



MODELS OF ENGAGEMENT COMPARISON

from the perspective of a “neighbor”

	Empowerment	Service	Government
Neighbor reaction to good works	Wow! Look what we accomplished!	I appreciate your help. It feels good to have someone work with me to solve my problems. (Based on the “we give a hand up, not a hand out” approach to service)	It’s great to see our elected officials making good decisions with our tax dollars.
Ownership levels 1 (low) – 10 (high)	7 – 10	4 – 6	1 - 3
Sources of ideas	Us	Inspired individuals translated into service organization charter and directed by funder priorities	Them (based on politics which is influenced by multiple things)
Source(s) of resources	Pooled resources and shared skills Funders (only on a very limited basis as needed)	Funders	Tax payers
Relationship with money	Almost never needed No staff. Participation driven by commitment to vision Small reserve fund needed for emergencies and special circumstances Needing large sums of cash indicates weakness in group processes	Needed for staff and projects Often involves lots of “volunteer” recruitment and management Tied to goals of funders. Budget drives work.	Needed for staff and projects Can involve some “volunteer” recruitment and management Tied to taxpayer expectations. Budget drives work.

Scope limitations	Unlimited	Charter and funder requirements	Re-election considerations
Leadership approach	Non-hierarchical No permission needed when within BeNe rules	Hierarchical with option to be open Permission required	Hierarchical – loosely or tightly closed depending on elected official style Permission required
Communication flows	Organic, circular	Top down with community input encouraged.	Top down with potential for community input on occasion Access to decision makers is often limited.
Success measures	# people involved in decision making # people contributing to projects # people benefiting from all that is done.	# satisfied clients # services provided within budget	# goals met in plan