

High Performance Organizational Analysis - Self Evaluation
Developed by Growth Strategy Partners LLC



The High Performance Organization Self Evaluation is an abbreviated form of our full, on-site evaluation. Although you may know that your performance is low, the question do you know what you need to implement to improve performance? If you don't, feel free to contact us at 781.837.3276

To score yourself, read each level of performance then write the level number of your performance in the Rating field then total your rating.

Organization Design Element	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Rating
Structure	Structure does not support strategy and inhibits competing. Heavy reliance on central authority. Weak definition of organization below key figures.	Structure weakly supports strategy, Over-centralization inhibits flexibility and responsiveness. Clear reporting structure, but unclear responsibilities and lines of authority.	Structure supports strategy and basis of competition. Weak delegation of authority; ways to manage complexity. Clear reporting and decision-making processes. Solid position descriptions; no definition of performance measurement basis.	Structure supports strategy and basis of competition. More effective decentralization of authority. Limited organization devices created to manage complexity. Clear reporting ,decision-making processes and authority levels.	Structure clearly supports strategy and nature of competition. Creative organization devices to manage complexity. Clear reporting, decision-making processes, authority levels and bases of measurement.	
Capabilities	Organization highly dependent on a few leaders. Directive management style. Capability building not viewed as needed.	Leadership team mix of "A" and "B" players. Development of middle managers is ad hoc. Minimal thought given to development and empowerment of front line employees.	Leadership team mix of "A" and "B" players. No clear definition of competency standards. Training is ad hoc and dependent on functional leaders. Mixed performance is tolerated.	Leadership team comprised of "A" players, but mixed at other levels. Competency requirements not well-defined throughout organization. Strong training programs, but not customized. Mixed level of coaching by managers.	"A" of "B" performers in each position. Competency requirements defined by level for each position. Training managed as strategic imperative. Managers view roles as coaches and developers of employees.	
Integration	Leadership team is somewhat dysfunctional. Functional silos. Weak alignment throughout organization. No use of functional or cross functional teams. Poor employee communications	Good leadership chemistry, no formal Management Committee. Good alignment within functions, but silo culture. Some ad hoc use of teams. Ad hoc employee communications, no plan.	Formal Management Committee, reasonable integration and alignment. Solid integration within each function, but only moderate integration across functions. Excellent use of functional teams by some functions. Variable communication.	Leadership teams works as one integrated team. Strong integration and alignment within functions, but need strengthening across functions. Some use of cross-functional teams. Solid communication plan, mixed execution.	Organization works as one seamless team throughout. Strong alignment of Leadership team and all levels with plans. High use of cross-functional teams to manage processes and help integration. Strong communication programs.	
Administrative Processes	Leadership is not process driven. No ownership for process performance or improvement. Poor process design, documentation, work standardization and measurements.	Improvements in small functional processes, but complex process are problematic. Process improvement is leader dependent and top-down. Procedures written, but execution uneven. Lacking in metrics.	All processes have assigned owners, but mixed use of multifunctional teams and employee involvement. All processes documented and standardized, but execution leader dependent. Opportunistic reengineering and improvement.	Process optimization is not uniformly part of culture. All processes documented, standardized and metrics in place. Use of teams and continuous improvement are still leader dependent.	All processes are standardized and continually optimized for reliability, productivity and timeliness. Process owners and multifunctional teams assigned. Process improvement embedded in culture.	
KPI's & Reporting	Limited financial reporting package. Limited functional KPI's. Weak management reports. No use of visual metrics or dashboards.	Complete financial reporting package Uneven functional reporting, no process reports. Some visual metrics, no dashboards.	Solid financial and functional reporting, but data bases, dashboards and visual metrics do not cover all KPI's. Process measurement still limited.	Insightful array of KPI's for company, functions and processes. Solid data bases, dashboards, visual metrics and management reports. Coverage is good but not complete.	Insightful array of KPI's for company, functions and process. Robust data bases, dashboards, visual metrics and management reports to support performance management.	
Values & Culture	Core values not defined. Little interest from leadership. Little understanding of importance of managing culture or how to do it.	Core values defined and communicated, but more a formality. Culture is not actively measured or managed. Leadership does not live the values.	Core values defined, communicated and reinforced. Culture not formally measured or managed. Uneven understanding of senior leadership team in managing culture, living the values.	Values and cultural attributes clearly defined and lived by leadership. Culture measured annually. Senior leadership understands role, but uneven support from middle management.	Values and cultural attributes clearly defined and lived. Culture measured annually. All levels of leadership understands role in managing culture; actively does so.	
Execution	Weak execution. Weak culture of accountability. Lack of annual plans, annual objectives, performance incentive plans. Totally dependent on few leaders.	Uneven execution and culture of accountability. Top-down management style. Use of budget and incentive plans, but weak linkage to business plan. Lack of monthly performance reviews.	Solid culture of accountability, but uneven functional execution. Good linkage across annual plans, management objectives, budgets and incentive plans. Poorly defined management operating system across all functions.	Solid culture of accountability and execution across company, but some toleration of weak performance. Tight linkage across business plans, annual objectives, budgets and incentive plans. Performance management operating system uneven across leaders.	Strong culture of accountability and execution across entire company. Tight linkage across business plans, annual objectives, budgets and incentive plans. Well-defined performance-oriented management operating system.	
Total						

Scoring:

- 30 to 35 points: Excellent! You understand and implement the elements of a high performing organization and undoubtedly have a high performing business
- 25 to 29 points: Above average: You have some of the fundamentals but need improvements to sustain them.
- 20 to 24 points: Average: You are just like everyone else therefore your performance is assumed to be just like theirs.
- 19 points or less: Below average: Unless you make significant changes in your organization you will continue to underperform