


COPYRIGHT NOTICE: You have purchased a single-use license for the PDF of this guide from the National Center for Family Philanthropy. This means that you may save or print one copy of this guide, but may not distribute copies of this guide in whole or part in any form (printed, PDF, etc.) to others.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW:
THE COMPLETE GUIDE *to*
EVALUATING THE FAMILY
FOUNDATION CE 



NATIONAL CENTER FOR FAMILY PHILANTHROPY

Dear Colleagues,

In 2010, the National Center for Family Philanthropy began extensive research into a subject that had never before been deeply explored: the leadership role of a family foundation chief executive. We wanted to fill a critical gap in the field's understanding of the unique circumstances that define this profession.

This guide is one of the outcomes of that work.

Our goal was to take the conversations that CEOs and boards had been having informally for years and bring discipline and research to the discussion. We wanted to provide research-based information to help boards and CEOs navigate this complex partnership.

To gather data, we conducted an in-depth interview study of 60 CEOs (some with the title of executive director or president) plus a sampling of board chairs. We also conducted an online survey of 200 CEOs in conjunction with The Johnson Center for Philanthropy at Grand Valley State University. Those findings helped shape the agenda for a national symposium for an invited group of 75 family foundation CEOs held in Washington, DC, March 23–24, 2011 at the Pew Charitable Trusts conference center. The symposium gave the CEOs a confidential space to talk candidly about the challenges and exhilarations that define their profession.

Several new resources and services for the field have grown out of this research. We've added to the field's literature through a research report and a series of guides. We've also launched an array of in-person educational offerings customized for veteran CEOs, those who are both CEOs and members of the donor family, and for new trustees. And we are using social media to connect more CEOs and board members for virtual discussions on board-CEO partnerships.

One challenge we explored in our research was how boards can provide meaningful performance reviews for their chief executives. The online survey asked: *Does your board conduct an annual performance review of your work?* Very few reported having a performance planning and review process. Yet, most felt that communication would be improved if the foundation had a process of regularly reviewing progress toward articulated goals.

This guide is the answer. We have tried to make it as practical as possible with case studies, models, and tips that you can begin using right now. We welcome your feedback on how well we've done and what more we can do.

VIRGINIA ESPOSITO

President

National Center for Family Philanthropy

PERFORMANCE REVIEW:
THE COMPLETE GUIDE *to*
EVALUATING THE FAMILY
FOUNDATION CEO 

BY SUSAN CRITES PRICE

In a 2010 interview study of 60 family foundation chief executives by National Center for Family Philanthropy President Virginia Esposito, most told her they do not receive a formal performance review by their board. (For simplicity, CEO is used in this guide to refer to the top paid staff person who may be called executive director, president, or a similar title.) But when NCFP interviewed board chairs, most said “yes” when asked if they annually evaluate their CEO. Why the disconnect?

It’s partly a matter of how people interpret the word “formal.” Is it the board chair taking the CEO to lunch at the end of the year and telling her that she’s doing a terrific job? Is it an annual survey of board members who evaluate the CEO against a set of pre-determined performance goals and provide collective feedback orally and in writing? Is it somewhere in between?

Performance review of family foundation CEOs can take many forms. It does not have to be a complex, time-consuming process. At its most basic, it’s about asking what you need to know to be successful. The CEO needs to know the board’s goals, and the board needs to know how effectively the CEO is leading the process to achieve them. Ideally, the review is focused on progress toward goals, not on behavior.

Of those Esposito interviewed, “most CEOs felt that communication would be improved if there was something more formal than what they currently have,” she said. “Most people pointed to the performance and priority setting being as important as the assessment,” she added. The annual review is an important way to take stock of where the foundation is, where the board wants it to go, and what the CEO’s role in that will be.

Much has been written about how to conduct performance reviews. Most people have experienced an evaluation process at some point in their working lives. Often these processes have been devised for the for-profit sector—where progress can be more easily measured—and adapted by the nonprofit sector. But little has been written about how to review family foundation CEOs specifically. The job carries a unique set of roles and responsibilities including some that are family-related such as supporting effective board governance, working within the family’s culture, representing the family in the community, and engaging in grantmaking in the context of the family legacy.

Every foundation is different, and there are a lot of ways to review a CEO’s performance. This guide, through case studies and sample evaluation forms, is designed to help you find a system that works for you. If you aren’t doing any kind of formal CEO evaluation now, we hope these stories and tools will get you started. If you already have a performance review process, we hope you will find ideas to make it a more productive and satisfying experience.

“Most CEOs felt that communication would be improved if there was something more formal than what they currently have.”

REASONS WHY BOARDS SHOULD DO PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

Boards owe it to their CEOs to perform some type of regular performance review. Here are some of the key reasons:

- It's part of the board's job. One of the key responsibilities of nonprofit boards is hiring chief executives and assessing their performance.
- It provides regular opportunities for both the board and CEO to get clear about expectations.
- It's a way to insure that the CEO is focused on the board's priorities and the foundation's goals. That also necessitates the board setting some goals for the foundation, which is another good practice.
- Most CEOs want and need feedback. The process also gives CEOs an opportunity to raise questions, request help, and give the board feedback in return.
- It serves as an early warning system. CEOs would rather hear early if something isn't working well, so they can adjust before things go off the track.
- It forces the board to speak with one voice to the CEO. When there is an objective process focused on achievement of goals, individual board members will be less likely to provide conflicting feedback and pull the CEO in different directions regarding priorities.
- It's an opportunity for a CEO and board to agree on a professional development plan, something every employee can benefit from, so they can stay fresh and grow in their position.
- It's a way for the board to learn more about what the CEO's job entails. Board members know firsthand how well the CEO works with the board, but have less knowledge of the management and grantmaking responsibilities on their CEO's shoulders.
- In the event the board has to terminate the CEO, written performance reviews help the foundation prevent or defend against a wrongful termination lawsuit.

WHY THE RELUCTANCE TO DO PERFORMANCE REVIEWS?

Given all the good reasons to do performance reviews, why do they happen so seldom? In the National Center's interview study, most CEOs said their board wouldn't do a performance review if the CEO didn't initiate it. Some of the reasons for board reluctance cited are:

- The board is very happy with their CEO so they don't see the need;
- It takes too much time when there are so many more pressing matters;
- It's hard to measure effectiveness. One CEO said that, unlike with her previous job as a nonprofit development officer where she was measured against her fundraising goals, "it's harder to measure success in a family foundation, both personally and organizationally."
- The board feels uncomfortable giving feedback. They don't like to "judge" a person who in many cases feels like a member of their family. (It's even more awkward when the CEO is a member of the family!)

"The bond between a CEO and the board can be very affectionate, and people feel awkward about evaluating someone they care about personally," Esposito said, and that goes double for a family member CEO. One described what happened when she tried to institute a formal review process. She developed an evaluation form, gave it to the three board members and asked them to rate her in various categories. The outcome wasn't what she'd hoped for. "My father sent me flowers, my mother phoned to tell me what a wonderful job I was doing, and my brother lost the form."

Along with the interview study, the National Center also conducted an online survey of 200 CEOs in conjunction with The Johnson Center for Philanthropy at Grand Valley State University. One question was: *Does your board conduct an annual performance review of your work?* Only about 37 percent of the CEOs who were members of the founding family received annual reviews.

