

CASE STUDY, PART TWO: RANKING THE FIVE

On your own, go through each of the five principles and rate them on a scale of 1 to 5. After you have done this, share your rankings with each other and then discuss the questions to consider.

1. **Mutuality**

A “1” means it is completely “us-them” with clear distinctions between the givers and the receivers and a “5” means there is an authentic “we” with real reciprocity, where everyone is benefitting from each other.

Question to Consider: To what degree do you think this ministry suffers from a proximity disorder?



2. **Participatory**

A “1” means there is one group doing everything for another group and a “5” means that everything is done *with* all people as equal participants in the work.

Question to Consider: To what degree do you think this ministry embodies the belief that the materially poor are bearers of God's image?



3. Holistic

A "1" means that it is a single-issue problem with a single-solution strategy and a "5" means that there is a comprehensive understanding of the interrelated factors creating the problem, as well as a multi-layered approach to addressing it.

Question to Consider: To what degree is this ministry rooted in the relational framework for understanding poverty (see page 40)?



4. Mind

A "1" means that it strictly engages emotional responses to alleviating the pain caused by poverty and a "5" means that the best expertise is being leveraged to create lasting solutions to poverty.

Question to Consider: How well has this ministry distinguished between crisis and chronic and worked to create robust development-based approaches where chronic poverty is present?



5. Impact

A "1" means that the success metrics measure volume of resources distributed or amount of activity done and a "5" means that it measures the end results of the work so as to create real, lasting change.

Question to Consider: Do you think this ministry is designed to alleviate the pain people experience due to poverty (a symptoms approach) or to address the causes of poverty (a systems approach)?



CASE STUDY, PART THREE: THE FOUR PARTS OF CHARITY

Determine how the ministry being studied would define each of the four building blocks of charity by discussing the questions listed in each quadrant.

<p style="text-align: center;">PROBLEM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the problem defined based on the symptoms or the causes of poverty?• What voices or information are missing from this understanding of the problem?• How might their understanding of the problem lead to ineffective or harmful results?	<p style="text-align: center;">SOLUTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the solution a lasting solution, or does it provide perpetual help to a perpetually recurring need?• Who determined that this model was the right response?• In what ways might this understanding of the solution lead to ineffective or harmful results?
<p style="text-align: center;">PROCESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does the process involve the materially poor as recipients or as participants?• Who makes decisions, determines strategies, and sets objectives?• In what ways might the process itself hinder solving the problem effectively?	<p style="text-align: center;">SOLUTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are the metrics based on the work or generosity of the helpers or on what is happening among those it is intended to benefit?• Who gets to decide what is measured, what stories are shared with supporters, and what milestones are celebrated?• How might the metrics being used actually hinder this ministry from doing healthy work?