

# MODULE 2: Governance Diagnostic Dashboard

## Sustainability & Inclusion Structured Audit Tool

DIAGNOSTIC TOOL

SUSTAINABILITY + INCLUSION

SELF-ASSESSMENT

KULTINCLUSION PROJECT

PROJECT NUMBER 2023-RO01-KA220-ADU-000156918



**Co-funded by  
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Images in this presentation were generated using AI image generation tools integrated within the Gamma platform, to visually illustrate training scenarios and concepts. They do not depict real people or real events.

### Document Classification

Internal Governance Instrument

Not for external communication or publication

### Prepared By

Organisation: \_\_\_\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of audit: \_\_\_\_\_

Review cycle: \_\_\_\_\_

- This document is a structured governance audit tool. It is designed for internal diagnostic use by cultural organisations, municipalities, and NGOs engaged in European policy-aligned event governance. All fields must be completed with written evidence.

SECTION 1

# Purpose of This Dashboard

This dashboard transforms a standard governance checklist into a structured diagnostic instrument. It supports objective scoring, imbalance detection between environmental and inclusion dimensions, and the strategic prioritisation of governance improvements within cultural organisations and public-facing events.

## What This Tool Does

→ **Structures Self-Assessment**

Converts qualitative judgements into scored, evidence-backed entries across two governance pillars.

→ **Detects Imbalances**

Compares environmental and inclusion averages to identify where governance investment is uneven.

→ **Guides Strategic Prioritisation**

Uses a 2x2 impact/feasibility matrix to direct attention towards the most actionable improvements.

## Important Distinction

This is an **internal governance instrument**, not a communication or marketing tool. Results are intended for internal review, strategic planning, and programme redesign — not for public reporting.

SECTION 2

# Scoring Methodology

Each governance area must be assigned a score from 0 to 3. Scores must not be estimated or assumed — every score requires written evidence in the corresponding column. The scale is designed to distinguish between symbolic compliance and genuinely integrated practice.

**0**

**Not Addressed**

No policy, practice, or awareness of this area exists within the organisation or event structure.

**1**

**Minimal / Symbolic**

An acknowledgement or intention exists, but no consistent practice or measurable outcome is in place.

**2**

**Functional but Inconsistent**

Practice exists and functions in some contexts, but is not systematically applied or regularly reviewed.

**3**

**Integrated & Monitored**

Practice is embedded in organisational processes, monitored against targets, and reviewed annually.

**❏ Mandatory Instruction:** Each score entered in the audit tables must be accompanied by a written evidence statement. Scores without evidence will be treated as 0 during any external validation process. Evidence may include policy documents, budget lines, post-event reports, staff records, or third-party assessments.

SECTION 3

# Environmental Governance Audit Table

Complete all rows. For each area, assign a score (0–3), provide a brief evidence statement, and note any gaps, constraints, or planned actions. Leave no field blank — enter "0 / No evidence available" where applicable.

Governance Area	Score (0–3)	Evidence	Notes / Planned Actions
<b>Energy</b> Consumption monitoring, renewable sourcing, efficiency measures	—		
<b>Waste</b> Reduction, segregation, circular economy practices	—		
<b>Water</b> Consumption tracking, water-saving infrastructure	—		
<b>Transport</b> Participant travel, low-emission logistics, modal shift	—		
<b>Sustainable Sourcing</b> Procurement criteria, supplier standards, local sourcing	—		
<b>Biodiversity</b> Site impact, green space protection, habitat considerations	—		
<b>Carbon Estimation</b> Footprint calculation, offset strategy, reporting	—		
<b>Accommodation</b> Eco-certified providers, proximity, occupancy optimisation	—		
<b>Community Legacy</b> Local benefit, post-event environmental commitments	—		
<b>Education &amp; Awareness</b> Environmental messaging, participant engagement, internal training	—		

Environmental Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_ / 30    Environmental Average (Total ÷ 10): \_\_\_\_\_

SECTION 4

# Inclusion Governance Audit Table

Complete all rows. For each area, assign a score (0–3), provide a brief evidence statement, and note any gaps, constraints, or planned actions. Leave no field blank — enter "0 / No evidence available" where applicable.