Jane Leighty Justis, executive director of The Leighty Foundation has encouraged her family to evaluate her annually. She starts with a self-assessment. "I take each point in my job description and write a couple of sentences on each of them about how I think I'm doing. Then I put it on the agenda for the annual meeting, we talk about it, and I ask if they have any feedback for me." The feedback she has received from this process has been very general, but she believes that the recent inclusion of members of the third generation on the board will offer an opportunity to expand this process and make it more helpful for all.

"The bond between a CEO and the board can be very affectionate, and people feel awkward about evaluating someone they care about personally."

TIP *Most anyone who has to give feedback to an employee—or a superior—can benefit from some training to ease the discomfort and make the experience more productive for everyone. You might arrange some board training on effective communications, including around performance reviews. This can help the CEO too, who has to provide feedback to the board and also review the foundation’s other staff members or contractors.*

“Without one, I don’t have a road map for my professional development and their expectations around grantmaking.”

Even some nonfamily CEOs have trouble convincing their boards of the value. “I never get an evaluation,” lamented one CEO with long tenure, “and I’d love one.” She puzzles over why the founder and his family are unwilling to review her. “That’s not how they operate their family business.”

One CEO who heads a large staff and who has a close working relationship with a living donor said his foundation “has a formal evaluation process for everyone but me.” With each staff member, he has an annual “performance reflection” that includes setting goals and measurements for the next year. But the donor doesn’t want to evaluate her CEO. “She says ‘why do I need to do an evaluation of you? I talk to you every day?’” He fills out his own performance reflection form anyway, and gives it to the board, but “if I didn’t give it to my donor, she probably wouldn’t ask for it.”

One CEO who pushed his board to do a review said “For me personally, not having an evaluation is a recipe for problems. Without one, I don’t have a road map for my professional development and their expectations around grantmaking. Anecdotal feedback isn’t usually helpful. They need to reflect on my performance and the performance of the foundation.”

Another CEO said her annual review “is the only time I ever get to reflect with the board on what we are accomplishing.”

The Process: No One Size Fits All

The main requirement for a performance review process is that it be useful for your family foundation's board and CEO. There are a lot of ways to get feedback that will be helpful to everyone. A review done by a small family foundation with a staff of two—a director and an assistant—may be less elaborate than one with a large staff and a multi-million dollar grants budget. But foundation size doesn't seem to be a good indicator of whether the CEO receives an effective performance review. Esposito's research turned up CEOs of large foundations who didn't have a process other than an end-of-year lunch where the CEO and board chair discuss how things are going and what the CEO's compensation will be for the coming year.

Typically, but not always, performance reviews are done annually. Sometimes they are tied to a discussion of compensation.

- Some foundations start with the CEO's job description as a basis for evaluation. The CEO might add a set of personal goals.
- Some boards set annual goals (sometimes called a work plan) for the foundation that the CEO and board both have roles in implementing.
- Most use a written evaluation form that allows board members to rate the CEO on various items taken from the job description and/or goals. Usually there is room for individual board members to make comments that are compiled without attribution and provided in writing to the CEO, typically by the board chair. (A variety of models appear at the end of this guide.)
- Some CEOs provide the board with a self-assessment so members have something to react to. In other foundations, the board members complete the survey and only see the self-assessment afterward.
- Some boards delegate the lead role in the CEO's performance review to their board chair. For others, the responsibility lies with the Executive Committee or a Personnel Committee.
- A few foundations involve others in the review such as the CEO's staff or outsiders who know the CEO's work.

The next sections of this guide will help you sort out your options and devise a CEO performance review process that works best for your board and CEO.

FOCUS ON FOUNDATION PRIORITIES AND GOALS

In Esposito's CEO interview study, "everyone thought they could benefit from a review process or a better process than what they had. The small number of CEOs who felt their foundation's process was satisfactory said "it was based on agreed upon priorities; it was more objective so it felt less personal," Esposito said. "They also thought it improved communications. Some have members of their board who don't really know what their CEO does."

Some people fear performance evaluations as something that can be awkward or unpleasant, Esposito said. "But the few who were happy with their review process said it is just the opposite. They said their review meetings were really terrific. It was energizing, and was about how we are doing this together. The difference was, they got good feedback on how they were contributing to the overall effectiveness of the foundation." One said his review included a "so what?" component. "If this is how we've done, what does this mean?" By putting the focus on

"It was based on agreed upon priorities; it was more objective so it felt less personal."

► VIEWS FROM THE FIELD

Elizabeth Casselman, has been the executive director of the Clowes Fund in Indianapolis for 12 years. Her annual review process grew out of her job description plus research by the late Gary A. Tobin, president of the Institute for Jewish and Community Research. In a 2004 article in “Foundation News and Commentary,” Tobin described the many other roles family foundation CEOs play such as advisor, mentor, ambassador, technical expert, visionary, truth teller, confidant and protector. “It’s hard to describe what I do on a daily basis. Reading that article helped me articulate it,” Casselman recalled. That, plus a template devised by the Council on Foundations, helped Casselman shape two forms her foundation uses for her annual performance review. One is called Assessment of Executive Director Performance and is a short form circulated to the board to aid their discussion of her performance during an executive session at their annual meeting. A second one, called the Annual Employment Performance Review, is a much more detailed evaluation that Casselman and the board chair complete and then discuss together. Because of the detail, the second form “stimulates a richer discussion.” This process gives her a good reading of the board’s views without all the members having to spend a lot of time completing a long form. (See samples on page 17.)

Special Note: A copy of Tobin’s seminal essay on family foundation CEOs can be found in the National Center for Family Philanthropy’s The Family Foundation CEO: Crafting Consensus out of Complexity, 2012.

the foundation’s goals and the board’s priorities, the conversation becomes an objective one about the CEO’s results, not his behavior.

Reviews are usually based on a combination of factors in the CEO’s job description plus some annual goals. The job description is the basis for questions about the CEO’s relationship to the family and should be a living document that is reviewed and subject to periodic change if necessary.

WRITING A WORK PLAN

Work plans—basically a list of personal and organizational goals—do not have to be elaborate. Some CEOs produce a plan that fits on one page and says “These are the four or five things that we want to accomplish in the next year.”

To identify organizational goals, one CEO suggested asking the board “What is the next most important thing the foundation must do to fulfill its mission?” This might generate responses such as: preparing for succession, reviewing the foundation’s intentions about perpetuity, shifting our grantmaking priorities. Armed with the board’s goals, the CEO can then devise a set of actions to help the board make them happen.

Once a work plan is set, allow for flexibility. Sometimes forces beyond the CEO’s control intervene to make it difficult to achieve all the goals. One CEO said succession planning is on her work plan, “but there is only so much I can do. I can educate them, and lead, but ultimately the board has to make it happen.”

Alternatively, the CEO may accomplish more than the work plan listed. One CEO said his review includes “seizing opportunities that weren’t even thought of when the goals were set.” He cited examples such as putting together a funding collaborative or helping create consensus around a community goal. “That’s a mark of innovative leadership upon which the CEO should be evaluated.”

TIP Somewhere in the goals discussion, there also needs to be room for the CEO to suggest what resources she will need to accomplish them. For example, if the board decides to set a goal of expanding an aspect of its grantmaking program, the CEO may need to hire additional help.

