in what areas did the director perform well, what areas need improvement, etc.).
 - Any additional goals for the director to achieve in 2009.
5. Following that discussion, the subcommittee will prepare a written summary of the evaluation.

November

6. The chair will share the subcommittee's proposed evaluation summary with the director and the other board members before the meeting.
7. The director will consider the summary evaluation, prepare her final priorities and goals for 2009, and give it to the chair.
8. At the board meeting, all members will meet in executive session to discuss the subcommittee's proposed evaluation. The board will then invite the director into the executive session for the formal evaluation and an opportunity to respond.

Early December

9. The chair will share the board's evaluation with the designated Governor's office liaison in person or by phone.