

GOVERNANCE PERFORMANCE DIAGNOSTIC

How Well Do You Think Your Local Government is Performing? Answer These Question and Get a Quick Assessment

What's in this document?

This document is a tool that can be used by individuals to quickly assess the performance of a local government with which they are familiar. It is part of a *Handbook for Local Governance*—a package of materials created by the Center for Public Service (CPS) in the Hatfield School of Government at Portland State University.¹

The primary audience for the handbook and its supporting materials is elected local officials: mayors, city council members, county commissioners, commissioners of special districts. To access the handbook and its supporting materials, [click here](#).

To help readers of the handbook find their way to parts most relevant to them and their jurisdiction, the handbook suggests starting by answering the questions to an *assessment tool*. *If you got here via a link in the handbook, or are planning to read the handbook, we recommend that you first complete the assessment tool.*

Even *if you are not planning to read the handbook*, you will still be able complete the assessment tool and get the feedback it provides. That feedback may help you directly in your thinking and conversations about your local government. It may even stimulate you to take a look at the parts of the handbook that the assessment tool suggests.

How to complete this Assessment Tool

The assessment tool is a questionnaire that you fill out. It starts on the next page. If you have time and interest, you can learn more about its design and uses before you answer the questions: [click here](#) to jump to that information. You can, however, skip that information. Either way, *we recommend that you read the instructions that follow on how to complete the assessment tool.*

- Questions start in **Section 1** with some short ones about you. You can skip these if you are doing the assessment on your own. If a larger group will complete the assessment, then it helps to have some information about background for potential cross-tabulation (e.g., “80% of the board give this activity an A; 75% of the staff give it a D or less”).
- All questions after the introductory questions are multiple-choice.
- All questions about *how you would rate performance (Sections 2 and 3)* are structured as if you were giving a grade on a report card. If you don’t want to give a grade, it helps to know why, especially if more than one person will complete the assessment. The options there are “no basis for an opinion,” “not applicable” in my local government, “do not have time to

¹ CPS’s mission is (1) to find new solutions to address the challenges of providing public services, and (2) to put those solutions into the hands of elected officials and public administrators.

think about it,” “not an area of importance or interest to me,” and “other.” Please check one of those so anyone tabulating results knows it was not left unanswered by mistake.

- The performance questions are organized under the two broad headings noted above: **Section 2**, Behavior and Relationship; and **Section 3**, Performance and Outcomes. Each headings has some subheadings.
- The performance questions in Sections 2 and 3 are followed by questions in **Section 4** asking your opinion about the *importance of that performance to good governance*. The assumption of the assessment tool is that a local government should focus on areas and activities that are both important to good governance and that are most in need of performance improvements. The assessment tool provides “default values” for importance that a person completing the tool can simply accept, or new values can be added.²

² Those default values are an arbitrary starting point. They simply divide 100% of the weight as follows: (1) 50% to behavior and relationships; 50% to performance and outcomes; and then (2) allocate that 50% in each category to each sub-category in equal parts. In other words, the default assumes that behavior/ relationships is just as important to good governance as good performance on decisionmaking, operations, and service delivery and (2) every sub-category of each is equally important. You may disagree: if so, change the weights.

The Assessment Tool: Questions for You to Answer

Any text in this format is an instruction or background for the person doing the assessment.

Questions start with a “Q” and are in blue, italicized text.

Unless otherwise instructed, select only one response for each question

1. Questions about you

Q 1.1 What is your connection to (your role in) the local government you are assessing?

Board member (e.g., Councilor; Commissioner) ☐ Appointed Committee Member ☐
Senior Leadership ☐ Middle management ☐ Staff Support ☐
Community partner ☐ Community advocate ☐ Contractor ☐ . Volunteer ☐
Citizen ☐
Other (specify) ☐ _____.

Q 1.2 How many years have you been connected to this local government?

Less than 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 yrs ☐ 4 – 5 yrs ☐ 6 – 10 yrs ☐ 11 – 15 yrs ☐ 20+ yrs ☐

Q 1.3 How many years have you had any role related to public service?

Less than 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 yrs ☐ 4 – 5 yrs ☐ 6 – 10 yrs ☐ 11 – 15 yrs ☐ 20+ yrs ☐

Q 1.4 What is your place of residence?

Do you live inside the boundaries of the local government you are assessing?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know ☐

What is the Zip Code of the place you live? _____

2. Questions about performance on behavior, communication, relationships

The primary audiences for the CPS Handbook on Governance are local elected officials and the staff leadership that supports them. The handbook provides a comprehensive discussion of the roles of elected local officials, and provides extensive references to techniques that can be used by elected officials and the staff supporting them to discharge those roles effectively, efficiently, equitably, and transparently. If you want to see that background information, go to section [3.3 of the handbook](#), which discusses five primary roles for elected officials:

1. Representation of community interests
2. Collegial deliberation and decision-making
3. Policy making
4. Organizational oversight
5. Community leadership.