TIP *Not everyone on the board may understand all the complexities of what the CEO does and how effectively she does it. One way to help them learn more is to have a performance review committee with a portion of the members rotating off every couple of years so everyone on the board gets a chance to serve and to get a more detailed picture of the CEO's roles and responsibilities.*

GETTING EVERYBODY ON THE SAME PAGE

CEO evaluations differ from that of other staff because instead of one boss, there is a whole board weighing in. One of the risks of having an informal process where the board chair meets with the CEO once a year for a “performance conversation” is that, while the two of them may have a good working relationship, the full board’s participation in the review is limited. This can lead to mixed messages.

Goal setting helps board members talk out their differences and reach agreement. It also helps if you have an outlier or two on the board who have issues with the CEO’s style. For example, a board member who likes lots of face-to-face, individual meetings with the CEO to keep up on foundation business can become a drain on a CEO’s time. But attempts by the CEO to limit such meetings might lead to resentment by the board member. An objective discussion by the whole board about priorities for the CEO’s time, as well as a conversation about how much and in what ways the board prefers the CEO to communicate could help deal with the issue constructively.

“With just the numbers, though, it’s sometimes hard for me to interpret the message.”

One CEO said that it’s part of her board’s culture “for every board member to have the opportunity and responsibility to fully participate. This makes for a vital, active, informed board. The flip side, however, is that sometimes the culture doesn’t push for clarity when there is a difference of opinion.” Her board members each complete an annual survey, rating her on various performance measures, and she sees the aggregate scores. “With just the numbers, though, it’s sometimes hard for me to interpret the message or whether one person or the whole group is driving the feedback. Is this three-fourths of the board speaking or just one person who put a lot of weight on that question?”

Lack of specificity in the questions can lead to confusion, too. “The board chair and I can look at the results and say two-thirds said this, but the questions are so broad, that it’s hard for me to know what to do to change.” Most evaluation forms include numerical ratings and places for comments without attribution to promote candid feedback. But many CEOs say their boards mostly stick to the ratings and add little in the way of comments, unless they are unhappy about something.

Changes in board members also affects the review process. As some leave and new ones join, opinions may change on what the CEO should be measured on and what the priorities are. Regular communication within the board about expectations of the CEO can help the board continue to be clear and speak with one voice.

Like everything else, performance review processes usually get better with practice. Said one CEO, “this is a process that will hone the trustees’ ability to set their own expectations about what the foundation can achieve and what resources will be needed to achieve it. That not only helps clarify the current relationship of the board and the CEO, but also helps prepare the board to decide what to look for in their next CEO.”

► VIEWS FROM THE FIELD

Gayle Williams, executive director of the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, developed a simple evaluation process when she was hired by the foundation 18 years ago. “There was no process when I came, and I said I wanted one,” Williams recalled. She didn’t have trouble convincing the board since many of the members had experience on other nonprofit boards that had conducted such evaluations.

Williams proposes annual goals at the end of each year for the next year, usually no more than seven or eight. For example, the goals might include reviewing two of their funding strategies over the next year. Since Williams announced in late 2011 her intention to retire at the end of 2012, her latest list of goals includes several concerning executive transition.

“Those become the basis of my annual performance review. Late in the year, the chair of the Administration and Personnel Committee launches a Survey Monkey online asking the rest of the board about my performance on those goals. It includes questions about general performance as well as things based on my job description. I write a report on what I see as the progress which gets attached to the survey.”

After the board members respond to the online survey, the committee chair tallies the results and “pulls out themes to talk to the whole board about.” Then the full board discusses the findings in an executive session. Following that meeting, the president and vice president of the board meet with Williams and provide her with an oral summary of the board’s discussion.

“My advice to other foundations is to keep the process as simple as possible.”

CEOS USUALLY TAKE THE LEAD

If you are the CEO and do not get a regular review, it’s up to you to ask for one and, if necessary, help the board develop a process. While it’s true that hiring and evaluating a CEO is part of the board’s job, it usually falls to the CEO to create the process and see that it gets done. This is quite natural since the board relies on the staff to manage the rest of the foundation’s work.

“My experience,” said one, “is that as CEO, if I’m not greasing the wheels to make them turn, any process of the foundation will get stuck.” When it comes to his own annual review, “directing that process feels inappropriate, but it wouldn’t get done otherwise.” When he tried to leave them to manage it themselves, “they couldn’t come up with the form the goals should be in, or who should have input and how, so it just stayed in this ‘process Neverland’ because I wasn’t there to help them do it.”

Douglas Bitonti Stewart, executive director of Max M. & Marjorie S. Fisher Foundation in Detroit, Michigan, became the foundation’s first CEO in 2007. “It was never a question of whether I would be evaluated or not. I simply said this is how I am going to evaluate myself

“As CEO, if I’m not greasing the wheels to make them turn, any process of the foundation will get stuck.”



TIP *Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.com) and Zoomerang (www.zoomerang.com) are just two of the simple-to-use, web-based survey tools that can be found on the internet and used by board members to provide input on CEO evaluations. Both have free services for small surveys with fee-based subscriptions for more advanced offerings.*

and asked the board how they wanted to participate in that process.” He believes it is a family foundation CEO’s job “to create a space for the board to give you honest feedback. It’s not the family’s job, it’s my responsibility.” At the same time, the process you develop with the board “needs to hold them to the standard that they need to be explicit about behaviors, expectations, and outcomes.”

The categories on Stewart’s evaluation parallel his job description (see sample on page 19). Over time, his evaluation form has changed. When he first started the job, he had only one assistant. Now that the foundation employs a grants manager and a program officer, his responsibilities have changed. “Now the questions focus less on the tactical matters and more on strategic issues and leadership.”

WHERE THE FOUNDATION’S MULTI-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN FITS IN

Some family foundations have strategic plans, typically spanning three to five years. In those cases, the CEO’s review ideally would be grounded not only in an annual work plan, but also flow from the larger strategic plan. Here’s how one foundation makes that work:

Greg Cantori, executive director of the Marion I. and Henry J. Knott Foundation in Baltimore, works with his board to use the annual performance review process to ensure the foundation’s strategic plan is a living document. Each year, he and each of his three staff members complete an annual review that includes goal setting for the coming year. The goals flow from the board’s five-year strategic plan. But the process doesn’t end there.

To keep track of progress against the annual goals, Cantori devised a spread sheet (see sample on page 24). On the sheet, each staff member, including Cantori, lists their annual goals, why each is important, some action steps, how completion will be measured, a timetable, and the current status. After each goal there is also a category for “percentage complete” which includes color coding. A goal that is 90 percent complete, for example, would be green, those in yellow are in progress, and those in red are stalled or not yet begun.

Although the process might seem complicated, Cantori said the spreadsheet actually takes very little time to update, and the color-coding makes it easy to focus on those things that need attention. His employees update their spread sheets twice a year, but he does his quarterly and sends the report to the board’s Executive Committee for review. Then he and the board president discuss the report and focus on the goals that need more work and what help Cantori might need to complete them. The full board also gets an update on the foundation’s progress toward its goals in the executive director’s report that he includes in each board meeting packet as part of the consent agenda.

