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“YOU KEEP USING THAT WORD”

ENGAGEMENT?

EMPOWERMENT?

ENABLEMENT?

MANAGEMENT?
LEADERS BUILD OTHER LEADERS

IT’S ABOUT INCREMENTAL STEPS

EMPOWERED

ENABLED

MANAGED

https://opensource.com/open-organization/18/10/understanding-engagement-empowerment
# HOW OPEN ARE YOU?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transparency</th>
<th>Inclusivity</th>
<th>Adaptability</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 0: Unaware</strong></td>
<td>Individuals and teams do not regularly disclose their plans, products, or processes; people are often surprised to learn about them after they have been made.</td>
<td>No channels are established for providing feedback or learning about projects; leaders make decisions without help, and people are accustomed to receiving direction without any opportunity to provide input.</td>
<td>Information flows in predefined, linear, and often hierarchical directions; power is centralized, and decision-making cannot keep pace with complex and shifting contexts.</td>
<td>Work gets duplicated unnecessarily across teams working toward similar goals; people share only when asked and are not aware of the ways that they can work with other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1: Initial</strong></td>
<td>People share resources after release, but in disconnected, fragmented, or siloed systems or repositories; there’s little context for understanding how decisions are made, and decisions are shared for feedback after they are final.</td>
<td>Internal guidelines and channels for encouraging diverse points of view about decisions are established; there’s at least one channel for people to register feedback, and some leaders are open to receiving it.</td>
<td>Members of the organization share materials, but typically in a one-way, “read only” fashion; discussions of failure often involve blame.</td>
<td>People understand that the best ideas win, and leadership responses to failures accrue to people with histories of contribution and commitment; a common language is forming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2: Defined</strong></td>
<td>Materials that are part of decision-making practices are available in defined project milestones; there’s a shared repository for collective knowledge, and some members contribute.</td>
<td>People share materials via multiple channels and with multiple methods for feedback; leaders use those channels and methods themselves, and openly encourage others to do so.</td>
<td>People actively seek opportunities to collaborate as a built-in or natural part of their planning; work is shared by initiating projects in group settings.</td>
<td>People collectively document shared visions and agreements, make them easily accessible, and reference them often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3: Optimizing</strong></td>
<td>People feel like they are a part of a shared, standard process for collective decision-making. Where materials are always available, individuals and teams frequently engage in difficult conversations during project execution.</td>
<td>Decision-making and problem-solving frameworks and processes are collectively modifiable, and members feel comfortable adjusting their behaviors in response to changing conditions; failure is seen as an acceptable outcome of experimentation.</td>
<td>People initiate projects in group settings, effectively sharing work by connecting with additional project groups to form cross-functional teams; people collaborate both internally and externally in ways that benefit all involved.</td>
<td>Shared values and principles inform decision-making, conflict resolution, and assessment processes; values and principles are referenced in both verbal and written formats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE: TRANSPARENCY

Level 0: Unaware
Individuals and teams do not regularly disclose their plans, products, or processes; people affected by decisions are often surprised to learn about them after they have been made.

Level 1: Initial
People share resources after release, but in disconnected, fragmented, or siloed systems or repositories; there's little context for understanding how decisions are made, and decisions are shared for feedback after they are final.

Level 2: Defined
Materials that are part of decision-making practices are available at defined project milestones; there's a shared repository for collective knowledge, and some members contribute.

Level 3: Optimizing
People feel like they are a part of a shared, standard process for collective decision-making where materials are always available; individuals and teams frequently engage in difficult conversations during project execution.

EMPOWERED
ENABLED
MANAGED

https://opensource.com/open-organization/resources/open-org-maturity-model
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