The categories of questions in the rest of this assessment cover those five roles, but they are not organized to match those five roles. Nonetheless, a basic overview of those roles could help you think about and answer the questions that follow. Two ways to get that overview:

- Short version: read the paragraphs that follow
- Longer version. Go to [Section 3.3 of the handbook](#).

BUT you can complete the rest of this assessment without reading either. If you don't have the need or time for the extra reading, skip the text that follows and go to the questions in Section 2.1. The most important objective is to get the assessment done so that you have a summary to work from.

2.A Inside the organization

Q 2.1 *How would you assess your Board members' communication and relationships with each other?*

- ☐ A+ Excellent with all Board members
- ☐ A Very good with all Board members
- ☐ A- Very good with all Board members, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good with most Board members, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good with most all Board members
- ☐ B- Good but could be better with one or two board members
- ☐ C+ Could be better with two or more board members.
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationship result in dysfunctional board work.
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us

Q 2.2 *Staff leadership' communication and relationships with staff leadership / management?*

- ☐ A+ Excellent with all Staff leadership
- ☐ A Very good with all Staff leadership
- ☐ A- Very good, but could be better with one or two Staff leadership
- ☐ B+ Very good, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good with most Staff leadership
- ☐ B- Could be better with one or two Staff leadership
- ☐ C+ Could be better with two or more Staff leadership
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationship result in dysfunctional board work.
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us

Q 2.3 *Staff leadership / management's communication and relationships with each other?*

- ☐ A+ Excellent with all Staff leadership
- ☐ A Very good with all Staff leadership
- ☐ A- Very good with all Staff leadership with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good with most Staff leadership; a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good with most Staff leadership
- ☐ B- Could be better with one or two Staff leadership
- ☐ C+ Could be better with two or more Staff leadership
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationship result in dysfunctional staff work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us

Q 2.4 *Staff leadership / management's communication and relationships with the rest of staff?*

- ☐ A+ Excellent with all Staff
- ☐ A Very good with all Staff
- ☐ A- Very good with all Staff, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good with most Staff, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good with most Staff
- ☐ B- Could be better with one or two Staff leadership
- ☐ C+ Could be better with two or more Staff leadership
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work.
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us

2.B Outside the organization

Board members to outside

Q 2.5 How would you assess your Board members' communication and relationships with other agencies co-producing services?

A co-producing agency is public or quasi-public institution (typically, a city county, or special district) that has some responsibility for the production of some public service. Examples: a fire district has a

- ☐ A+ Excellent with all co-producers
- ☐ A Very good with all co-producers
- ☐ A- Very good with all coproducers, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good with most co-producers, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good with most co-producers
- ☐ B- Could be better with one or two co-producers
- ☐ C+ Could be better with two or more co-producers
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us

Q 2.6 How would you assess your Board members' communication and relationships with private sector and non-profit co-producers and advocacy groups

- ☐ A+ Excellent with all co-producers
- ☐ A Very good with all co-producers
- ☐ A- Very good with all coproducers, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good with most co-producers, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good with most co-producers
- ☐ B- Could be better with one or two co-producers
- ☐ C+ Could be better with two or more co-producers
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us

Q 2.7 How would you assess your Board members' communication and relationships with the public at large?

- ☐ A+ Excellent
- ☐ A Very good
- ☐ A- Very good, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good, but with a significant exception or two

- ☐ B Good
- ☐ B- Could be better in a few instances
- ☐ C+ Could be better in several instances
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us

Staff leadership to outside

Q 2.8 *How would you assess your Staff leadership' communication and relationships with other agencies co-producing services?*

- ☐ A+ Excellent with all co-producers
- ☐ A Very good with all co-producers
- ☐ A- Very good with all coproducers, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good with most co-producers, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good with most co-producers
- ☐ B- Could be better with one or two co-producers
- ☐ C+ Could be better with two or more co-producers
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us

Q 2.9 *How would you assess your Staff leadership' communication and relationships with private sector and non-profit co-producers and advocacy groups*

- ☐ A+ Excellent with all co-producers
- ☐ A Very good with all co-producers
- ☐ A- Very good with all coproducers, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good with most co-producers, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good with most co-producers
- ☐ B- Could be better with one or two co-producers
- ☐ C+ Could be better with two or more co-producers
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work

- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us

Q 2.10 *How would you assess your Staff leadership' communication and relationships with the public at large?*

- ☐ A+ Excellent
- ☐ A Very good
- ☐ A- Very good, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good
- ☐ B- Could be better in a few instances
- ☐ C+ Could be better in several instances
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us³. Questions about performance: board deliberation/decision making, organizational performance, program operations/service delivery (outcomes)

3.1 Deliberation and decision making

Q3.11 *How well is the board performing its deliberative and decision-making responsibilities?*

- ☐ A+ Excellent
- ☐ A Very good
- ☐ A- Very good, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good
- ☐ B- Could be better in a few instances
- ☐ C+ Could be better in several instances
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.

- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us³. Questions about performance: board deliberation/decision making, organizational performance, program operations/service delivery (outcomes)

Q3.12 How well is the senior leadership team providing the board with the information it needs to undertake successful board deliberation and decision-making?

- ☐ A+ Excellent
- ☐ A Very good
- ☐ A- Very good, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good
- ☐ B- Could be better in a few instances
- ☐ C+ Could be better in several instances
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us³. Questions about performance: board deliberation/decision making, organizational performance, program operations/service delivery (outcomes)

Q3.13 How well is the board obtaining, assessing and using appropriate community information in its board deliberations and decision-making

- ☐ A+ Excellent
- ☐ A Very good
- ☐ A- Very good, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good
- ☐ B- Could be better in a few instances
- ☐ C+ Could be better in several instances
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us³. Questions about performance: board deliberation/decision making, organizational performance, program operations/service delivery (outcomes)

Q3.14 What are your top three suggestions for improving board deliberation and decision-making?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

3.2 Organizational Performance

Q3.21 Do you have the information necessary to assess the performance of the organization?

- ☐ A+ Excellent
- ☐ A Very good
- ☐ A- Very good, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good
- ☐ B- Could be better in a few instances
- ☐ C+ Could be better in several instances
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us³. Questions about performance: board deliberation/decision making, organizational performance, program operations/service delivery (outcomes)

Q3.22 How satisfied are you with the overall performance of the organization?

- ☐ A+ Excellent
- ☐ A Very good
- ☐ A- Very good, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good
- ☐ B- Could be better in a few instances
- ☐ C+ Could be better in several instances
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.

- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us. Questions about performance: board deliberation/decision making, organizational performance, program operations/service delivery (outcomes)

Q3.23 What are your top three suggestions for improving organizational performance?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

3.3 Program Operations and Service Delivery

Q3.31 Do you have the information to assess whether program resources are being allocated in alignment with board priorities?

- ☐ A+ Excellent
- ☐ A Very good
- ☐ A- Very good, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good
- ☐ B- Could be better in a few instances
- ☐ C+ Could be better in several instances
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us. Questions about performance: board deliberation/decision making, organizational performance, program operations/service delivery (outcomes)

Q3.32 Do you have the information to evaluate the effectiveness of program outcomes?

- ☐ A+ Excellent
- ☐ A Very good
- ☐ A- Very good, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good
- ☐ B- Could be better in a few instances
- ☐ C+ Could be better in several instances
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible

- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us³. Questions about performance: board deliberation/decision making, organizational performance, program operations/service delivery (outcomes)

Q3.33 Do you have the information to assess the satisfaction of the community with service delivery?

- ☐ A+ Excellent
- ☐ A Very good
- ☐ A- Very good, but with a few resolvable problems
- ☐ B+ Very good, but with a significant exception or two
- ☐ B Good
- ☐ B- Could be better in a few instances
- ☐ C+ Could be better in several instances
- ☐ C Not great; not horrible; but improvement is needed and should be possible
- ☐ C- Sometimes relationships result in dysfunctional work
- ☐ D Bad; every organization has its problems, but no local government should operate at this level.
- ☐ F Approaching dysfunctional. Change needed soon, or change may be thrust upon us³. Questions about performance: board deliberation/decision making, organizational performance, program operations/service delivery (outcomes)

Q3.34 What are your top three suggestions for improving service delivery?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

3.4. Questions about the relative importance of the performance categories in sections 2 and 3

Q3.41 On a scale of 1(low)-10(high) how important is behavior, communication, relationships?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10						

Low
high

Q3.42 *On a scale of 1(low)-10(high) how important is effective board deliberation and decision-making?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10						

Low
high

Q3.43 *On a scale of 1(low)-10(high) how important is organizational performance?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10						

Low
high

Q3.44 *On a scale of 1(low)-10(high) how important is service delivery?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10						

Low
high

Q3.45 *On a scale of 1(low)-10(high) how important is board leadership in the community and with partner organizations?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10						

Low
high

Appendix: More Detail about the Assessment Tool

The assessment tool can help local elected officials and their management leadership team assess how well they are helping each other perform their different governing roles, decide what performance they should and want to improve, identify and evaluate their options for improvement, and assess the time and resources needed to make these improvements. The primary audience for the diagnostic tool, the accompanying handbook and its supporting materials is elected local officials: mayors, city council members, county commissioners, commissioners of special districts.

