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	**1 … 2 … 3 … 4 … 5**	Motivation and enthusiasm are high. People are fully engaged
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 *and celebrated*

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

Policy Governance is a registered service mark of John Carver.
The authoritative website for the Policy Governance model can be found at www.carvergovernance.com.