The process also “helps us work internally to get buy-in and a sense of commitment to the plan. It’s a living document.”

Cantori not only makes his spreadsheet available to his board but also to his staff. “It’s vital that they see where we’re making progress and where we’re falling short,” Cantori explains. He also uses the task function in his Outlook computer program to create tasks for the staff—and they can create tasks for him—to help everyone stay on track.

By pegging his annual goals to the board’s strategic plan, Cantori also makes clear what the board’s role is in his ability to accomplish his work plan. For example, the strategic plan that started in 2008 included a goal that he implement a plan to make multi-year grants. Then when the economy tanked, he couldn’t do that because of the large drop in the foundation’s assets. The board had to suspend the plan.

Cantori said that he, the staff and the board, go to these extra lengths because he had seen other organizations write strategic plans and then let them sit on a shelf. “We were so determined not to let that happen. The process also “helps us work internally to get buy-in and a sense of commitment to the plan. It’s a living document.”

ARE 360 DEGREE REVIEWS USEFUL?

A 360 degree review is a human resources term referring to feedback solicited from many sources surrounding the CEO. More commonly used in the corporate world, 360 reviews have garnered mixed opinions on how useful they are in improving performance.

Some foundations use a modified approach, where they ask a CEO’s staff to complete an evaluation form, separate from the board’s, about their boss. (See sample from the Knott Foundation on page 22.)

One CEO of a large foundation said his board, plus key staff and the staff of the family office with whom he works closely, all get an evaluation form to fill out. The comments and numerical scores are compiled, and that input is included in an Executive Committee letter to the full board and the CEO. That letter includes their expectations of the CEO for the coming year and shares the comments and scores from the evaluation forms.

The Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation includes the views of two outsiders in the field who are familiar with the CEO’s work (see Views from the Field on page 14).

The risk with 360 reviews is that the people who are surveyed may not have enough exposure to the CEO’s work to be helpful. There may even be some bad chemistry based on only one or two encounters that will color the information. The reviews also add an additional layer of work to the process, so think about how much value you will get before you decide to do one. Some foundations that use 360s only do them every three to five years.

TIP *Some foundations conduct grantee perception surveys every few years to make sure they are being responsive grant partners. Usually a third partner handles the survey so grantees can remain anonymous. The Center for Effective Philanthropy has a process that has been used by large foundations.*

DOES THE BOARD ASSESS ITS OWN PERFORMANCE?

It's considered best practice for all boards to assess their own performance periodically. Since a family foundation's leadership is shared by its board and chief staff person, evaluating only the CEO leaves part of the operation unexamined. In practice, though, board self-assessment is not that common in family foundations. In 2008, the National Center conducted the first ever random survey of current practices in family foundations. Among the findings was that most foundation boards (66 percent), do not conduct regular self-assessments. About 30 percent reported that they conduct informal self-assessments, and only three percent said they use formal assessment tools. Only 41 percent felt they assessed themselves adequately. (The *Current Practices of Family Foundations* research report can be downloaded from the National Center's website at www.ncfp.org.)

► VIEWS FROM THE FIELD

The Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation in New York City evaluates its CEO every other year. On the off years, the board members evaluate themselves. The foundation's president, Victor De Luca, created the process, which includes soliciting feedback from his staff. He feels that every other year is frequent enough for his evaluation since "this isn't the only time the board can do course corrections," and the process is time consuming. The foundation, with approximately \$42 million in assets, has 16 board members, six of whom are family members.

Here's how the process works:

In September, a letter is sent to the board and staff with a form to complete and a separate return envelope addressed to the board chair. De Luca also writes a self-evaluation which is sent with the form. He also thinks it is valuable to have the views of his performance from outside the foundation. He contacts a couple of people he works with in the philanthropy field, such as someone he serves on a board or committee with (but not a grantee), and asks them if they'd be willing to speak to his chair.

The chair compiles the results, both the numerical ratings and the comments—without attribution—and prepares a report for the board, staff, and De Luca. Then the board discusses the report at the fall meeting in executive session. Afterward, the chair meets with De Luca to discuss the board's conversation and any corrective actions that are needed.

For the board member self-assessment, the foundation office sends a form with a return envelope with a number on it. (See sample, page 26.) No names are used to maintain anonymity. When the office receives all the forms back, De Luca opens all the envelopes at once and compiles the results. (His report is reviewed by the whole board, and sometimes, if there are comments about specific committees, those comments are forwarded on.)

The board's self-assessment is valuable to De Luca, too. "Once I see what people are saying, often I can help. For example, board members might say they don't feel we're tapping their knowledge base and experience." Since De Luca sometimes brings in outside speakers for board meetings, he can consider how they might use board members instead, either as speakers on a topic in which they have expertise or as respondents to an outsider's presentation.

De Luca feels strongly about the value of performance evaluations. "It's a way to show you are trying to achieve what you set out to do."

“It’s a way to show you are trying to achieve what you set out to do.”

The lack of family foundation board assessment isn’t all that surprising. It’s common in the nonprofit world for boards to focus more on assessing staff than themselves. Compounding the issue for family foundations is finding an appropriate instrument. Nonprofit board assessment tools don’t include the family aspects of governing a foundation such as honoring donor intent or planning for generational succession.

Another factor is the nature of family foundation boards. Since they are often made up of a handful of closely related board members such as parents and their children, they may not feel it necessary to do something formal. The advantage, however, is that just filling out a form periodically reminds the board of its job in governing the foundation, and lets each member reflect anonymously on how well it does that, making it more likely that board will perform effectively.

One CEO said his board chair tried to get the board to do a self-assessment. “That year they tried to come up with goals for the organization, for the board, and for me, but they couldn’t agree. It just became an assessment of the program and of me. My review that year got really mucked up as a result.”

To help family foundations do self-assessments, the National Center for Family Philanthropy created Pursuit of Excellence. This process helps foundations understand their current performance and develop an action plan to achieve greater effectiveness. The first-ever research-based assessment tool specifically designed for family foundations, POE combines an online self-assessment with the resources and in-person help needed to put an action plan in place.

Here is an example of how POE is being used:

Doug Bitonti Stewart of the Fisher Foundation had an objective in his work plan to move the foundation forward in developing its first comprehensive strategic plan. “While the board had been strategic in its focus during the first three years of its operation, we felt we needed a more specific set of strategies in each of our four impact areas so we and our partners would know if we are achieving our shared goals,” he explained. First, the board and he used the Pursuit of Excellence assessment, and through that process, “discovered a misalignment of views various board members held regarding the relationship of donor legacy to our initial mission. Having been in business for only a few years, we realized we needed to sharpen our mission statement before we could plan our strategy.”

This slowed down the foundation’s timetable for developing a strategic plan, “but we all knew why,” so not meeting that objective didn’t reflect negatively on Stewart’s annual performance.

TIP To learn more about the Pursuit of Excellence Self Assessment process, contact ncfp@ncfp.org.

Conclusion

By now you've figured out that reviewing the performance of a family foundation CEO is more art than science. There is no one right way, but doing it is an essential task. Whatever process you use should be formal enough to be genuinely meaningful, should fit the culture of your organization, and provide useful information to both the board and CEO. Here's one final tip. After you finish your next—and every—CEO performance review, take a look at the process itself. Is it giving both the CEO and the board enough feedback to continue to move the foundation forward? The answer to that will probably change over time, and your review process should too. It can grow with the foundation as you strive to continually achieve greater levels of effectiveness.