Governance Area	Score (0–3)	Evidence	Notes / Planned Actions
<b>Physical Accessibility</b> Venue access, mobility infrastructure, signage	—		
<b>Sensory Accessibility</b> BSL, audio description, quiet spaces, sensory-friendly provisions	—		
<b>Communication Accessibility</b> Easy-read formats, multilingual materials, plain language	—		
<b>Digital Accessibility</b> WCAG compliance, assistive technology support, digital equity	—		
<b>Inclusive Programming</b> Diversity of voices, representative curation, co-design	—		
<b>Affordability</b> Ticket pricing, subsidies, financial barrier reduction	—		
<b>Gender &amp; Child Protection</b> Safeguarding policy, safe spaces, reporting mechanisms	—		
<b>Staff Training</b> Inclusion awareness, equality training, lived experience input	—		
<b>Dietary Inclusion</b> Allergen labelling, halal/kosher/vegan/free-from provisions	—		
<b>Feedback Mechanisms</b> Accessibility feedback channels, post-event review processes	—		
<b>Emergency Preparedness</b> Evacuation procedures for disabled participants, medical provision	—		

Inclusion Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_ / 33 Inclusion Average (Total ÷ 11): \_\_\_\_\_

SECTION 5

# Imbalance Detection & Strategic Priorities

Use the averages calculated in Sections 3 and 4 to identify where governance attention is unbalanced. Any area with an average score of 0-1 requires immediate priority review and targeted action planning before the next event cycle.

## Average Scores Summary

**Environmental Average:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Inclusion Average:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Combined Governance Average:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Interpretation:** Scores of 0-1 in either pillar indicate systemic under-investment and require formal priority review. A gap of more than 0.5 between pillars suggests structural imbalance requiring reallocation of governance resources.

## Priority Matrix Instructions

Plot your highest-gap areas into the 2x2 matrix below. Prioritise actions that fall in the **High Impact / High Feasibility** quadrant for immediate implementation.

↑ HIGH IMPACT	
<b>High Feasibility</b> → Implement immediately	<b>Low Feasibility</b> → Plan & resource
<b>Low Impact / High Feasibility</b> → Quick wins	<b>Low Impact / Low Feasibility</b> → Deprioritise
↓ LOW IMPACT	

### Selected Environmental Priority

Area identified:

\_\_\_\_\_

Rationale: \_\_\_\_\_

Lead responsible:

\_\_\_\_\_

Target review date:

\_\_\_\_\_

### Selected Inclusion Priority

Area identified:

\_\_\_\_\_

Rationale: \_\_\_\_\_

Lead responsible:

\_\_\_\_\_

Target review date:

\_\_\_\_\_

### Selected Structural Priority

Area identified:

\_\_\_\_\_

Rationale: \_\_\_\_\_

Lead responsible:

\_\_\_\_\_

Target review date:

\_\_\_\_\_

SECTION 6

# Critical Reflection

This section requires honest, analytical reflection on the diagnostic process itself. Governance improvement depends not only on identifying gaps, but on understanding the assumptions and blind spots that allowed those gaps to persist. Complete each prompt with a minimum of two sentences.

## Which area was overestimated in previous cycles?

Identify the governance area where your organisation assigned a higher score than the evidence now supports. What practice was assumed to be functioning that was not rigorously evidenced?

Response:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## What assumption influenced this overestimation?

Identify the organisational belief, cultural norm, or resource constraint that shaped an inflated or uncritical self-assessment. Consider role bias, sector norms, or absence of external challenge.

Response:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## What data or evidence is needed before the next audit cycle?

Specify the concrete data sources, measurement systems, or stakeholder feedback mechanisms that must be established to enable a more robust audit in the next programme year.

Response:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

*"Diagnosis precedes redesign."*

No governance improvement programme can succeed without an honest, evidence-based understanding of the current state. This dashboard is the first step — not the final one.

Auditor signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by (line manager / board): \_\_\_\_\_

Date completed: \_\_\_\_\_

Next scheduled review: \_\_\_\_\_