



**BAYES**  
BUSINESS SCHOOL  
CITY, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

**Building Better Governance  
Board and trustee  
performance review:  
a good practice guide**

Fiona Ash, Centre for Charity Effectiveness (CCE)

[ Centre for Charity Effectiveness ]

## **CENTRE FOR CHARITY EFFECTIVENESS**

Inspiring transformation within the nonprofit sector.

The vision of the Centre for Charity Effectiveness (CCE) at Bayes Business School is that of a nonprofit sector leading positive social change. We support the sector to achieve this through the services that we deliver: education, knowledge sharing, research and independent consultancy advice.

As one of Bayes Business School's centres of excellence, impactful knowledge exchange has been at the heart of what we do since our inception over 20 years ago.

CCE aspires to see a voluntary, community and social enterprise sector constantly extending its own knowledge boundaries and driving performance excellence – whilst developing and inspiring the next generation of leaders.

A number of the wider CCE team have made valuable contributions to this guide, including Caroline Copeman and Ruth Lesirge. This edition has been updated and edited by Fiona Ash.

# Foreword

**The unwavering vision of the Centre for Charity Effectiveness (CCE) is that of a strong nonprofit sector leading positive social change. We support the sector to achieve this through the services we deliver: education, knowledge sharing, research and independent consultancy advice.**

We know that the need for good governance in our sector is greater than ever with recent public concern and media scrutiny which is often about the effectiveness of an organisation's governance. As the Charity Governance Code says, 'good governance in charities is fundamental to their success'. Our governance practice team is regularly commissioned to undertake reviews or other activities in support of more effective governance.

This is one of a series of updated Building Better Governance (BBG) good practice guides covering key governance activities including:

- Board & trustee performance review
- Board involvement in strategy and planning
- Board reports that add value
- Developing a balanced scorecard & dashboard
- Developing the whole top team
- Effective board meetings.

We are confident that, taken together, these guides will be an extremely useful resource for trustees and the senior team, covering the key areas of practice that make the difference between a board that does the minimum and one that is truly effective. If you need further information or advice, please get in touch.

**Alex Skales**

Director, Centre for Charity Effectiveness (CCE)

Centre for Charity Effectiveness

E: [CCE@city.ac.uk](mailto:CCE@city.ac.uk)

[www.bayes.city.ac.uk/cce](http://www.bayes.city.ac.uk/cce)

# Contents

What is effective board performance review?	3
Key benefits of board performance review	4
Resistance to governance review	5
This guide	6
Part one: Board or collective performance review	7
Who should conduct a collective board review?	7
What should it cover?	7
Getting started	8
Top tips	9
Part two: Individual performance reviews	10
Getting started	10
Reviewing the Chair's performance	12
Trustees who are new to the role & new to the board	12
Top tips	13
Resources	14
Appendix 1: Template for board development plan	15
Appendix 2: Reviewing committee effectiveness – two approaches	16
Appendix 3: Succession planning	17
Appendix 4: A sample review question framework	18
Appendix 5: Trustee record	20
Appendix 6: Gathering deeper & broader levels of feedback	21

# What is effective board performance review?

**Effective board performance review (or evaluation) is about a systematic assessment of how well the board (rather than the organisation) is performing in relation to its legal responsibilities and in contributing to organisational success. It considers the performance of the whole board and the contribution of individual members. In all of this, the ambition should be to ensure that the review process is of benefit to the organisation's beneficiaries.**

The best performing boards invest resources in their development (time if not financial), regularly reviewing 'how things are going' and taking action as necessary. This is reinforced in the Charity Governance Code for larger charities<sup>2</sup> which recommends a review of board performance and that of individual trustees every year – incorporating an external evaluation of governance every three years – and that the board should explain how the organisation reviews or evaluates its governance in the Trustees Annual Report.

“Great governance requires self-awareness about performance as individuals and as a collective. Self-awareness increases with measurement, discussion, and learning about areas of strength and weakness, and board performance increases when there is deliberate attention paid to how to improve and concrete action to do so.”<sup>1</sup>

Cathy Trower

Board performance review is one of the most powerful interventions available to transform a good board into an excellent, high performing one. To be effective, performance review needs to be rigorous, undertaken by a board committed to improvement and willing to hear at times uncomfortable messages – and importantly – one that is prepared to take action where necessary to improve governance performance. Taking a superficial, tick box approach won't result in significant change, and only squanders the investment. We have found that boards who undertake and are committed to performance review, have stronger, more engaged boards and take responsibility for governance development.