***THANKS TO OUR PEER REVIEWERS:** The National Center for Family Philanthropy wishes to thank Greg Cantori, Executive Director of the Marion I. and Henry J. Knott Foundation, and Elizabeth Casselman, Executive Director of the Clowes Fund, for serving as peer reviewers of this guide.*

Clowes Fund

ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT PERFORMANCE REVIEW (USED BY BOARD CHAIR AND CEO)

For:

Date of Review:

Date of Employment:

This review is based on the Council on Foundations survey of executive development for foundation chief officers which identified three core areas for examination -- External Leadership, Organizational Leadership and Management -- as well as 10 Personal Characteristics.

Traits are listed below for each category. Executive should complete as self-assessment; directors complete with assessment of previous year performance and direction for coming year.

ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Providing leadership and management of the foundation.

1. Work with the foundation Board for effective governance of the foundation.
2. Craft the foundation's vision/mission with Board and staff.
3. Develop a strategic plan with Board and staff to achieve the vision/mission.
4. Select, manage, supervise and communicate effectively with staff.
5. Oversee and perform grantmaking, administrative, financial and other operational functions.
6. Provide a positive work culture for staff that stimulates creative and effective work.
7. Establish accountability standards, track and demonstrate the impact of the foundation's work.
8. Nurture and support the professional development of staff.

EXTERNAL LEADERSHIP

Providing leadership to the global, national, or local community; to the fields of foundation's focus; and to the field of philanthropy.

1. Contribute to the vision and thought leadership of the field of philanthropy.
2. Work collaboratively with other foundations for greater societal impact.
3. Help shape the agenda and decision-making of government and other external stakeholders.
4. Contribute to the vision and thought leadership of the foundation's funding program areas.
5. Communicate the foundation's mission and the field of philanthropy's meaningful contributions to society.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The Council reports the following as key characteristics of a successful foundation executive:

Humility, intelligence, sense of humor, integrity, open-mindedness/good listener, flexibility, generosity, inclusiveness, diplomacy, empathy.

Compensation history and recommendation:

[Insert CEO's salary history plus information to benchmark compensation such as salary survey for comparable position.]

M&M Fisher

Max M. & Marjorie S. Fisher Foundation

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EVALUATION

Scale: 1 Lowest / 5 Highest (NA=No opinion)

1. Grant Making	Score	Comments
Provide leadership and vision for Foundation mission and each impact area		
Administration of grant making program		
Investigation / evaluation of proposals		
Written reports and recommendations for grant making programs		
Monitor grant partner performance		

2. Leadership	Score	Comments
Facilitate effective Board member relationships		
Provide leadership opportunities for Board/family members		

Keep Board/family informed		
Serve as Foundation spokesperson		

3. Management	Score	Comments
Oversee general day-to-day activities		
Advise, counsel, and direct Foundation staff		
Board meeting preparation/planning		

4. Promote Philanthropy	Score	Comments
Develop relationships with present/potential grant partners		
Foster the public awareness of the Foundation as appropriate		
Participate in philanthropic sector leadership organizations		

5. Administration	Score	Comments
Financial administration and management		
Preparation/review of operations budget		
Development of fiscal policies governing distribution of assets/monitor fund performance		

Additional Comments:

- Areas of particular strength that should be reinforced:

- Areas needing improvement or attention:

- Specific aspects needing redirection or modification for the coming year:

- Other comments:

Knott Foundation

CAREER DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

This guideline conversation gives a framework for discussion during our annual review. During the discussion, the Executive Director will take notes and summarize the conversation. A copy of the summary will be distributed both to you and to your personnel file.

Discuss:

Effectiveness: The staff's effectiveness in carrying out their particular responsibilities.

Do you:

- Demonstrate the ability to produce a substantial amount of work compared to the number of hours worked?
- Consistently produce high quality work with few to no errors?
- Prioritize your work, focusing on items with the highest positive impact on the Foundation?
- Maintain easy to access reference files, papers and decisions?

Teamwork: The staff's effectiveness as a member of the team.

Do you:

- Show a willingness to work additional hours to help staff or the Foundation meet deadlines?
- Consistently demonstrate a positive attitude that fosters the support and cooperation of other staff?
- Put the good of the group over individual needs?
- Contribute to the team by sharing knowledge and experience?
- Help others when asked while being careful in balancing too much input with too little?

Service: The staff's role, and effectiveness in providing exceptional service.

Do you:

- Understand what the Foundation's expectations are as related to your work? If not, why?
- Have any ideas how mutual expectations could be better communicated?
- Keep others at the Foundation informed of issues?
- Demonstrate a personal willingness to be flexible in work agenda, schedules and approach to work in order to fulfill the Foundation's needs and expectations? (Willingness to alter what you do, when you do it, and how you do it in order to meet overall organizational demands)
- Go above and beyond the call of duty to serve the Foundation?

Self Development: The staff's progress in relation to career growth and professional development.

Do You:

- Take the initiative to develop your knowledge, skills and abilities, including on your own time ?
- Become involved in appropriate professional activities?

Systems and Procedures: The staff's role in developing and implementing new ways of doing things.

Do you:

- Try to develop/adopt new, efficient ways of doing your work?
- Show initiative in proactively taking on a task or problem and seeing it through to its conclusion?
- Show willingness to modify systems and procedures to improve efficiency?
- Show a willingness to try new approaches/ideas/technologies?

Knott Foundation

CAREER DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

SETTING INDIVIDUAL GOALS

The career development review is a good time for you and your Executive Director to discuss your long-term and short-term goals. It is your responsibility to develop goals for the next year, and your Executive Director will offer suggestions and ideas. These goals should relate to those elements necessary for you to grow and develop in your job,

- items that relate to the Foundation's needs and the Strategic Plan, as well as team needs and objectives, and
- providing exceptional service to our grantees and Trustees

You should begin the goal setting process by developing individual goals for improvement/growth to accomplish in the upcoming year. (Please write down a draft of your goals before your career development review.) Goals should be realistic, specific, and measurable and have a timetable for completion. Use the following outline when setting your individual goals.

1. Set 2 - 5 goals for the next year. Goals should be:

- realistic - not too hard, not too easy
- specific
- comprehensive
- understandable

2. Action Plan

- Determine steps required to reach each goal.
- Are there additional training or resources required?

3. Determine how the goal is to be measured.

- What are the results expected? (This is a key item!!)
- Do all parties agree with goals set?
- Can results be observed by others?

4. Timetable

- Schedule meetings to review progress.

GUIDE FOR INDIVIDUAL GOAL SETTING

During the review, you and the Executive Director will discuss the goals you have developed, and your Director will offer input and suggestions. Once you have met with the Executive Director and received his or her input, finalize your goals and give a copy to your Executive Director.

