

Planning a typology grid essays examples

[Parts of the World](#), [Australia](#)



MANAGEMENT TYPOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

Introduction

Community based organizations (CBOs) are responsible for improving the lives of people within local communities. According to Mike Hudson (2009), CBOs possess a unique model of transactions when compared to the public and private sector. These organizations provide services to the public while the service users enjoy the privilege of not having to pay for anything.

However, not all CBOs are able to offer the same quality of service. In this regard, one way to compare them to each other is by creating a typology grid that can compare and contrast them with one another. This will help potential donors distinguish which organizations are better at achieving their goals and at managing their funds (Brown, Kenny, & Turner 2000); hence, enabling them to choose the organizations they should support.

There are different kinds of typologies that can be created. Mike Hudson (2009) enumerates five kinds of classification schemes, namely: life cycle theory, classification by activity, classification by source of funds, classification by board composition, and classification by approach. For this paper, the classification scheme that will be used is the classification by activity. This typology involves comparing and contrasting different organizations with similar activities or that cater to similar sub-sectors. There are also twelve sub-categories under this classification scheme (Hudson 2009). The sub-category that will be chosen for this paper is that of social services, specifically organizations that cater to children's welfare. Three Australia-based CBOs that provide services for the betterment of children are

chosen, namely ChildFund Australia, PLAN International Australia, and Save the Children Australia.

Typology Grid

Sources for typology grid: (ChildFund Australia 2011; Childfund Australia 2013; PLAN International Australia 2012; PLAN International Australia 2013; SCA 2013a; SCA 2013b)

Critical Appraisal

It is apparent that all three organizations have the same goals but use extremely different approaches to achieve those goals. From the typology grid, it can be inferred that the CBO that needs the most improvement is Save the Children Australia. Compared to the other two organizations, it lacks proper accountability and links with the local communities. The only advantage that its quarterly reports have over the annual reports of the other two CBOs is that theirs allow for more frequent updates and assessments of their performances (SCA 2013a). However, the Annual Effectiveness Review of Plan International and the Annual Development Effectiveness Framework Report of ChildFund are more comprehensive and constructive by leaps and bounds. Among the three, the most impressive means of ensuring accountability and effectiveness is the ChildFund's annual report because it covers all aspects of the organization's performance. Its 16 outcome indicators measure the long term impact of ChildFund. Its 41 organizational output descriptors assess the concrete immediate results of their work. And lastly, its case studies provide qualitative evaluation regarding specific children, families, and communities (Childfund Australia

2013).

Another aspect where Save the Children needs to further improve on is their link with the local communities. It seems that ChildFund and PLAN International have a keener awareness regarding their stakeholders because they are not only focused on their partnerships with huge corporations and government agencies. They are also giving importance to their partnerships with the local communities, especially the children. It is important to note that Save the Children does excel in its accessibility since it is able to provide an integrated suite of supporter service. However, it does not encourage active and significant participation from their service users in a way that would empower them. This can be attributed to the structure of their leadership, which is centralized. Because the power and decision making are concentrated in the top tier for only the executive team and board members, it leaves little room for the people in the local communities to provide a remarkable contribution. They only remain as service users instead of being active partners.

For ChildFund and PLAN International, this is not the case. Because of their decentralized structure, the service users—particularly the children—have a bigger and more important role in the decision-making process of the organization. PLAN International has youth networks and advisory groups, which enable children to establish connections with one another and work together in promoting their rights. But it is ChildFund, once again, that has the most effective approach with their Youth Empowerment Project (YEP) and publication of ChildWorld. YEP not only allows children to form connections and fight for their rights; it also provides them with bigger

opportunities for their futures. As young as 18 years old, some participants of the program have already been able to start their own businesses such as banana plantations and grocery stores (ChildFund Australia 2013). In addition to that, they have their own publication entitled ChildWorld, a magazine that is about children, for children, and by children (ChildFund Australia 2011). Because of this undeniably consequential role that children play within the organization, it is no surprise that ChildFund's biggest source of funds comes from their child sponsors.

In sum, these go to show that community involvement is important in ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of non-profit organizations. The community is a great source of information and feedback on the concerns and problems that need to be addressed with regards to the issues at hand, and it is with the community members' cooperation that the success of these non-profit organizations' initiatives is ensured.

Conclusion

Being a non-profit community-based organization is not an easy job. These organizations constantly face different challenges such as acquiring enough volunteers, measuring their performances, meeting the expectations of stakeholders, and collecting enough funds (Hudson 2009). Save the Children Australia definitely experienced these challenges. They were able to rise above some of them, but were also unsuccessful in some. This is because, as can be seen in the typology grid, their organization does not have as much connection to their service users as the other two CBOs. Their management also prioritizes their partner corporations. This is not a bad thing; but every CBO should also be able to equally prioritize the local communities they are

catering to.

ChildFund Australia, on the other hand, understands completely the nature of their work. Because of this, they are able to successfully overcome the challenges that non-profit organizations usually face. Their different approaches in management always ensure the participation of the local communities, especially the children. They are proof that an organization that is able to use effective approaches to achieve their vision/mission will definitely attract more support. This is because to them, they don't see challenges—they only see opportunities to help people.

References

Brown, K., Kenny, S., and Turner, B. S., 2000. Rhetorics of welfare: Uncertainty, choice and voluntary. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

ChildFund Australia, 2011. Strategic plan 2011-2015. [online] Available at: <http://www.childfund.org.au/sites/default/files/publications/ChildFund%20Australia%20Strategic%20Plan%202011-15.pdf> [Accessed 27 October 2014]

ChildFund Australia, 2013. Annual report 2013. [online] Available at: <https://www.childfund.org.au/sites/default/files/publications/CF114-ANNUAL-REPORT13-web.pdf> [Accessed 27 October 2014]

Hudson, M. 2009. Managing without profit: Leadership, management, and governance of third sector organisations. 3rd edn. London: Directory of Social Change.

PLAN International Australia, 2012. Champion for child rights: Plan International Australia strategic plan 2012-2016. [online] Available at: https://www.plan.org.au/~/_/media/Documents/Strategy%20Policies%20and

<https://assignbuster.com/planning-a-typology-grid-essays-examples/>

%20Procedures/Plan-Strategic-Plan-2012-2016. ashx [Accessed 27 October 2014]

PLAN International Australia, 2013. Plan International Australia: Annual report 2013.[online] Available at: [http://www. plan. org](http://www.plan.org).

[au/~media/Documents/Annual%20Report/Plan-Annual-Report-2013. ashx](http://www.plan.org.au/~media/Documents/Annual%20Report/Plan-Annual-Report-2013.ashx) [Accessed 27 October 2014]

Save the Children Australia (SCA), 2013a. 2012 annual report. [online] Available at: [https://www. savethechildren. org](https://www.savethechildren.org).

[au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/5484/2012_Annual_Report. pdf](https://www.savethechildren.org.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/5484/2012_Annual_Report.pdf) [Accessed 27 October 2014]

Save the Children Australia (SCA), 2013b. Strategic plan 2013-2015. [online] Available at: [https://www. savethechildren. org](https://www.savethechildren.org).

[au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0018/6336/Pauls-report-V4. pdf](https://www.savethechildren.org.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0018/6336/Pauls-report-V4.pdf) [Accessed 27 October 2014]