

BRIDGING FOR HEALTH -- STEWARDSHIP SELF ASSESSMENT

Rate your coalition on the three components of a stewardship mindset. Be prepared to discuss your rating with other coalition members.

Purpose

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
There is a lack of clarity and/or unresolved differences of opinion regarding the purpose of the coalition.	While the purpose is not made explicit, many hold the belief that this coalition is a long-term fixture in the community.	The purpose and vision are still under construction but there is general support and alignment.	Most of the parties involved are committed to the purpose of the coalition and support decisions that may not align directly within the mission and vision of their own agency/institution.	All parties are committed to a shared, encompassing purpose. Vision for the system and plan are clear and well communicated.

People

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Parties in the coalition actively avoid taking responsibility for the “valuables” of others. It is apparent that only a few parties with resources are invited to fully engage in planning and decision making.	There is a lack of awareness of the need to take responsibility for the resources of other parties in the coalition. There are important groups and/or sub-populations not represented on the coalition.	While working relationships are good, parties contributing greater resources are perceived to get deferential treatment in decision making. There is representative diversity in coalition membership.	The input and ideas of parties with fewer resources to offer are typically as valued as those offered by parties that contribute greater resources. The insights of those with expertise in sub-populations are engaged and valued.	All parties are fully engaged, valued, and provided the opportunity to utilize strengths toward the collective effort. All parties feel responsible for mitigating potential harm to other parties. Representatives of sub-populations are engaged and their insights valued.

Structure

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
There is a general perception that the coalition is dysfunctional and exists in name only.	Meetings and structures for communication and decision making are often inefficient. Important issues are only addressed when they reach near-crisis stage.	There may be an over-reliance on coalition staff for decision making and accountability of proper investments made by the coalition.	There is a clear and transparent leadership structure and decision making process. There are plans in place to onboard new/replace coalition members to keep the group “evergreen”	Meetings and coalition structures are purposeful, productive and efficient. Important, unmentioned issues are identified and resolved. There are forums and tools to have healthy conflict.