GOAL	ACTION PLAN	MEASURABILITY	TIMETABLE
What would I like to accomplish? <i>What does the team need? What does the Foundation need?</i>	What specific steps can I take to reach these goals?	How will I know if these goals are reached?	When do I plan to complete the action plan?
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

Knott Foundation Executive Director

CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

2011 GOAL SETTING

GOAL	WHY	ACTION PLAN	MEASURABILITY	TIMETABLE	STATUS	% Complete
<p><i>What would I like to accomplish? What does the team need? What does the Foundation need?</i></p> <p>1. A. Fully integrate new staff into Foundation operational, board and committee workflows.</p>	<p><i>Why is this goal important?</i></p> <p>To ensure all operational details are covered and integrated, including cases where primary staff is absent</p>	<p><i>What specific steps can I take to reach these goals?</i></p> <p>Ongoing orientation, review and revision of workflow diagrams, manuals and procedures.</p> <p>Ensure committees are fully and clearly supported and staffed</p>	<p><i>How will I know if these goals are reached?</i></p> <p>Workflow will be seamless with staff able to cover each other during absences.</p> <p>Each committee will have a designated staff member</p>	<p><i>When will the action be completed?</i></p> <p>Summer 2011 initially and again by year-end.</p> <p>Jun-11</p>	<p><i>Where are we as of: XXXXXXXX</i></p> <p>Job descriptions and workflow completed - Staff effectively working together</p> <p>Staff all are assigned now</p>	100%
<p>B. Redesign our internal grant processes</p>	<p>To further systematize and refine our grantmaking process, making it straightforward for grantees, and useful to Trustees</p>	<p>Add a Continuous Process Improvement component</p>	<p>We will have at least a half dozen improvements identified and undergoing implementation</p>	<p>Ongoing with mid-year and year-end reports for 2011</p>	<p>Final planning meeting completed</p>	75%
<p>2. Outcomes Measures committee will develop its recommendations to the board in light of the new strategic planning and goal setting process.</p>	<p>To ascertain our grantmaking impact and grantee capacity in meeting their goals</p>	<p>Keep a running action-item list from grantee post grant and 5-15 (lessons learned) reports</p> <p>Lead staff in identifying best outcomes measure practices that we can implement as we begin to set goals from our planning process</p>	<p>Will have an online and hard copy notebook</p> <p>Have a list of outcome tools and processes to inform our planning and goal setting into 2012</p>	<p>Year end</p> <p>June-11</p>	<p>Added an After Action Review to interim and post grants</p> <p>Arts underway now</p>	75%
<p>3. Complete the on-line grant application system</p>	<p>To streamline our grantmaking process with more accessible information for Trustees</p>	<p>Work closely with grantees in developing good outcome measures for schools</p> <p>Ensure each grant defines what success will look like</p>	<p>Complete the school measurement tool that every school will use</p> <p>Complete the Audit Insight tool that every full proposal will use</p> <p>Grants will have upfront outcomes outlined. Interim and Post grant reports will be contractually tied to original agreed upon outcomes that will become a part of their contract and post grant reporting</p> <p>Grantees will have ability to submit LOI and full proposals online</p>	<p>Jun-11</p> <p>Jun-11</p> <p>Jun-11</p> <p>Jun-11</p>	<p>Completed April 2011</p> <p>Completed April 2011 Modified Oct.</p> <p>With new IGAM online now - the outcomes will become part of the contract</p>	100%
<p>4. Proactive and Multiyear process will be completed</p>	<p>To have a clear and agreed upon process for longer term grant engagements and proactive initiatives</p>	<p>Complete phase 1 pilot by March 2011.</p> <p>Implement full-fledged process for the June 2011 cycle</p> <p>Ensure each grant is categorized and prioritized in relation to our Strategic Plan</p> <p>Ensure Trustee portal is easily and regularly accessed</p> <p>Pre-established policies will be established for Proactive and multiyear engagements.</p>	<p>Grantees will have ability to submit LOI and full proposals online</p> <p>Every LOI will be properly categorized and ranked in relation to our Strategic Plan's priorities</p> <p>Regular reports on Trustee portal access rates</p> <p>Guidelines and policies for proactive and multiyear grants completed</p>	<p>Jun-11</p> <p>Jun-11</p> <p>Jun-11</p> <p>Dec-11</p>	<p>Phase 2 process went extremely well for Oct cycle</p> <p>Completed with IGAM</p> <p>We have regular reports on portal access rates</p> <p>Draft in process</p>	90%
<p>5. Other:</p> <p>a. Begin the next phase of our Strategic Planning process</p>	<p>To refine and clarify our purpose and success rates in assisting our grantees and our own operational effectiveness</p>	<p>Recommend eliminating both the awarded and denied grant blackout periods – each grant request stands on its own merits</p> <p>Work with president in setting the stage in introducing the new planning process</p>	<p>Board will consider eliminating all blackout periods</p> <p>We will have set the stage for a new planning process into 2012</p>	<p>Dec-11</p> <p>By Dec 2011 for planning process approval</p>	<p>Will build into Strategic Plan update process into 2012</p> <p>Ongoing with President, Board Development and Exc. Committee</p>	50%

Noyes Foundation

PRESIDENT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM – 2011

Performance Categories	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Outstanding	Not Sure
<p>1. Planning & Organizing: Demonstrates an understanding of the Foundation's mission and priorities; establishes effective courses of action to implement the goals and objectives set forth in the strategic plan</p>					
<p>2. Judgment & Decisiveness: Makes well-timed and sound decisions; takes action in a timely manner; meets deadlines; solves problems promptly; sets appropriate priorities for tasks</p>					
<p>3. Initiative: Sets high goals/standards of performance for self and others; originates action rather than only responding to the action of others</p>					
<p>4. Vision: Clearly articulates a vision for the future of the organization; considers issues that are broader and longer range</p>					
<p>5. Oral Communication: Gives and receives information effectively; clearly presents ideas/tasks; listens to others</p>					
<p>6. Written Communication: Expresses ideas in a clear and effective manner; prepares reports that are easily understood and responsive to the needs of the board; advances the Foundation's communications and information systems, including the web site</p>					

Noyes Foundation

PRESIDENT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM – 2011 *(continued)*

Performance Categories	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Outstanding	Not Sure
<p>7. Analytical Ability: Sorts through and compares data from different sources; identifies key issues; secures needed information</p>					
<p>8. Sensitivity: Demonstrates consideration for others; shows appreciation for the work done by others; makes effort to put people at ease; solicits feedback and opinions from others</p>					
<p>9. Adaptability & Resourcefulness: Maintains effectiveness in varying environments; reaches goals using various means available</p>					
<p>10. Team Building & Conflict Resolution: Fosters collaborative work among both board and staff; is a good team player; facilitates work group effectiveness; resolves conflicting interests fairly</p>					
<p>11. Management: Manages and motivates the staff effectively; provides clear direction; measures results; gives timely and specific feedback; establishes communication channels; ensures quality work performance and timely completion of tasks; fosters a comfortable work environment; delegates to, mentors and enhances the skills of the staff; promotes a welcoming and helpful approach to grant seekers and other foundations</p>					
<p>12. Financial Management: Demonstrates effective oversight of the financial health and well-being of the Foundation, including budgeting; ensures that the operations are soundly managed; clearly communicates financial information to the board</p>					

Noyes Foundation

PRESIDENT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM – 2011 *(continued)*

Performance Categories	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Outstanding	Not Sure
<p>13. Professional Knowledge: Understands and stays abreast of current issues in the philanthropic and social investment fields and in the issues the Foundation has prioritized</p>					
<p>14. Board of Directors Relations: Works well with board members individually and as a unit; is accessible and responsive; provides sufficient information for board members to make thoughtful decisions; creates opportunities to involve board members in various aspects of the Foundation's activities</p>					
<p>15. External Relations: Develops effective working relationships and networks with other funders; interacts well and respectfully with the grantee community; participates as a panelist or speaker and acts as a spokesperson for the Foundation on topical issues; enhances the Foundation's image in the philanthropic community and beyond</p>					

16. What one or two major strengths or significant achievements of the president would you like to highlight?

17. What weaknesses have there been in the president's performance?

18. What should be included in the organizational and/or personal goals for the president during the next two years?

Comments/Recommendations:

Please provide more detailed responses to the above categories and/or any other comments you wish.