The job of local officials, broadly, is to (1) clearly specify the services they believe community members want and are willing to support, and then (2) make decisions that enable their organization to provide those services effectively, efficiently, within budget, fairly, and in partnership with other public, private, and non-profit sector service providers. The handbook aims to provide practical advice and tools for helping them do that. Though aimed at local officials and managing staff, anyone who wants to understand how local government works and cares about its performance (the efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, fairness of its decisions and operations) is likely to find something of interest in the handbook. To access the handbook and its supporting materials, [click here](#).

The tool is designed for ease and speed of completion. The benefits of simplicity come by sacrificing detail, measuring with opinion rather than observation, and generalizing. The tool cannot provide definitive, much less absolute, answers. It is only as good as your interpretation of what it shows you.

That said, as a starting place for a local government that wants to improve its performance on governance—either in general or in some specific area—the assessment tool should be helpful. Even if only one elected official completes the assessment tool, we see benefits. For that official, he or she will have done some structured thinking about what “good performance” means and how about the relative performance of the local governing board and staff. That thinking will find its way into future discussions with other elected officials, staff, partners, advocates, and citizens.

If the tool gets more use, its potential advantages increase. Most of those advantages derive from this one: anyone can complete parts or all of this assessment tool. Anyone can have opinions about the performance of their local government. Yes, one would expect elected officials and staff to have more information on which to base those opinions. But it is also valuable to hear what citizen volunteers, partner agencies, advocacy groups, and citizens in general think about performance. At a minimum, their *perceptions* (whether they accurately reflect all the facts or not) are critical to good governance. And because they see performance from a certain angle (e.g., as customers of government services), they may see facts that the local government service provider does not see. The extended advantages of collecting this information include:

- *Engagement.* Many people like simple tools for short self-assessments. They like a quick report card. They may start hoping for and expecting an “A”; they may be predisposed to give a “D” to some services. Whatever...the tool stimulates *thinking and discussion*, and it shows a local government commitment to engagement and improvement. There are reasons to argue for distributing the tool narrowly (e.g., “let’s find out first what the governing board thinks to inform their work sessions on next year’s work plan”) or broadly (e.g., “let’s use the tool as part of our public engagement program for developing a new strategic plan”). Those are decisions for local elected officials and their staff leadership.

- *Relative performance.* If taken by just one person, the tool documents that person's opinion about which parts of governance are working better than others. When coupled with opinions about the that person's view of their relative importance, the tool can create a relative ranking of things needing attention (high importance + low importance = needs attention). If many groups and people complete the assessment, the tool creates a average overall ranking the same way, and also allows comparisons of rankings across groups (e.g., board members, staff, service-delivery partners, interest groups, citizens/customers).
- *Benchmarking.* If used over time (e.g., annually), the tool becomes a way to monitor progress: e.g., "We worked on this last year: do people think we improved the service?"

The handbook authors spent a lot of time experimenting with the structure of the assessment tool. They found, of course, that there are many ways to view the work of local governments. Some examples:

- By Department. E.g., Police, Fire, Community Development, Recreation, Central Services.
- By Service. Similar to "by department," but some services are co-produced by more than one department.
- By Role of Elected Officials. The *Handbook for Local Governance* describes five primary roles: (1) representation of community interests; (2) collegial deliberation and decision-making; (3) policy making; (4) organizational oversight; and (5) community leadership.

Ultimately, we decided to take a perspective that derives from this question: What should the leadership in this organization be doing well so that the organization is choosing to do the right things and doing them in the right ways? That seemed like the most direct and practical way to connect to local elected officials and staff managers. That question suggested two broad questions for thinking about performance:

1. How well are we creating and maintaining relationships critical to getting agreement among elected officials, management leadership, staff, citizen volunteers, partner agencies, advocacy groups, and citizens in general?³
2. How do we assure that we are doing the right things, (our vision, goals, and mission) and doing them in concert with our values (e.g., effectively, efficiently, transparently, equitably,)?⁴

High marks on both of those questions are necessary conditions for having a high-performing local government. In summary, on-going high performance means paying constant attention to behavior and relationships, and to technical performance.

³ Section 3.3.1 of the handbook: staff leadership and staff, citizens and community groups. advisory boards, partner service providers

⁴ Section 4 of the handbook: the values should be operationalized as "performance standards," and performance should be judged against objectives indicators (measurements) relative to the standards (outcomes). In other words, are we finding and do a good job of implementing "best practices"? A governing board has a primary responsibility for best practices in the area of policy-making and organizational oversight; staff have the primary responsibility for best practices related to the details of service delivery.

To create its summary assessment, the tool assumes that a person's overall rating of areas of governance that have *the most need for improvement* is a function of that person's assessment of (1) *current performance*, and (2) *the relative importance of that area/activity to good governance and community well-being*.