

Session 7 Monitoring

Types of Monitoring

1. Internal Report- subject to fraud, inexpensive in terms of time and money
2. External Report- independent, expensive in terms of time and money, may be an unnecessary level of information
3. Direct Inspection- by board or subgroup, most disruptive, risk a loss of focus on ends and increased focus on past rather than future

What to Keep in Mind About Monitoring

1. The policies <i>are</i> the criteria.	Only criteria stated in policy is monitored. The policies are the criteria for organizational performance.
2. The monitoring of criteria is a passive process that is different from the setting of criteria.	Monitoring in Policy Governance is simply the comparison of what <i>is</i> to the Superintendent's interpretation of what was required. The only judgment applied to true monitoring data is simply to determine whether the data demonstrate accomplishment of a reasonable interpretation of the requirement set out in policy.
3. "Any reasonable interpretation" means just that.	The question a board must answer is, "Is this a reasonable interpretation?" Board members do not ask, "Would I have made that decision?" because that compares the Superintendent's performance to an individual's personally determined criterion rather than to the board's previously stated expectation.

<p>4. Policy violation can mean one of several things.</p>	<p>If the Superintendent has not accorded a reasonable interpretation of a policy, the board must reject the interpretation.</p> <p>If the Superintendent has made a reasonable interpretation but has failed to accomplish it, the board must decide if this is a temporary and insignificant blip that will be righted immediately or if the Superintendent is performing below the level required by the board based on a pattern that emerges through monitoring.</p>
<p>5. The Board is not there to help the Superintendent but to instruct and monitor the Superintendent.</p>	<p>If the board finds that the Superintendent is performing below the required standards, the board must continue to hold the Superintendent accountable and not help him fix the problem. If the Superintendent cannot restore performance to the required level within the time allowed by the board, the board should consider replacing the Superintendent.</p>
<p>6. The relevant question must be answered.</p>	<p>The Superintendent must provide the relevant data to the question the policy is asking, and not provide more data than is needed to answer the question.</p> <p>Further, the board must not accept a report that confirms compliance without providing data.</p>
<p>7. The monitoring report should contain both the Superintendent's interpretation and the relevant data.</p>	<p>See sample monitoring report.</p>

<p>8. Monitoring reports should contain only monitoring information.</p>	<p>The board may wish to receive other information from the Superintendent such as decision information or incidental information, but it should not be included in the monitoring report as these types of information have a different focus.</p>
<p>9. If a policy is worth stating, it is worth monitoring.</p>	<p>If rules are set, they must be checked.. The board states at what frequency it wishes to monitor each policy. There is no need to monitor a policy at a high frequency if a lower frequency will suffice.</p>

Sample Monitoring Report

POLICY WORDING 2.2.2: *The Superintendent shall not retaliate against any staff member for non-disruptive expression of dissent.*

SUPERINTENDENT'S INTERPRETATION:

Expression of dissent is any statement by an employee that indicates disagreement with a decision made by management. Such expression is non-disruptive when:

- There is no refusal to perform work,
- There is no encouragement of others not to perform work,
- It is made in a courteous and private manner, and
- It is not made publicly including to the media.

Employees who disagree non-disruptively (as defined above) with management decisions may not experience retaliation from the Superintendent or any other member of management such as firing, reassignment to less desirable jobs or job hours, or initiation of a formal discipline procedure. 95% of staff should be able to report that no such retaliation occurs. This percentage is chosen because HR research at (name the credible source used as a reference) indicates that 5% of staff will always complain that management has erred or will err, regardless of the facts.

DATA

Responders to an anonymous stratified random sample were asked to report on retaliation as defined. 100% of respondents said that they were aware of no occasion in which a staff member was fired for disagreeing with management as defined. 97% reported no experience of job reassignment, and 96% reported no knowledge of formal discipline proceedings. I therefore report **COMPLIANCE**.

Board questions that need to be answered:

1. Can I tell whether the board policy has been reasonably interpreted?
2. Does that data submitted demonstrate that the Superintendent has accomplished the interpretation?