Your Name:

Date:

Roy A. Hunt Foundation

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Anniversary Date:

Definitions:

Far Exceeds Expectations (FE): results and the manner in which they are achieved far exceed most expectations. This rating is reserved for truly exceptional performers. (Typically, no more than 20% of all employees in a large organization would be rated at this level.)

Exceeds Expectations (EE): results and the manner in which they are achieved consistently meet and often exceed most expectations. (Typically between 25-30% of all employees would achieve this rating.)

Achieves Expectations (AE): overall results and the manner in which they are achieved meet all and may exceed some expectations. (Approximately 50% of all employees will achieve expectations. This represents the consistent, steady performer who is performing to standard.)

Does Not Meet Expectations (DE): results and the manner in which they are achieved do not meet minimum requirements for the position. Considerable improvement is required. (This represents an individual who may require some additional instruction or remedial action but is not yet ready for performance counseling.)

CORE COMPETENCIES

Planning

Planning is one of the most critical leadership responsibilities of the Executive Director. Working with the Trustees, the Executive Director must work toward a shared vision for the future of the Foundation and develop appropriate goals and strategies to advance the Foundation's mission.

Uses the mission of the Foundation as a guide in making decisions.

FE EE AE DE

Engages the Trustees in meaningful strategic thinking about the Foundation.

FE EE AE DE

Develops appropriate goals and objectives to advance the Foundation's mission.

FE EE AE DE

Effectively leads the staff in implementing annual goals and strategic objectives.

FE EE AE DE

Administration

The Executive Director has overall responsibility for the day-to-day operations of the Foundation. The Executive Director works with the staff to develop, maintain and use the systems and resources that facilitate the effective operation of the Foundation.

Roy A. Hunt Foundation

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR *(continued)*

Displays a thorough knowledge of the Foundation's mission and funding interests.

FE EE AE DE

Manages the Foundation efficiently on a day-to-day basis.

FE EE AE DE

Manages the successful process of grantmaking.

FE EE AE DE

Recruits, develops, and retains staff needed to implement the annual work plan.

FE EE AE DE

Minimizes risk by ensuring that appropriate day-to-day organizational policies and procedures are in place.

FE EE AE DE

Ensures compliance with all legal and regulatory requirements.

FE EE AE DE

Board Relations

Together, the Executive Director and the Trustees form the leadership team of the Foundation. Each arm of the team draws upon its own unique strengths and abilities. The Executive Director and Trustees have joint responsibility for developing and maintaining a strong working relationship and a system for sharing information that enables the Trustees to effectively carry out its governance role.

Maintains an effective working relationship with the Trustees, characterized by open communication, respect and trust.

FE EE AE DE

Working with the Chair of the Executive Committee, focuses meetings on topics of highest priority that need Trustee attention and involvement.

FE EE AE DE

Provides Trustees with the appropriate information needed to support informed decision making and effective governance.

FE EE AE DE

Engages Trustees, collectively and individually, in understanding and making sense of the Foundation's environment, challenges and potential.

FE EE AE DE

Financial Management

Ensuring that resources are managed wisely is especially important for a foundation operating in the public trust. The Executive Director's role is to see that the Foundation's goals and strategic plan serve as the basis for sound financial management, that solid budgeting and accounting systems are in place, and that appropriate financial controls and risk management strategies protect the Foundation's assets.

Roy A. Hunt Foundation

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR *(continued)*

Makes sound financial decisions and recommendations based on a thorough understanding of the Foundation's overall financial picture.

FE EE AE DE

Allocates financial and human resources appropriately to achieve the organization's goals and objectives.

FE EE AE DE

Presents the annual budget and financial statements in a timely and accurate manner for review and action by the Trustees.

FE EE AE DE

Implements appropriate internal controls to protect the Foundation from fraud and abuse.

FE EE AE DE

Communication and Public Relations

The Executive Director serves as a primary spokesperson and "public face" for the Foundation. This role has three major components: effectively representing the Foundation, advocating for the mission and work of the Foundation, and building relationships with stakeholder groups critical to the success of the Foundation.

Serves as an articulate and effective spokesperson for the Foundation.

FE EE AE DE

Serves as a strong advocate for the Foundation's mission.

FE EE AE DE

Establishes and maintains positive relationships with individuals and groups that impact the success of the Foundation.

FE EE AE DE

Grantmaking

The Executive Director, in partnership with the Trustees and appropriate staff, is responsible for developing and implementing grantmaking systems and processes that enable the Foundation to carry out its mission.

Serves as an effective grantmaker.

FE EE AE DE

Ensures that the Foundation develops appropriate grantmaking strategies and policies.

FE EE AE DE

Effectively involves the Trustees in implementing the Foundation's grantmaking programs.

FE EE AE DE

Personal Leadership Qualities

Beyond the core functional responsibilities of the Executive Director, there are a number of additional leadership and interpersonal skills that are important to the Executive Director's success. The Executive Director demonstrates:

Roy A. Hunt Foundation

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR *(continued)*

A clear commitment to the Foundation's mission and values.

FE EE AE DE

An ability to learn from the successes and failures of the past in planning for the future.

FE EE AE DE

A willingness to ask difficult questions and challenge assumptions.

FE EE AE DE

An awareness of trends and information in the external environment that may impact the Foundation.

FE EE AE DE

A sense of motivation and creativity.

FE EE AE DE

Effective problem-solving skills.

FE EE AE DE

Good judgment in decision making.

FE EE AE DE

Effective communication skills.

FE EE AE DE

The ability to build trusting relationships.

FE EE AE DE

The ability to balance diverging and competing points of view.

FE EE AE DE

The ability to accept constructive criticism.

FE EE AE DE

Roy A. Hunt Foundation

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR *(continued)*

SUMMARY/COMMENTS:

What were the most significant achievements of the Executive Director over the past year?

In the past year, what difficult issues did the Foundation face and how did the Executive Director address them?

What are the two most important priorities for the Executive Director in the next year?

What are the two most important professional development goals for the Executive Director in the next year?

This review was discussed by the board president and executive director on _____(date).

President

CEO

SUPPORTERS OF THE CEO INITIATIVE

The National Center for Family Philanthropy is deeply grateful to all our funders and to the organizations that provided designated support to The CEO Initiative, to the research, and to the programs that made this guide possible.

