



Board Capacity Indicator Guide

Section 2: Perceived Importance of Responsibilities for the Next 1-2 Years

Section 3: Quality of Board Effectiveness Enablers



OVERVIEW

The Nonprofit Board Self Assessment Tool is designed to help nonprofit organizations assess their board's performance and identify priorities for board activities going forward. We believe this combination of performance assessment and priority-setting is the foundation of superior nonprofit board performance over time. The tool should be used with our framework for nonprofit board responsibilities, which describes in detail the key elements of effective nonprofit board governance. The output of the assessment is intended to focus discussion among board members around the governance activities that will result in the greatest benefit for the organization. The tool may be used by nonprofit managers and board members:

- To identify the areas of board performance that are strongest and those that need improvement
- To identify priority areas for the board to focus on over the next 1 or 2 years
- To allow different views to emerge – the difference between responses given by two groups of board members or by the board and senior staff can be tracked and used to start a discussion

Superior board performance across the full range of nonprofit institutions cannot be precisely defined. Distinctive performance for each of the dimensions is therefore not intended to be precisely accurate for any single institution. In fact, institutions rarely need to perform at a distinctive level in every area. A board committee, rather than the entire board, can often handle specific responsibilities and bring topics forward for full board discussion as needed. Respondents should use their best judgment to rate their board in the spirit if not in the letter of the performance description. The scores are meant to provide a general indication – a “temperature” taking – of a board’s performance, in order to identify potential areas for improvement.

Please make generous use of the comments section to expand on or explain your ratings. We typically find summaries of anonymous comments as helpful as the ratings themselves in surfacing issues.

This tool is meant to create an informed starting point for discussion among the leadership of a nonprofit. Informed discussion and commitment to address priorities results in board effectiveness. We encourage you to adapt the tool to meet your own organization’s governance needs, and we appreciate any feedback on how to improve the usefulness of this tool.

McKINSEY & COMPANY NONPROFIT BOARD SELF ASSESSMENT TOOL – LONG FORM

GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSORS

The Nonprofit Board Self Assessment Tool has three sections:

1. Performance of the board (or board committee) on its core responsibilities
2. Perceived importance of responsibilities for the next 1-2 years
3. Quality of enablers in place to support board effectiveness

In sections 1 and 3, "Performance of board on its core responsibilities" and "Enablers of board effectiveness," mark the box in each row that is closest to describing the situation at hand; descriptions will rarely be a perfect match, so use the comments section to expand on any aspect of performance that you wish.

If a row is not relevant to the organization assessed, write "N/A" in the comments section; if you simply have no knowledge, write "D/K."

For each of the responsibilities in Section 2, "Perceived importance of responsibilities for the next 1-2 years," indicate how important you believe it will be for the board to focus on each area in order to make the most positive impact on the performance of the organization. Since the board cannot focus on all responsibilities with equal weight at the same time, the ratings are intended to indicate relative priorities for each responsibility.

Please return your completed tool to the administrator, who will collate the results and compile an anonymous summary of comments for board discussion.

Please identify your role in the organization:

Board Member _____ Management _____ Other _____

Approximate time needed for completion: 30 minutes

AREAS COVERED BY THE ASSESSMENT'S THREE SECTIONS

SECTION 1: PERFORMANCE OF BOARD ON ITS CORE RESPONSIBILITIES

Shape mission and strategic direction

- Clarify mission and vision
- Participate in and approve strategic and policy decisions

Ensure leadership and resources

- Select, evaluate, and develop CEO
- Ensure adequate financial resources
- Provide expertise and access for organizational needs
- Build reputation

Monitor and improve performance

- Oversee financial and risk management
- Monitor organizational performance
- Improve board performance

SECTION 2: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE NEXT 1-2 YEARS

SECTION 3: QUALITY OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS ENABLERS

- Size and structure
- Composition
- Leadership
- Processes

McKINSEY & COMPANY NONPROFIT BOARD SELF ASSESSMENT TOOL – LONG FORM

SECTION 2: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE NEXT 1-2 YEARS

A nonprofit board adds value by undertaking each of the nine responsibilities identified; however, boards rarely have time to focus on all the responsibilities. Good nonprofits prioritize their activities depending the context of the organization. As you complete this section please choose those areas of potential board focus that are most needed over the next 1 to 2 years to ensure the organization succeeds against its mission.