1. Board assessments: trash or treasure? Cathy Trower, author of *The Practitioner's Guide to Governance as Leadership*  
 2. The Code defines larger charities as those 'with a typical income of over £1m a year, and whose accounts are externally audited'; those below this threshold are recommended to use the Code for smaller charities.

# Key benefits of board performance review<sup>3</sup>

- Delivers an accurate check on the 'pulse' of governance; what's working, what needs improvement e.g. from easier to address areas such as identifying skills gaps to more challenging ones such as behaviours, relationships and board culture,
- Provides a mechanism to 'surface' potentially difficult issues
- Increases ownership and accountability by building commitment and a shared sense of responsibility for addressing priority issues
- Helps create a culture of learning in the organisation by leading by example
- Helps the board and thus the organisation to be more effective by for example changing how the board uses its limited time, how it works with the Chief Executive and how trustees and the executive work together.

3. Adapted from Board Assessment: laying the foundation for better governance. Nadler Advisory (adapted from material by Mercer LLC).

# Resistance to governance review

Although we now see boards undertaking whole board and individual performance reviews much more frequently – and the practice has been considerably strengthened via a recommendation in the Charity Governance Code<sup>4</sup> – there can still be resistance by some boards and their Chief Executive to undertake performance review. Reasons for this can include:

- A perception that this will take up valuable and limited board time or that it is too onerous (in time and activity) for the chair to undertake individual performance reviews with trustees
- Fear of damaging board dynamics through the surfacing of issues which, if handled inappropriately, can generate tensions in the board
- Fear of opening a ‘Pandora’s box’ (‘not sure what it might uncover’) but once revealed, the issue(s) can’t be ignored
- Revealing sensitive issues such as underperforming or incompetent trustees which, once identified, have to be dealt with. If ignored or swept under the carpet, performance review will lose its credibility and be hard to repeat
- Unwillingness of trustees to have their individual performance reviewed. The phrase ‘we are only volunteers’ is often heard in this context. Chairs too can be uncomfortable in undertaking such an activity with colleague trustees (who may be known within their personal or social networks) and do not wish to confront or address difficult behaviours as is sometimes necessary.

---

4. Code Principle 5: paragraph 5.8.2

# This guide

This guide is designed to stimulate discussion across the whole spectrum of board performance review activities, from individual performance reviews to whole board assessment.

**Part one** looks at whole board performance review or collective review processes.

**Part two** focuses on individual trustee performance reviews.

We recommend that after reviews have been undertaken, the board produces an annual development plan which takes into account information derived from individual performance reviews, whole board reviews and other development activities. Appendix 1 offers a draft template for this.

# Part one: Board or collective performance review

## WHO SHOULD CONDUCT A COLLECTIVE BOARD REVIEW?

The Charity Governance Code recommends that the board reviews its own performance every year with an external evaluation every three years.

**External evaluations:** Although there are normally cost implications when commissioning an external evaluation, there are obvious benefits to having an outsider conduct a review including that the assessor should:

- Bring experience of different assessment methodologies and recommend the most appropriate approach as well as offering informal benchmarking
- Provide independent and impartial advice, objectivity and rigour,
- Share knowledge of good practice seen elsewhere in the sector
- Offer a fresh perspective; trustees and staff are also likely to offer more candid feedback when speaking to someone outside the organisation who is gathering a range of views
- Generate constructive feedback on a wide range of areas – including areas of strength – and surface issues that may not have been previously considered by the board.

Using an external consultant or facilitator undoubtedly brings a fresh perspective. Areas that may be unpalatable if said by a member of the board including the chair, might be acceptable if said by someone from outside but on the other hand, trustees can more easily reject unpopular

or difficult opinions when they are offered by an external party.

An alternative and cost effective way of bringing in an external perspective could be to invite an ‘outsider’ to observe a board meeting and feedback on what was seen and heard in terms of group dynamics, dialogue and engagement as well as on some of the practical aspects of the board meeting.

**Self-assessment:** In undertaking a self-assessment of its governance, a board should be careful that it doesn’t become a tick box exercise or an exercise that generates few if any improvements to governance practice. The real value of board evaluations is to encourage board members to engage in thinking about and discussing how the board operates, finding ways to be even more effective. An assessment that doesn’t surface any areas for improvement should be viewed with caution and can be evidence of either a poorly designed process or a board that has disengaged; most governance reviews will identify 5 or 6 key areas for attention. Similarly, the board should be regularly discussing the results of its assessment and taking action as necessary. As above, having a development plan reinforces the activity and provides a timetable of actions.