The Lilly Endowment
The Leighty Foundation
The Dyson Foundation
Richard H. Driehaus Foundation
Gerald Oppenheimer Family Foundation
Rasmuson Foundation
The Springs Close Foundation
Marclad Foundation
Weaver Foundation
The Self Family Foundation
George B. Storer Foundation
Nord Family Foundation
Brindle Fund
William J. & Dorothy K. O'Neill
Foundation
Bank of America Merrill Lynch (sponsor)
The Pew Charitable Trusts (in kind)

NATIONAL CENTER FOR FAMILY PHILANTHROPY BOARD OF DIRECTORS (2012)

Chair

Caroline Avery
President, The Durfee Foundation

Vice Chair

Kathleen Odne
Executive Director, Dean & Margaret Lesher Foundation

Treasurer

Linda Perryman Evans
President and CEO, The Meadows Foundation

Secretary

Bruce Maza
Executive Director, C.E. & S. Foundation

Sarah Cavanaugh
Trustee
The Russell Family Foundation

Claire Costello
National Foundation Executive for
Philanthropic Management
US Trust
Bank of America Merrill Lynch

Julie Fisher Cummings
Vice Chairman
Max M. and Marjorie S. Fisher Foundation

Adrienne Furniss
Vice Chair and Trustee
The Benton Foundation

Kimberly Myers Hewlett
Treasurer
Myers Family Foundation

Bruce Karmazin
Executive Director
The Lumpkin Family Foundation

Sarah Kozmetsky Miller
Adjunct Board Member
RGK Foundation

Richard L. Moore
President
Weaver Foundation

Sushma Raman
President
Southern California Grantmakers

Ridgway White
Vice President of Special Projects
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

Frank Wideman
President
The Self Family Foundation

William C. Graustein (through 2011)
Trustee
William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund

Nancy Brain (through 2011)
Executive Director
Sam L. Cohen Foundation

CEO INITIATIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thomas Beech
Retired President and Chief Executive Officer
Fetzer Institute

Sanford Cardin
President
Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Foundation

Christina Collier
Executive Vice President
RGK Foundation

Victor De Luca
President
Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, Inc.

Joanne Florino
Executive Director
Triad Foundation, Inc.

Diana Gurieva
Executive Vice President
Dyson Foundation

Phillip Henderson
President
Surdna Foundation

Steven M. Hilton
President and Chief Executive Officer
Conrad N. Hilton Foundation

Carol Larson
President and Chief Executive Officer
David and Lucile Packard Foundation

Lance Lindblom
President and Chief Executive Officer
Nathan Cummings Foundation

Bruce Maza
Executive Director
C. E. & S. Foundation, Inc.

Sarah Meyer
Executive Director
Joyce and Irving Goldman Family Foundation

Richard Moore
President
Weaver Foundation

Kathleen Odne
Executive Director
Dean and Margaret Lesher Foundation

Claire Peeps
Executive Director
Durfee Foundation

Teresa Sloyan
Executive Director
Hyde Family Foundations

Jeffrey Solomon
President
Andrea and Charles Bronfman Philanthropies

Douglas Bitonti Stewart
Executive Director
Max M. & Marjorie S. Fisher Foundation

Steve Toben
President
Flora Family Foundation

David Weitnauer
Executive Director
R. Howard Dobbs, Jr. Foundation

Frank Wideman
President
Self Family Foundation

E. Miles Wilson
Director, The Grantmaking School
Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy and
Nonprofit Leadership

Kate Wolford
President
McKnight Foundation

NCFP Senior Fellow
Alice Buhl
Senior Consultant, Lansberg, Gersick, and Associates

The National Center *for* Family Philanthropy would like to thank our generous sponsor:



Bank of America Merrill Lynch Institutional Investments & Philanthropic Solutions

We put the strength of Bank of America Merrill Lynch to work in our clients' best interest, with proactive and objective advice, specialized expertise and robust investment solutions, delivered through a close working relationship with a trusted advisor.

Individuals and families rely on us for advice, support and resources that can transform their charitable goals into meaningful action. We have worked with hundreds of successful individuals and families to help them achieve their personal visions and create a tradition of giving. From mission statements to governance structures to grantmaking programs, we'll work with our individual clients and families on all aspects of strategic giving. Using a range of philanthropic vehicles, your advisor will help integrate a client's philanthropic vision into their overall wealth management plan. In short, we'll help our clients make their philanthropic vision a reality.

Bank of America Merrill Lynch has an enormous amount to offer clients. We're committed to putting the strength of our global resources and intellectual capital to work for you in a partnership that delivers solutions that are in your best interest.

Bank of America Merrill Lynch is a marketing name for Institutional Investments & Philanthropic Solutions (II&PS). II&PS is part of U.S. Trust, Bank of America Private Wealth Management ("U.S. Trust"). U.S. Trust operates through Bank of America, N.A. and other subsidiaries of Bank of America Corporation ("BAC"). Bank of America, N.A., Member FDIC. Banking and fiduciary activities are performed by wholly owned banking affiliates of BAC, including Bank of America, N.A. Brokerage services may be performed by wholly owned brokerage affiliates of BAC, including Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporated ("MLPF&S").

Investment products:

Are Not FDIC Insured Are Not Bank Guaranteed May Lose Value

Investment products and services may be available through a relationship managed by U.S. Trust or through a relationship with MLPF&S. Certain U.S. Trust associates are also registered representatives with MLPF&S and may assist you with investment products and services provided through MLPF&S and other nonbank investment affiliates. MLPF&S is a registered broker-dealer, member SIPC and a wholly owned subsidiary of BAC.

Bank of America Merrill Lynch and U.S. Trust makes available investment products sponsored, managed, distributed or provided by companies that are affiliates of BAC or in which BAC has a substantial economic interest, including BofA™ Global Capital Management.

© 2012 Bank of America Corporation. All rights reserved. AR54J3Z5 | 1/2012

Acknowledgements

The National Center for Family Philanthropy is deeply grateful for the many people and organizations that have made this guide and the entire CEO Leadership Initiative possible.

The financial support of our funders, and our Friends of the Family members in particular, makes everything we do possible.

The National Center's board and staff conceived of the CEO Leadership Initiative, and our outstanding CEO Advisory Committee helped guide it to fruition. You honor our work by your commitment to it.

We are also grateful to Susan Crites Price, former National Center vice president, who played a key role in the initiative and authored this guide as well as two others in this series.

Finally, we owe huge thanks to the many CEOs, board members, and experts who candidly and thoughtfully shared their insights—through phone and in-person interviews, our online survey, and participation in our national symposium. Your colleagues current and future reap the benefits of the time and effort you put into this work.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Susan Crites Price is a former vice president of the National Center for Family Philanthropy and is now a consultant and freelance writer. She is the author or co-author of several books including *The Giving Family: Raising Our Children to Help Others*. She is a frequent speaker on next generation philanthropy.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR FAMILY PHILANTHROPY

A nonprofit 501(c)3 organization, the National Center for Family Philanthropy has, for 15 years, been the nation's leading voice for the value—and values—of family philanthropy. The National Center has sponsored groundbreaking research on governance practices, family dynamics, and management options for families, and has developed a living, growing database of several hundred profiles and stories of families engaged in philanthropy. We have published many of the field's most widely read guides and issues papers, organized national symposia, and presented at hundreds of events in cities and regions around the world on our core belief in the continuing value of family involvement in philanthropy.



NATIONAL CENTER

**FAMILY
PHILANTHROPY**