How important is it for your board to focus on:	Low	Medium	High
Clarifying the organization’s mission or vision		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resolving key strategic or policy issues (please identify issues below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developing (or replacing) the CEO	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developing the financial resources needed to support the strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing expertise or access to support organizational priorities (please identify priorities below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Building/enhancing reputation of organization with key stakeholders/community (please identify stakeholders/community targets below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overseeing financial performance and ensuring adequate risk management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessing performance against mission and key program priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improving board performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please add any additional thoughts to explain your answers or identify additional needs:

McKINSEY & COMPANY NONPROFIT BOARD SELF ASSESSMENT TOOL – LONG FORM

SECTION 3: ENABLERS OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS

Size and structure	1 Poor	2 Average	3 Good	4 Distinctive	Comments
Board size	Board either too small, creating heavy work for volunteer members or inadequate coverage of key responsibilities, or too large to form cohesive group; board has not addressed size as issue to be resolved	Board size is largely legacy of past decisions; imbalances exist in workload and/or coverage of board roles.	While not a topic of discussion, board size for most part adequately meets the board's needs	Board discusses issue of size explicitly and directors widely believe the current size adequately balances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coverage of roles ▪ Cohesiveness among members ▪ Work load 	
Executive committee (if it exists)	Executive committee acts as de-facto board, which tends to demoralize other board members	Executive committee exists although role is not clearly understood by all board members; emerging sense that executive committee may overstep its appropriate bounds	Executive committee has clear role, well understood and supported by all board members; value of executive committee as resource not completely exploited by the organization	Executive committee has clear role, well understood and supported by all board members; serves as a valuable resource to the board chair and CEO in guiding the organization and also in improving the overall board performance	
Committee structure: Purpose and charter of committees	Committee structure mirrors staff functions and not organizational priorities; charter unclear or indistinguishable from staff functions	Committees are logically organized and reflect organizational priorities but few have clear charter/ goals	Most standing committees have clear charter and reflect organizational priorities with few exceptions	Committee structure explicitly designed with clear charter around organizational priorities; board effectively uses mix of ad-hoc and standing committees to fulfill objectives	
Mechanisms for affiliation with organization other than governance board membership	Non-board mechanisms to increase affiliation with organization have not been considered, although some members see potential benefits	Organization has non-governance board affiliation options but there is considerable role confusion or options do not seem to achieve desired objectives	Mechanisms in place but effectiveness or coverage of key constituencies varies	Board has effective structures/mechanisms for affiliation such as advisory groups with well-defined roles or, such options have been considered and rejected as not necessary	

McKINSEY & COMPANY NONPROFIT BOARD SELF ASSESSMENT TOOL – LONG FORM

SECTION 3: ENABLERS OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS

Composition	1 Poor	2 Average	3 Good	4 Distinctive	Comments
Understanding of board composition needed to meet organizational goals	There is little discussion of desired board member skills/attributes; as a result board composition seems to be a legacy of random conversations/initiatives	Needs discussed are largely about how we can get more large donors. Significant gaps exist in skills needed by board	The process of identifying board needs is not as strong as it could be, but for the most part few gaps exist	Systematic process for identifying needed board skills driven by strategic plan; gaps are understood and agreed to by the entire board; most new board members seem to “fit our needs well”	
Process and criteria for recruitment	Recruitment process is ad-hoc; Board is largely reactive to the suggestions of a few board members/ CEO	Formal process exists to identify and cultivate potential members. Candidate pool is generally seen as more narrow and a sense exists that other boards in area attract a stronger pool of directors	Formal recruitment process with clear criteria in place; Board seems to surface a strong list of potential candidates, but converts on a smaller percentage than it would like	Formal process with clear evaluative criteria in place; whole board reaches out to potential members from a wide range sources; recruitment process is continuous and with multi-year horizon; new members are seen as great additions to the board	
Diversity on the board	Diversity not a topic of conversation and no material representation of potentially useful sources of diversity	Board’s view of diversity not tailored to the needs of the organization and board has not achieved the desired composition	Board understands the types of diversity needed, has a plan to achieve the desired diversity and is on its way to fulfilling it	Board understands types of diversity needed for organization and the value of diversity; current diversity on the board adequately reflects the diversity needed	