There are a range of different frameworks<sup>5</sup> you could use to self-assess your governance including the Charity Governance Code as described below. These can be adapted to conduct your own review or self-assessment.

## WHAT SHOULD IT COVER?

A productive full board review should evaluate effectiveness across a range of dimensions. The Charity Governance Code (5.8.2) says that board evaluations will ‘typically consider the board’s balance of skills, experience and knowledge, its diversity in the widest sense, how the board works together and other factors relevant to its effectiveness’.

The Code – which is set out in 7 principles – can be used as a framework to evaluate governance performance – perhaps reviewing practice against one or more of the Principles across an agreed period. The Code is however deliberately aspirational and recognises that some elements will be a stretch for many organisations to achieve; this is intentional and the Code should be viewed as a tool for continuous improvement towards the highest standards of governance and as such is a valuable mechanism to encourage awareness of good governance.

Instead of a full review, you could agree to review one or more aspects of your governance, for example, reviewing one of the following areas per year:

- Succession planning
- Recruitment practice including the induction programme
- Committee effectiveness (see Appendix 2 for an approach)
- Meetings practices including agenda effectiveness; the board’s focus and what it pays attention to
- Relationship and boundary with the executive

5. An example of a self-assessment framework: Lesirge, R., Oakley, R., The board appraisal toolkit: self-assessment for chairs and trustees. London: National Council for Voluntary Organisations.

- Decision making effectiveness – reviewing one or more significant decisions and how these were made
- Meeting practices (see an Meetings Observation framework in *BBG: Effective Board Meetings*).

It can be useful to review governance at a time of change when for example, the Chair or the Chief Executive is new to the role, resulting in one or both parties seeking to understand more about their board and how it operates.

#### GETTING STARTED

1. Consider instituting a Governance Committee to oversee the introduction of a board review if one is not already in place. The Chair will need to understand and champion the activity, helping trustees to recognise the value of review and longer-term benefits to the organisation and its board.
  2. If you are undertaking a self-assessment, keep it simple to start with to enable the building of a shared recognition within the board of the importance of regular and on-going review as part of a holistic approach to board development.
  3. Scope areas for particular review – both when commissioning an external review or when planning a self-assessment exercise. Be clear about the objectives of the review and what you hope to achieve.
  4. Ensure that action is taken after the review has been undertaken. This is critical to the success of the activity. Document the findings and what is agreed using a template such as that included in Appendix 1. Include outputs from other activities such as one to one reviews with trustees. Agree such matters as planning and implementing steps to address shortcomings, make improvements and agree who leads on each activity. Regularly review the actions and importantly, discuss candidly whether there have been improvements.
  5. Ensure there is a timetable for when any reports relating to the review process will come to the board and make this part of your calendar of board activities.
  6. Introduce other opportunities for regular review of governance activities by:
    - Including time on the agenda for a short end of meeting review. Reflect on the specifics of the meeting (time spent on particular items, reviewing how well the information provided supported effective decision making, agenda construction etc.)  
On occasion, reflect on one or more general questions such as:
      - What was the most and least useful item discussed at the meeting and why?
      - What have we achieved at this meeting as a board that would not have happened had we not met?
    - Including time in your away day agenda for a performance review activity exploring how effectively a particular aspect of governance practice is working
    - Adding an occasional short ‘closed’ session for trustees into the board agenda (sometimes without the attendance of the Chief Executive) provides time for the board to reflect on its performance.
- What have we learnt about the organisation that we didn’t know before?
  - What information has the board found most useful?
  - How well did we strike the balance between support and challenge?

# Top tips

- View board performance review as part of an integrated approach to board development. Introducing a feedback loop of review and improvement starts to generate a culture of learning ('action, review and improve for next time') which is maintained despite the regular refresh of the composition of the board.

- Don't think that only poorly performing boards should spend time on performance review; the best boards constantly look for opportunities to discover new ways to enhance governance performance (including composition, process, culture) thereby helping good boards to get even better.

- Maintain a line of sight to the mission of your organisation and your agreed strategic aims in considering board performance and areas for improvement.

- Find quick wins to improve board effectiveness to enable trustees to see changes early in the process and encourages engagement.

- Invest in the board's development. Ensure there is a budget for this work and annually review how the budget has been spent and reflect on the process of performance review through board discussion.

- Seek feedback from those joining or leaving the board as both can provide valuable perspectives on a range of issues – particularly the fresh eye perspectives from a new trustee or from an exit interview with one retiring from the board.

# Part two: Individual performance reviews

Research by Mike Hudson and Bayes Business School (2012) on governance in large organisations identified 'reviewing individual performance' as one of the top 20 drivers of good governance performance.

Individual performance reviews should be viewed positively rather than as a negative or judgemental activity. Such reviews have both formal and informal elements and offer a framework for a constructive conversation between peers. The right kind of review is constructive, reinforces a culture of accountability, helps trustees to reflect on the contribution they have made to the board, assess the impact they have had on governance practice and allow an exploration of their hopes for the future.

Individual reviews should also encourage trustees to have an open discussion about areas where they feel less confident and might need more support, often about finance or a specialist aspect of the organisation's work. A lack of confidence can result in the trustee letting others take the lead in challenging the executive on matters brought to the board, sometimes leaving the 'common sense' questions requiring no in-depth specialist knowledge un-asked.

Benefits of individual trustee performance reviews include helping the Chair:

- To get to know trustees outside the confines of the board meeting. Some Chairs report that in starting to undertake such reviews, they learn so much more about the organisation and/or the individual trustee than they knew before

- To identify skills, knowledge and experience on the board of which they were previously unaware
- To seek feedback on their own performance (see Reviewing the Chair's Performance below).

In addition, reviews can help with the board's succession planning (see Appendix 3), enabling a discussion about how the trustee envisages their future on the board: i.e. whether they are interested in becoming a sub-committee chair or taking on an honorary officer or senior role such as the Chair, Vice Chair or Treasurer; how long they see themselves on the board including whether they might leave before the end of the agreed term or not.

## GETTING STARTED

1. **Keep it simple** but build in good practice from the beginning. Having some formality to the process ensures that there is consistency of approach.

It is sometimes necessary to start the process gradually and use an informal approach in the first year, leading to a more formal approach in the second. For example in the first year you might use a system of self-appraisal by the trustee and observations from the Chair or person leading the review, before moving to a system in which wider feedback is sought. Getting input from trustee peers really adds value.

## 2. Discuss the principles at board level to get engagement

It is helpful if the chair initiates a discussion about the benefits of individual performance reviews. The Governance or Nominations Committee, where one operates, might initially consider this and make recommendations to the board for further discussion. The board could consider establishing such a committee to oversee this important activity.

Ensure that there is discussion about the process at board level. This helps the whole board to appreciate and accept the value of such reviews for the overall governance health of the organisation and those it serves.

## 3. Agree who will undertake the reviews

The assumption is that it is the Chair who will undertake the reviews but it is perfectly acceptable for the Chair to delegate the task to the Vice Chair or to another trustee, perhaps the Chair of the Nominations or Governance Committee (where one operates). In this circumstance, attention needs to be given to liaison with the Chair, particularly with regard to the gathering of feedback. Most reviews are undertaken one to one rather than the Chair with another trustee undertaking the review.

## 4. Agree timing

Set an annually recurring time for the review; choose a point in your annual cycle which allows your board to evidence good governance in the Trustees' Annual Report. Add the agreed timeframe to your board calendar of events.

Determine and agree the time scale for completion of all the reviews (advance notice will help ensure everyone can deliver) so that the period during which reviews are being undertaken is not too long. Agree the length of each review interview; 60 minutes is common practice.

## 5. Agree what is to happen to the 'findings' of the review meetings.

It is most effective if the chair collates key aspects of the results of the reviews (without identifying individual trustees) which are then fed into the overall development plan (Appendix 1). This facilitates an integrated approach to discussion and planning the board's development.

## 6. Agree a clear framework for the review process

This helps both parties to prepare for the review and to structure and document the subsequent discussion. The suggested frameworks in Appendix 4 and 5 are included as a prompt for both parties to stimulate dialogue and encourage structured preparation for the meeting, and to identify information you may wish to collect before the meeting.

## 7. Seeking feedback

Getting started with feedback can be a simple process of asking committee chairs for their feedback on members of their group, including attendance, participation and contribution towards the work of the sub-committee or asking other committee chairs or the vice chair or treasurer for their feedback (where this relates to the committee chair). The Chair should aim to gather as wide a range of views as possible, to add potentially new information to their own perspective. The Chair should be open about how feedback is to be gathered when discussing the activity with the whole board.

