

Policy Governance Board Self-Assessment

For each area, circle the number reflecting the current performance level of your board.		
1 = Very Low; 2 = Moderately Low; 3 = Just OK; 4 = Moderately High; 5 = Very High		
PERFORMANCE RATING		
Low — Medium — High		
No monitoring reports were provided to the board	1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5	Monitoring reports were provided according to board annual agenda schedule
Interests and needs of Participating Members and those we serve were not considered or discussed	1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5	Time was spent considering interests and needs of Participating Members and those we serve
Motivation and enthusiasm are low. People are not fully engaged and did not feel invited to participate	1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5	Motivation and enthusiasm are high. People are fully engaged and felt invited to participate
There is confusion related to the purpose of information provided to the board.	1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5	Information provided to the board was clearly identified as: 1) monitoring; 2) decision; or 3) information only
No time was spent on Ends	1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5	Discussions were linked to Ends
The board discussed and/or took action on responsibilities delegated to staff	1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5	Staff means were avoided
Issues were discussed without any connection to existing policies	1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5	Policies were referred to during discussion of new issues
Certain board members are not being held accountable for code of conduct violations	1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5	Board member code of conduct was followed
No effort was made toward consensual decision-making	1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5	Everyone made an effort to respect principles of consensual decision-making
Achievements were not acknowledged	1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5	Achievements were acknowledged <i>and celebrated</i>

Special thanks to David Mustine who initially provided a copy of a Board Self-Assessment.