From: *Reinventing Your Board, Revised Edition*, by John Carver and Miriam Carver

Evaluating ENDS

<p>Why evaluating ends is important:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It discloses unacceptable deviation from desired values ▪ It enables the board to relax about the present and focus on the future ▪ It keeps board policies constantly in the spotlight so that they're more likely to amended as they grow out of date
<p>Well-placed concerns about evaluation:</p>	<p>Nonprofit and educational organizations do not produce services; they produce results in people's lives by <i>using</i> services. Services are means, not ends. Evaluation of ends not only assess whether organizational activity is effective, but also whether it is sufficiently effective to be worth the cost.</p>
<p>Misplaced concern about evaluation:</p>	<p>Sometimes a board will say it can't have a particular end because it can't evaluate it. It is more important to have the right ends than the right evaluation. Don't focus on evaluation until after your ends are developed.</p>
<p>Other thoughts about ends evaluation if a board is feeling challenged:</p>	<p><i>No formal evaluation:</i> State what the organization is to contribute to the world, what condition is worth achieving, and what you would evaluate if you could. An authoritative, clear statement of what is to be accomplished has a powerful effect on organizational behavior, even if the results are never evaluated.</p> <p><i>Evaluating the wrong things:</i> Measuring the wrong things is damaging in two ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 'You get what you inspect, not what you expect.' What you measure is what employees see as what really matters. ▪ Evaluating the wrong thing feels better than

	<p>having no evaluation and will reduce the pressure a board feels to have even a crude measure of the right thing.</p>
<p>Evaluating the right things</p>	<p>Only when the board knows what it wants the organization to accomplish can it intelligently discuss evaluation.</p> <p>The issue of evaluation is just this: What is the most convincing evidence that a reasonable interpretation of what the board sought is being produced?</p> <p>An evaluation requires reasonable assurance of the swap of results for cost, not scientific accuracy.</p> <p>A crude measure of the right thing beats a precise measure of the wrong thing.</p> <p>The most important real world evaluation in almost all non-profit and public organizations – public judgment of an organizations’ worth – is extremely crude. The board's task it to make that judgment explicit.</p> <p>Ultimately, the board needs to answer the questions: “What did we want to accomplish? Are we achieving it?”</p>
<p>Remember:</p>	<p>The only judgment that takes place in monitoring is whether actual performance matches a reasonable interpretation of the pre-established criteria (ends).</p>

Source: Carver, John. *Boards That Make a Difference, Third Edition*. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco, CA. 2006

Board Self-Assessment

The Board may use one of the following self-assessment instruments to evaluate its performance during meetings.

Rate the Board's general meeting behavior by assigning a numerical rating using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
We failed	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Commendable	Met our best expectations

General meeting behavior:

_____ The Board followed its agenda and did not allow itself to get sidetracked.

_____ The agenda was well planned to focus on the real work of the Board

_____ The meeting was well attended

_____ The meeting proceeded without interruptions or distractions.

_____ The Board's decision-making processes were understood and were implemented appropriately.

_____ Participation was balanced. Everyone participated, no one dominated.

_____ Members all listened attentively as each participant spoke. Board members avoided side conversations.

_____ Work was accomplished in an atmosphere of trust and openness. _____

Meeting participants treated each other with respect and courtesy.

Governance principles review:

_____ Most Board actions occur at the policy level rather than at the operational level.

_____ Any stand-alone resolutions considered by the Board were clearly the Board's work.

_____ The Board reviews what it has already said in its policy about each specific topic before discussion on that issue.

- _____ In writing additional policies, the Board starts with a broad statement and becomes more detailed in a logical sequence.
- _____ The Board uses less than 15 percent of Board meeting time monitoring past performance.
- _____ The Board routinely spends time monitoring and improving its own process.
- _____ The Board works on clarifying Board priorities/values among the range of potential outcomes, beneficiaries and costs of outcomes.
- _____ Ends policies are clearly and logically stated and support the mission.
- _____ The Board follows an annual calendar based on a plan for accomplishing its job.
- _____ The Board Chair helps the Board get its job done rather than supervising or becoming involved in staff work.
- _____ The Board spends most of its time debating, defining and clarifying its vision and in linking with its owners and public as opposed to “fixing things”
- _____ The Board supports the superintendent in any reasonable interpretation of applicable Board policies.

Board Effectiveness Feedback

Date: _____

In your opinion, did every board member:

	YES	NO
1. Study the agenda prior to the meeting?	_____	_____
2. Participate in the meeting, with no one dominating?	_____	_____
3. Listen attentively as each participant spoke, avoiding side conversations?	_____	_____
4. Treat each other with respect and courtesy?	_____	_____
5. Contribute to an atmosphere of trust and openness?	_____	_____
6. Avoid micromanaging?	_____	_____
7. Appear to have contacted the Superintendent or chair in advance concerning questions about agenda items?	_____	_____
8. Follow the agenda and not get sidetracked?	_____	_____
9. Was information provided in a manner that made it easily understandable?	_____	_____
10. Was the agenda well-planned to focus on the work of the Board?	_____	_____

Comments: (If you answered “No” to any of the above, please explain.)

Monitoring Method: Board self-assessment **Monitoring Frequency:** Quarterly