Appendix 6 offers a multi-directional and deeper approach to seek feedback from a range of stakeholders including peer trustees, managers and others.

## 8. Feedback about the Chair: The Chair can take the opportunity to seek informal feedback on their own performance during the review process. See below

## 9. Keeping a record: How should the meeting be recorded and by whom?

It is helpful to keep a track of what has been said or requested in the trustee review. It helps both reviewer and trustee check progress (and whether agreements have been kept) on both sides. This record should be used in the subsequent year in assessing progress made.

We suggest a central file of all reviews be kept within the organisation (hard copy or electronic), accessible to the chair and/or lead reviewer and the trustee in question and maintained confidentially.

We also recommend that you devise a framework or template for this record for ease of year-on-year reference (see Appendix 4).

In addition, Appendix 5 provides a suggested information sheet which could be completed by the person responsible for board administration, to provide a record of length of service on the board, attendance and other items that may be relevant to the discussion.

#### **10. After completion of the review meetings**

The detailed content of each meeting can remain confidential, but the themes emerging are the legitimate concern of the entire board as well as the senior management team.

To make the most of the investment you have made (in the trustee reviews), we suggest that the Chair or lead reviewer presents a short, written summary of the key themes from the reviews and any resulting recommendations. The Chair should stimulate discussion about the process and the outcomes, including any changes and improvements needed. Trustees can discuss what might be learnt from this and what development activities they suggest for the whole board.

#### **11. Keep the activity alive and relevant**

Periodically review the process by asking the board for their feedback, then adjusting the framework appropriately.

#### **REVIEWING THE CHAIR'S PERFORMANCE**

A similar process as outlined above for trustees can be used for the Chair. It is often the vice chair, treasurer (or sometimes a 'lay' person from outside the board and organisation) who reviews the Chair's performance. In such cases, the group reviewing the Chair should collate the feedback, complete the assessment form and use this as the basis of their feedback to the Chair.

#### **TRUSTEES WHO ARE NEW TO THE ROLE & NEW TO THE BOARD**

The Chair needs to spend time ensuring that the new trustee – who is also new to the role – receives more attention during their early period on the board. This should be reflected in the individual performance review process. An informal review meeting with the new trustee after 2 or 3 board meetings (depending on the frequency of meetings) will be useful to check out how both parties are finding the experience. It is also an opportunity to seek feedback on governance from the new trustee since they will be seeing the board and its governance practice with a fresh eye.

Pairing the new trustee with a more experienced board member as part of the induction programme is a useful way to help the new trustee integrate and gain confidence.

# Top tips

- Include as an expectation of the role – and include in the role profile and Code of Conduct – that trustees are expected to engage with and attend regular performance reviews so that it's clear from the outset that this activity will be part of the role.

- Reassure trustees that individual performance review is unlike the review processes they may have experienced (or currently experience) during employment.

- Emphasise in the role profile that trusteeship should be considered a developmental/learning experience; consider introducing individual development plans to support trustees to gain the most from undertaking the role.

- Ensure that individual reviews take place at the same time each year and fit with the organisation's (strategic) planning cycle and its overall organisational performance management system.

- Aim to hold individual reviews over a relatively short period to optimise the opportunity to learn from the activity collectively via the generation of themes emerging from the interviews that can then be added to the board's development plan.

# Resources

Charity Governance Code for larger charities (2017)

Chait, R. P., Ryan, W. P., & Taylor, B. E., (2005) *Governance as Leadership: reframing the work of non-profit boards*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons

Hudson, M., & Ashworth, J., in association with the Centre for Charity Effectiveness (2012) *Delivering effective governance, insights from the boards of larger charities*

Nadler, D. A., (May 2004) Building Better Boards *Harvard Business Review*

Nadler, D. A., Nadler, M. B., & Behan, B. A., (2006) *Building Better Boards: A Blueprint for Effective Governance*, Jossey-Bass.

Sonnenfeld, J. A., (September 2002) What Makes Great Boards Great *Harvard Business Review*

Trower, C., (2013) *The Practitioner's Guide to Governance as Leadership* Jossey Bass: San Francisco

# Appendix 1: Template for board development plan

RAG KEY:		
Red URGENT: Action in the next 3-6 months	Amber MEDIUM TERM Action within 6 – 12 months	Green LONGER TERM Action in 12 months+

Development need or area	Agreed action	Lead by & Timescale	Comments Measurement of success	Urgency RAG

# Appendix 2: Reviewing committee effectiveness – two approaches

## 1. OBJECTIVE FEEDBACK FROM OTHER TRUSTEES

(a) Invite 1 or 2 non-committee members to observe a meeting including a review of the agenda and resulting minutes and offer some feedback on what they have read and observed including clarity of purpose and impact on governance practice.

(b) Include in the trustee role profile an expectation that they will attend a meeting of a committee of which they are not a member at least once a year and offer feedback, including what they have learnt about the organisation that they didn't know before the observation. This would increase trustees' knowledge of the organisation and governance practice/oversight.

(c) Feedback could be provided to the whole board and a discussion generated.

## 2. COMMITTEE ASSESSMENT PROCESS<sup>6</sup>

Ask all members of the committee to complete the following assessment once a year answering the following questions:

- How would you summarise the central purpose of this committee?
  - What was the most strategically significant work this committee has undertaken in the past 12 months?
  - What areas have been given the most time and attention? What percentage is it of the committee's time and what can be learnt from this?
  - What is the most strategically significant work this committee should do in the next 12 months?
  - What would be lost to us if this committee did not function for 2 years?
  - Are the right people on this committee?
  - Are you clear about your role?
  - What have you most enjoyed about serving on this committee?
  - What have you least enjoyed about serving on this committee?
  - What could the chair of this committee do to make it more effective?
  - What has been the most important thing you have learnt by being a member of this committee?
- Rate on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 being high) the following areas:
    - Importance of the committee's purpose
    - Contribution to early strategic thinking
    - Clarity of committee papers
    - Significance of agenda items
    - Opportunities to propose agenda items
    - Timeliness of information
    - Usefulness of information
    - Opportunities for candid give and take
    - Opportunities to influence decision making
    - Overall assessment of committee's performance

6. Adapted from an approach by Cathy Trower in The Practitioner's Guide to Governance as Leadership

# Appendix 3: Succession planning

An important benefit of undertaking individual performance reviews is as a support to your succession planning.

How does your board plan for changes and rotation of the honorary officers and other trustees including committee chairs?

Have you undertaken a skills audit to identify gaps?

Consider the composition of your committees; consider rotation so that trustees build knowledge of different areas of the organisation.

If you currently have no plan, consider developing one now; it does not need to be unduly onerous but will keep the idea of 'refreshment' of the skills, knowledge and ideas that will be needed to support the future organisation (and its board).

Results from your performance reviews can also provide a view of the trustees on the current board who are interested in taking on a new role or who are intending to step down (and whether this is at the end of their agreed term or earlier).

# Appendix 4: A sample review question framework

The sample questions below are designed to assist both parties to prepare for the review meeting and to provide a framework for the meeting; the questions focus on the interviewee but need to be considered in advance by both parties. We suggest you adapt them for your use.

Questions to consider before & at the review meeting by the trustee & the person conducting the review	Note of your responses in preparation for the review meeting (Trustee & the Chair)	NOTE OF KEY points and agreed actions at the review meeting (Trustee & the Chair)
<b>THE BOARD</b>		
What's your broad overview of how the board has operated in the past 12 months? What have we done well this year? What needs attention in the next 12 months? Why?		
What are the board's key tasks? What do we need to focus on in the next 12 months?		
What are our trustees' strengths and limitations; how do these impact on the board's effectiveness?		
How do you rate the level of knowledge of the external environment and community on our board?		
How would you assess trustees' preparedness for board and other meetings (in addition to reading the papers?) To what extent do you interrogate the agenda papers you receive in advance of meetings? Are there examples of discussions about a key issue with the Chair, Chief Executive or another trustee or of more extensive reading before the meeting?		
What activity has there been in relation to board committees in terms of: a) their contribution such as in depth analysis or contribution based on specialist knowledge b) introduction to helpful external contacts and networks c) early strategic thinking d) contribution to activities/areas outside own specialist knowledge (for example, taking a whole board view of finance or fundraising)		

