

Minutes



Performance Evaluation Steering Committee Meeting #4

Date: Thursday, October 14, 2004

Time: 10:00 am – 1:00 p.m.

Place: CASA – Small Board Room

10035 108 ST NW FLR 10
EDMONTON AB T5J 3E1
CANADA

Ph (780) 427-9793
Fax (780) 422-3127
E-mail casa@casahome.org
Web www.casahome.org

In attendance:

Name	Organization
John Donner	Alberta Environment
Ian Peace	RAPID
Ted Stoner, Chair	CPPI
Donna Tingley	CASA
Bill Page	PAGE Management Counsel Ltd.

Action Items:

Action Item 4.1 – Bill Page will prepare a footnote to conclusion 5.2.3 distinguishing it from conclusion 5.4.2.

Action Item 4.2 – Bill Page will prepare a cover letter to his reports addressed to CASA.

Action Item 4.3 – Donna Tingley will prepare a draft report from the steering committee to the board for committee review – by October 22, 2004.

1. Administration

(a) Approve Draft Agenda & Meeting Objectives

Members accepted the draft agenda and meeting objectives.

(b) Approve Draft Minutes of August 5, 2004 Meeting

Members approved by consensus the draft minutes from August 5.

(c) Review August 5 Action Items

All action items from August 5 were completed.

2. Review Final Report, Summary & Organizational Checklist with Consultant

The independent evaluator, Bill Page, reviewed his report with steering committee members, referencing the summary document. The following includes the supplementary analysis provided by the consultant in his presentation and summarizes the discussion on those points where committee members has questions and comments:

- The report is built in three stages, starting with the most general: one, the CASA mandate; two, elements of the mandate; and three, specific questions in the evaluation terms of reference.
- **4.0** – The CASA mandate should be read in the context of the vision and goals.
- **4.1** – CASA does not follow the CAMS as described in the *CAMS 2000* document; the elements of the CAMS are in place, but the description of the process could be clearer. An interview with a former board member confirmed that the CAMS process has evolved since CASA was formed.
- **4.2** – The strategic planning system should be more closed and CASA should report on the five steps in the process.
- **4.3** – It is unclear as to where public concerns fit in. The key question is: do CASA stakeholders represent “the public”?

CASA does a very good job at developing action plans.

A question arises as to the commitment of membership to provide resources. There was considerable discussion around the issue of how stakeholder commitment of resources is a part of the prioritization process, although possibly unstated. It was noted that the prioritization process is iterative, starting with a list of issues, some of which result in action. There is a difference between issues which are important, and issues which become a priority for a CASA action plan.

- **5.1** – The greatest area of concern in the matter of the elements of effective strategic planning is the process for prioritizing issues since it is not clear on how it is done.
- **5.2** – There was considerable discussion about the third key focus area, ecological health, which was assigned a progress rating of 4.5, in comparison to the other three focus areas each of which were rated at 4. There was concern expressed about the rating, given CASA’s apparent difficulty in moving forward with ecological effects monitoring. The consultant clarified his position in that the rating reflects the matter of progress over the past three years by CASA in the area of ecological health, not monitoring per se. Nonetheless, committee members were concerned that this rating, which goes against the conventional wisdom at CASA, may call into question some of the other ratings. Bill agreed to add a footnote to this item in the report clarifying the distinction between the rating of the “ecological health” key focus area and his evaluation of the CASA performance measure related to monitoring under conclusion 5.4.2.

Action Item 4.1 – Bill Page will prepare a footnote to conclusion 5.2.3 distinguishing it from conclusion 5.4.2.

While it may be out of scope for the evaluation, the consultant questioned whether the CASA mandate supports implementation such as reflected in the Vehicle Emissions Team's pilot projects, for example.

- **5.3** – Overall, CASA operates by its principles.
- **5.4** – With respect to CASA's performance measures, it was not possible to rate each measure; rather, the consultant checked to see whether each indicator showed progress over the past three years. With respect to the "recommendations implemented" performance measure, the consultant raised some doubts about the value of the measure since it groups together a wide range of strategic recommendations that may not be of the same weight when it comes to implementation.

Members also reviewed briefly the organizational effectiveness checklist, mainly to determine its context and potential use. The consultant noted that he has used the checklist previously to evaluate a wide range of organizations, including government departments and agencies, resource companies, professional governing bodies and social service agencies. It is intended to be used as a starting point for an organization in looking at whether it is doing the things that make an organization effective.

Bill Page had a number of suggestions for the steering committee for the 2007 performance evaluation:

- Basing the performance evaluation on documents alone was not adequate. For another time, it would be helpful to supplement the document review with interviews with individuals or small groups of stakeholders. It would also be helpful to sit in on more meetings.
- The performance evaluation would be more effective with established targets determined in advance of the year(s) under review.
- While the actual resources assigned to the review and work time was about right, it would be more effective to stretch the evaluation over a longer period of time, say four months.
- The terms of reference for the 2004 performance evaluation were adequate although for another review, it would be useful to include a question about the internal allocation of resources.
- Using a scale of 1 – 10 or 1-5 was not helpful. A future evaluation would be more effective if it related to organizational objectives and targets. The budgeting used in the 2004 was adequate for a review of this intent and for the future.

- It may be not be necessary to have each performance evaluation done by an independent evaluator; it could be sufficient, for example, to have every second evaluation done by CASA stakeholders not directly involved in current project teams.

Members agreed that it would be helpful to have a covering letter from the consultant to CASA.

Action Item 4.2 – Bill Page will prepare a cover letter to his reports addressed to CASA.

3. Report to CASA Board – November 25

(a) Committee Recommendations to the Board

Committee members agreed that they would make four recommendations to the board:

1. The board/members accept the report as completion of the 2004 performance evaluation;
2. The board accept that there is opportunity for improvement in a number of areas, specifically:
 - Prioritization/resources
 - Goals/key focus areas
 - Public involvement/stakeholder involvement
 - Ecological health/environmental improvement
 - Implementation
 - Document clarification
3. The board approve a process for addressing each of the above issues;
4. The board approve a recommended process for the 2007 evaluation.

Members agreed that they could suggest a variety of processes to address the issues: some, such as the issue of public involvement will require a board discussion, some can be done by a small board committee, and some, such as the document rewrite, can be done in draft by the secretariat. Donna agreed to prepare a draft report for committee review and comment; if necessary, members will meet by conference call.

Action Item 4.3 – Donna Tingley will prepare a draft report to the board from the steering committee for committee review – by October 22, 2004.

(b) Presentation & Presenter

The three committee members will make the presentation to the board. Bill Page agreed to attend the board meeting in the event there are questions for him.

Since there is only 45 minutes scheduled for this item, it will not be possible and not recommended to discuss all of the recommendations.

Since the by-laws require the “members” to do the evaluation, the board meeting will become a meeting of the members for this item. However, the board and the members are the same people, so there is no practical difference.