Stakeholders group Self-assessment tool

For scoring a multi-stakeholder group performances

WHAT IS NEEDED?

Participants: members of a multi-stakeholders group

Material support: blank version of the self-assessment tool for stakeholders groups (*see overleaf*).

> It can be useful to repeat this exercise a couple of times during the project cycle, to monitor the activity of the stakeholder group, and adjust the elements that are not working as well as they could.

This tool has been developed for multi-stakeholders group to self-assess their organisation and functioning, by scoring their performance on a number of dimensions.

This can be useful for the group to monitor its activities and adjust on a regular basis.

WHAT FOR?

> **To reflect** on the performance of a stakeholder group, taking various dimensions in consideration

> **To find ways** to address these issues.

HOW TO USE IT?

Step 1 Fill in the table by giving a score to several indicators (between 1 and 5) and by indicating evidence for the score.
The indicators are grouped in the following main categories:
- **>** Organisation
- **>** Diversity of the membership
- **>** Participation
- **>** Empowerment
- **>** Consideration of other voices
- **>** Involvement potential funders
- **>** Leadership
- **>** Animation and structure of meetings

Step 2 Once the Excel tool has been filled in, the tool produces a **spider diagram** outlining strengths and weaknesses of the stakeholders group performance along the different dimensions listed above. Building on this visual, the group can then explore ways to improve on the weak points and further build on the strong ones.

> In order to create a visualisation of the scoring (spider diagram), you can use the **Excel version of the tool**, available on the toolbox.

Figure: example of a Spider diagram resulting of the self-assessment using the tool (Excel version)

SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR STAKEHOLDERS GROUPS

GOVERNANCE & DECISION-MAKING

Indicators	Score awarded (out of 5)	Evidence for score (why was this score given)	Indications for scoring
Frequency of meetings			**Score1**: Group has few meetings (e.g. one per year) **Score 3**: Regular meetings, no info on participation **Score 5**: Regular and frequent meetings with high level of participation, links to meeting notes
Organisation of stakeholders meetings			**Score 1**: not enough time, part of another meeting **Score 3**: More time, but not well organised **Score 5**: Enough time, well organised
Diversity of members			**Score 1**: Group dominated by public officials from municipality **Score 3**: members mostly public officials but other agencies involved **Score 5**: involvement of representatives from public sector, private sector and civil society
Participation of residents, users of service or business			**Score 1**: No effort made to consult with users or residents or businesses **Score 3**: Some efforts made to consult **Score 5**: Full involvement of users/residents/businesses in meetings OR specific meetings held to engage them
Empowerment of citizens, residents etc			**Score 1**: No effort made on empowerment **Score 3**: Few effort made on empowerment **Score 5**: Capacity-Building measures, delegation of expenditure to local micro projects
Other voices - have attempts been made to find out what less confident partners want?			**Score 1**: Other voices have not been addressed **Score 3**: A few efforts have been made to involve other actors **Score 5**: Serious efforts are made to ensure that hidden and oppositional voices are heard and engaged
Involvement of potential funders in meetings			**Score 1**: potential funders are not involved **Score 3**: potential funders have token or occasional involvement **Score 5**: potential funders regularly attend meetings
Leadership of the group			**Score 1**: Coordinator appointed by the municipality **Score 3**: Coordinator selected by group **Score 5**: Coordinator is appointed by members or chairing is rotating
Animation and structure of meetings			**Score 1**: All meetings are organised in traditional "committee" format **Score 3**: some efforts to introduce new formats **Score 5**: innovative techniques have been deployed for meeting animation and shared decision making
TOTAL SCORE			