Questions to consider before & at the review meeting by the trustee & the person conducting the review	Note of your responses in preparation for the review meeting (Trustee & the Chair)	NOTE OF KEY points and agreed actions at the review meeting (Trustee & the Chair)
Are there examples of support given this year to the organisation's management, such as chairing a task and finish group, supporting SMT recruitment etc.?		
<b>YOUR CONTRIBUTION AS TRUSTEE</b>		
What trustee development have you undertaken in the past 12 months? <i>This could include attendance and contribution to board away days; ensuring a good and up to date understanding of a specialist area; keeping abreast of anticipated changes in the external environment</i>		
What areas do you feel least confident about? <i>This might be finance, fundraising, property, staffing issues etc.</i>		
How can the organisation support your development as a trustee (in the above areas or in general)?		
Where and what have you contributed between meetings? <i>This could be tasks undertaken on behalf of the Chair or with the Chief Executive or time spent working with other trustees?</i>		
What (in particular) do you hope to contribute in the next 12 months?		
Do you want to change any of your roles e.g. your committee membership?		
Do you aspire to become a committee Chair (or are you considering stepping down as a Chair ahead of the original term)?		
Do you intend to complete your term as a trustee?		
Is there anything you think the Chair or Chief Executive could do to better support you or the board in being more effective?		

# Appendix 5: Trustee record

A suggested information sheet is offered below which could be completed by the person in the organisation responsible for board administration. It is useful to have this information because it provides a record of length of service on the board and other items that may be relevant to the discussion.

Name of the trustee	
When joined the board	
Date for possible re-election or retirement from the board	
Committee or trading company board membership	
List committees/boards and date of joining	
<i>If applicable:</i> Chair of a committee Date when took up the role	
Any additional responsibilities or special assignments undertaken such as being a member of a task and finish group or a working party	
Date of review meeting	
Reviewed by (name & role)	

# Appendix 6: Gathering deeper and broader levels of feedback

It is useful for a board to gather as wide a range of views as possible whether this is in relation to the performance of the Chair, Chief Executive or individual trustees.

- Aim to gather feedback from the trustee's peers and those who support the board including staff, who come into contact with the trustee; the advantage of this approach is that members of a board see one another at work and therefore have first-hand knowledge to enable an evaluation to be made.
- A governance committee can steer the process, overseeing the type of question framework used, ensuring that reviews are undertaken and that follow-up action is taken as a result (i.e. that a draft board development plan is agreed).
- An additional way to generate depth of feedback is through a short framework of questions distributed through an online survey provider so that responses cannot be individually identified. This can also cut the time involved in collecting feedback.
- The collated feedback can then be offered during the review meeting, as a contribution and framing of the review conversation; it can help to identify areas where trustees have contributed well or areas where they might want some development (for example, by attending a committee which is outside their area of expertise or being briefed by a member of staff).
- For the Chief Executive's performance review, it is helpful to have a 360° process gathering views from all trustees, those they manage as well as from peers and external stakeholders; involve the board in setting and monitoring goals.

## Disclaimer

While great care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of information contained in this publication, information contained is provided on an 'as is' basis with no guarantees of completeness, accuracy, usefulness, timeliness or of the results obtained from the use of the information and the Centre for Charity Effectiveness accepts no responsibility or liability for any errors or omissions that may occur. The publisher and author make no representation, express or implied with regard to the accuracy of the information contained in this publication.

The views expressed in this publication may not necessarily be those of the Centre for Charity Effectiveness. Any action you take upon this information is strictly at your own risk. Specific advice should be sought from professional advisers for specific situations.

7. Nadler, D. A., Nadler, M. B., and Behan, B. A., (2006) *Building Better Boards: A Blueprint for Effective Governance*, Jossey-Bass.

**Bayes Business School**  
106 Bunhill Row  
London EC1Y 8TZ  
E: CCE@city.ac.uk  
www.bayes.city.ac.uk/cce

 [youtube.com/bayesbusinessschoolofficial](https://www.youtube.com/bayesbusinessschoolofficial)

 [linkedin.com/company/bayescce](https://www.linkedin.com/company/bayescce)

 [twitter.com/BayesCCE](https://twitter.com/BayesCCE)

 [facebook.com/BayesBSchool](https://www.facebook.com/BayesBSchool)

 [instagram.com/bayesbschool](https://www.instagram.com/bayesbschool)



City, University of London is an independent member of the University of London which was established by Royal Charter in 1836. It consists of 18 independent member institutions of outstanding global reputation and several prestigious central academic bodies and activities.

Disclaimer: All the information contained within this brochure was correct at the time of going to print. Published March 2019. Updated September 2021.