McKINSEY & COMPANY NONPROFIT BOARD SELF ASSESSMENT TOOL – LONG FORM

Composition	1 Poor	2 Average	3 Good	4 Distinctive	Comments
Term limits	No clear policy on term limits exists	Term limits policy exists, but the board tends to reappoint current members until term limits are reached	Although term limits works for the most part, exceptions exist, tilting to either the need for new members or the desire to retain a few exceptional long-standing members. Exiting directors are frequently “lost” to the organization	Term limits effectively balance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need for new members/skills ▪ Retention of valuable directors Mechanisms are in place for ensuring continued involvement of high-performing retiring board members	
Orientation of new members	No formal orientation for new board members	Formal orientation exists but misses key topics; new directors feel welcomed, but take a while to get up to speed	Effective formal orientation covers key topics, but misses the opportunity to welcome/listen to new directors. Initial new director roles sometimes don’t make sense/inspire new members	Formal orientation process covers key topics (mission, organization, finances, responsibilities of directors); committee assignments are welcomed by new directors who quickly become effective members of the board	

McKINSEY & COMPANY NONPROFIT BOARD SELF ASSESSMENT TOOL – LONG FORM

SECTION 3: ENABLERS OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS

Leadership (board chair and committee leaders)	1 Poor	2 Average	3 Good	4 Distinctive	Comments
Process for deciding who leads and for how long	No clear process exists for selecting the leadership and/or most members do not know the selection process	Process exists for selecting/transitioning board and committee leadership; Some confusion within board about process or election criteria or leadership tenures	Process exists for selecting leadership at board and committee levels although leadership criteria not articulated. Expected duration of leadership positions not articulated	Clear, well-understood, and accepted process is in place to select and transition board and committee leadership. Board leadership decisions seen to strengthen performance of institution	
Succession planning and development of board leaders	No process (formal or informal) in place to cultivate next generation of board leaders	Next generation of leaders has yet to be identified by current leaders. Succession decisions result in need for much learning on the job	Future leaders are identified and given opportunities to lead. Most transitions are seen as appropriate and timely	Process in place to identify and develop board leaders; committee assignments rotated to give board members experience and opportunity to lead; board seen to have a rich set of future leaders	
Quality of leadership relationship with CEO/ key staff	Leadership working relationship with the CEO is strained	Board chair has a good relationship with CEO though relationships with staff are under-developed; committee leaders do not interact with CEO or staff very often or effectively	The board chair has an effective relationship with the CEO and key staff although at the committee level, the quality of relationship varies	Board leadership has an effective working relationship with the CEO and key staff	
Effectiveness of board leadership	Current board leadership is largely ineffective given the needs of the organization	Current effectiveness of board leadership group (chair, committee chairs) is mixed, due to varying degrees of skill and enthusiasm	For the most part, board leadership is effective with a few exceptions	Current board leadership has the necessary skills, enthusiasm, energy, and time to provide leadership to the board	

McKINSEY & COMPANY NONPROFIT BOARD SELF ASSESSMENT TOOL – LONG FORM

SECTION 3: ENABLERS OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS

Processes	1 Poor	2 Average	3 Good	4 Distinctive	Comments
Quality of preparation	Calendar of meetings for the year and agenda for individual meetings not established in timely manner; Board receives materials during meetings	Calendar of meetings established although anticipated content not included; Board receives agenda and some materials ahead of meeting; Materials not of appropriate quality for board to prepare; Additional meeting time required to get board up to speed	Board receives agenda and meeting materials for individual meetings in a timely manner; Annual calendar allows appropriate time for previewing/ consideration of key decisions	Calendar of meetings set and distributed for the year; agenda for the individual meetings sent out ahead of time with indication of expected focus/ high impact areas for board consideration; board receives quality background materials well in advance of meetings and arrive prepared	
Effective meeting processes	Meetings often start late and run long; Majority of time spend on presentations to board without sufficient time for board debate and discussion	Meetings start and end on time although structure of agenda revolves around CEO/staff 'show and tell'; Significant board debate on issues not expected or desired	Significant amount of agenda is CEO/staff 'show and tell'; Board has some time to debate but discussion is often cut short due to time constraints. Some members do not contribute, although they could	Meetings start and end on time and time is managed to ensure board discussion on all important topics; minimal 'show and tell' by the CEO/staff; most time dedicated to board discussion and debate on important issues. Board members feel involved and their contributions valued	
Fun and Passion	Board views meetings as a chore; board members do not socialize before or after the meetings	Board meetings are for the most part work driven and lack opportunities for camaraderie building and connecting to the mission; Members don't mind having to miss a meeting now and then	Board meetings are for the most part productive and fun; some attempts are made to include activities to build camaraderie and connect board members with the mission; attendance is typically high	Board interactions are productive and enjoyable; good mixture of work and fun activities including effective efforts to connect board members to the mission (e.g., site visits); board members hate to miss meetings	

McKINSEY & COMPANY NONPROFIT BOARD SELF ASSESSMENT TOOL – LONG FORM

OTHER COMMENTS: