

From Community Institution to Economic Engine: The Changing Role of Credit Unions in America

Petar Jelinic

DBA, MBA, CPA, CRM, USA

Corresponding author

Petar Jelinic, DBA, MBA, CPA, CRM, USA.

Received: August 27, 2026; Accepted: September 14, 2026; Published: September 28, 2026

ABSTRACT

Credit unions occupy an unusual place in the American financial system. They are financial intermediaries, but they are also cooperatives. They compete in many of the same markets as banks and financial technology companies, yet their owners are the members who use their services. For much of their history, this difference was explained through a straightforward community narrative: people pooled their savings so that other members could borrow on reasonable terms. That description remains true, but the scale and complexity of the modern credit union system suggest that it is no longer sufficient. At the end of the first quarter of 2026, federally insured credit unions held approximately \$2.48 trillion in assets, maintained \$1.73 trillion in loans outstanding, and served 145.8 million members (National Credit Union Administration [NCUA], 2026a). Institutions operating at that scale do more than provide financial products. Their decisions influence where capital flows, which households gain financial capacity, which businesses obtain financing, which housing projects move forward, and how communities respond to economic change.

This article argues that the next stage in the evolution of the American credit union movement should be understood as a transition from community financial institution to community economic engine. The argument is not a call for indiscriminate growth or greater risk-taking. It is a call for a broader understanding of what financial intermediation accomplishes when it is connected deliberately to cooperative purpose. Credit unions can convert member savings into productive credit, and productive credit can support housing, entrepreneurship, business investment, household resilience, and community development. Realizing that potential requires disciplined underwriting, strong capital and liquidity, capable governance, technological investment, commercial expertise, and credible measurement of economic outcomes. The article therefore presents economic impact not as an alternative to safety and soundness, but as something made possible by it.

Keywords: Credit Unions, Cooperative Finance, Economic Development, Financial Intermediation, Small-Business Lending, Financial Inclusion, Housing Finance, Community Development, Economic Resilience, Leadership

Introduction

A Familiar Institution with a Larger Economic Story

There is a familiar way to describe a credit union. It is a member-owned, not-for-profit financial cooperative created to serve people who share an eligible field of membership. That description is legally meaningful, historically accurate, and central to the identity of the movement. Yet it can also make the modern credit union sound smaller than it has become. It describes the form of the institution without fully describing its economic function.

Consider the system as it exists today. In the first quarter of 2026, federally insured credit unions held \$2.48 trillion in assets and

\$1.73 trillion in loans. Membership had reached 145.8 million, even as the number of federally insured institutions continued a long consolidation trend and declined to 4,250 [1]. Those figures are not merely measures of institutional size. They represent an enormous pool of savings, credit, relationships, information, and financial capacity. When that capital is placed into a mortgage, a business line of credit, an equipment loan, a construction facility, or a consumer loan that helps a household remain economically mobile, it does not remain inside the credit union. It moves into the economy.

That movement of capital is where the larger story begins. Credit unions have traditionally spoken about their purpose in the language of member service: better rates, fewer fees, personal relationships, financial education, and community commitment. Those ideas remain important. But they describe what the institution provides more readily than they describe what the institution makes possible. A mortgage is a financial product, but

it can also be the mechanism through which a family acquires an appreciating asset. A commercial loan is an earning asset, but it can also finance machinery, inventory, a building, or payroll. A small-dollar loan is a consumer product, but it can also prevent a temporary financial shock from becoming a much larger economic setback.

The distinction matters because it changes the strategic question. A community financial institution asks, "How well are we serving our members?" An economic engine asks a second question: "What economic capacity exists because we are here?" The first question should never disappear. The second should increasingly sit beside it.

This article develops that proposition in a deliberately practical way. It does not suggest that every credit union should become a commercial bank in cooperative clothing, nor that every loan can be described as economic development. It argues instead that credit union leaders should understand the balance sheet as more than a financial statement. It is a record of choices about where cooperative capital is deployed. At sufficient scale, those choices have consequences for households, businesses, housing markets, and communities. The opportunity for the movement is to become more intentional about those consequences.

The Cooperative Idea was Economic Before it was Institutional

The roots of the American credit union movement help explain why this broader interpretation is not a departure from the mission. It is, in many ways, a return to its economic logic. Credit unions developed because ordinary people often faced difficulty obtaining safe savings services and affordable credit. The cooperative response was to pool resources. One person's surplus savings could become another person's loan. The institution existed because collective action created financial capacity that individual members did not possess on their own. The first U.S. credit union, St. Mary's Cooperative Credit Association, opened in Manchester, New Hampshire, in 1909. Massachusetts enacted the first general state credit union law that same year, and the Federal Credit Union Act followed in 1934. The creation of the NCUA and federal share insurance in 1970 further institutionalized the movement (NCUA, n.d.-a). Over time, credit unions moved from relatively narrow occupational and associational institutions toward increasingly diverse financial organizations. McKillop and Wilson in their broad review of credit union theory and evidence, describe a movement shaped by questions of efficiency, technology, diversification, regulation, mergers, organizational form, and the continuing tension between cooperative purpose and financial evolution [2].

What has remained constant is the underlying act of intermediation. Savers rarely know the businesses that need working capital, the families seeking mortgages, or the entrepreneurs who need equipment. Borrowers cannot efficiently assemble hundreds or thousands of individual savers willing to provide precisely the right amount of money for precisely the right period and at an acceptable level of risk. Financial institutions solve that coordination problem. They aggregate funds, evaluate risk, provide liquidity, structure credit, monitor repayment, and absorb the operational burden of moving capital between savers and borrowers.

In a credit union, that intermediation occurs inside a cooperative ownership model. The difference is not cosmetic. Members are both users and owners. Earnings that are not needed for expenses, reserves, capital, or reinvestment ultimately remain within an institution owned by those members. The cooperative form therefore creates the possibility that financial value can circulate through better pricing, stronger services, greater institutional capacity, or other forms of member benefit rather than being distributed to outside shareholders.

Van Rijn found that cooperative identity remains observable in U.S. [3]. credit unions even as the industry has matured and grown more complex. That finding is strategically important. It suggests that scale does not automatically erase cooperative distinction. But it also implies that distinction has to be expressed in behavior. A charter may define an institution as cooperative; members and communities experience the difference only through what the institution actually does.

When Deposits Become Productive Capital

A deposit is easy to think of as money sitting in an account. From the member's perspective, that is often exactly what it is: savings held for future use, emergency reserves, payroll funds, or working balances. From the institution's perspective, however, deposits are part of the funding structure that makes lending possible. This is where the credit union begins to function as an economic mechanism rather than simply a financial repository.

Imagine a member depositing \$25,000 accumulated over several years. The credit union must maintain liquidity and comply with capital, interest-rate-risk, and other prudential requirements, but the broader funding base allows it to make loans. Somewhere else in the cooperative, a family may borrow to purchase a home. A contractor may finance a vehicle. A dental practice may acquire equipment. A manufacturer may obtain a line of credit to carry receivables while waiting for customers to pay. The original saver does not know these borrowers, yet the institution connects their economic circumstances.

The point is not that a particular deposit can be traced directly into a particular loan. Modern balance-sheet management is more complex than that. The point is that intermediation converts collective savings capacity into credit capacity. That conversion is economically consequential. It moves purchasing power from people who do not need to use it immediately to people and enterprises that have productive or consumption needs in the present.

This perspective also changes the language of lending. Loans are commonly discussed as earning assets, and rightly so. They produce interest income and expose the institution to credit, liquidity, concentration, and interest-rate risk. Yet an earning asset can simultaneously be an instrument of economic activity. The two identities are not mutually exclusive. The loan must perform financially for the credit union, while the borrowed funds perform economically for the borrower.

That is why the most useful concept is not simply lending growth but productive capital deployment. Growth asks how much the portfolio increased. Productive deployment asks whether capital was placed into transactions that are sustainable for the borrower,

appropriately compensated for the institution, and consistent with the economic needs the credit union is capable of serving. The difference is subtle, but it is fundamental.

Small Business is Where the Economic-Engine Idea Becomes Visible

Nowhere is the relationship between finance and economic capacity easier to see than in small business. The United States had approximately 36.2 million small businesses in 2026. They represented 99.9 percent of U.S. businesses, employed 62.3 million people, accounted for 45.9 percent of private-sector employment, and generated an estimated 43.5 percent of economic activity, according to the U.S. Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy [4]. Those numbers make small-business finance more than a specialized lending category. It is a channel into a large part of the productive economy.

A small business rarely experiences financing as an abstract financial product. A loan usually corresponds to something tangible. The owner needs another truck because the company has more work than its existing fleet can handle. A manufacturer has won a contract but must purchase machinery before production can begin. A restaurant needs to renovate a second location. A medical practice is buying the building it currently leases. A contractor needs working capital because payroll comes every two weeks while customers pay in 45 days. Financing sits between the opportunity and the ability to act on it.

The economics of these firms differ materially from those of large corporations. Berger and Udell showed that the financing needs and sources available to smaller firms evolve as businesses age, grow, and become more informationally transparent [5]. Young and small firms often operate with less formal financial information, fewer financing alternatives, and greater information asymmetry. Those conditions help explain why relationships can matter so much in small-business lending.

A standardized model can tell a lender a great deal. It can identify leverage, liquidity, repayment history, cash-flow coverage, industry risk, collateral values, and many other variables. What it may not fully capture is the character of a local market, the resilience of an owner who successfully navigated a previous downturn, the importance of a customer relationship, or the operational competence visible to a lender who has known the business for years. These forms of knowledge should never replace quantitative analysis, but they can enrich it.

This is an area where credit unions may possess a meaningful advantage if they choose to develop it. Large national institutions have scale. Fintech lenders have speed and automation. Community-oriented credit unions can combine technology with proximity. The opportunity is not to reject standardized data but to place it alongside contextual knowledge. Data provide discipline; relationships provide context; experience provides judgment. When all three are present, relationship banking becomes more than a slogan.

The economic effect of a well-structured business loan also extends beyond the borrower. Suppose a local manufacturer borrows \$1 million for automated production equipment. On the credit union's balance sheet, the transaction is a commercial

loan. Inside the company, the money becomes machinery. The machinery may increase production, improve quality, allow the firm to bid on larger contracts, or help it remain competitive against lower-cost producers. The equipment supplier receives revenue. Contractors may install the system. Employees may be trained to operate it. The business may retain or add workers. None of those downstream effects should be claimed without evidence, but the financing clearly enables a productive investment that would otherwise require another source of capital.

That distinction should influence how credit union leaders think about commercial lending. The objective is not to count every dollar lent as community impact. It is to understand that a commercial portfolio has an economic geography and an economic purpose. Executives can know which industries they finance, how many businesses they serve, where those businesses operate, how much financing supports owner-occupied real estate versus investment property, and how much credit reaches smaller enterprises. That information makes the portfolio strategically legible.

Mission Does not Replace Underwriting

The argument for a larger economic role becomes dangerous if it is interpreted as an argument for looser credit. It is not. In fact, the opposite is true. The more consequential a credit union becomes as a source of community capital, the more important its risk discipline becomes.

Business lending is specialized work. Repayment may depend on operating cash flow that changes with competition, customer concentration, labor costs, commodity prices, management decisions, interest rates, or economic cycles. Commercial real estate can be affected by vacancy, capitalization rates, tenant quality, property type, and local supply. Construction lending adds completion, absorption, cost-overrun, and sponsor risks. Small-business borrowers may have limited financial reporting infrastructure. Each of these conditions requires expertise.

Research reinforces the point. Gómez-Biscarri, López-Espinosa, and Mesa-Toro examined the risk implications of business lending by credit unions and found that expansion into business lending can increase asset-side risk, particularly when institutions enter the activity and grow rapidly [6]. That finding should not be read as an indictment of commercial lending. It should be read as a warning against treating commercial lending as simply another product line.

A credit union that wants to finance more businesses needs more than business-development officers. It needs underwriters who understand cash flow and structure, credit administrators who can challenge assumptions independently, systems that monitor covenants and risk ratings, experienced problem-loan management, concentration limits, stress testing, documentation discipline, and a board that understands the risk it has authorized. Growth in origination without comparable growth in institutional capability is not economic development. It is risk accumulation.

This leads to an essential principle for the economic-engine credit union: mission requires risk management. Capital that is lost through poor underwriting cannot be recycled into the next

mortgage, the next small business, or the next member need. Strong credit discipline protects future lending capacity. Safety and soundness are therefore not obstacles to community impact. They are what allow community impact to continue.

Housing is More Than a Mortgage Product

Housing provides a second lens through which to see the credit union as economic infrastructure. Most financial institutions naturally organize housing around products: first mortgages, home-equity loans, construction loans, or multifamily credit. Communities experience housing differently. They experience it as shelter, wealth, labor mobility, neighborhood stability, development capacity, and cost of living.

A mortgage allows a household to purchase an asset that may become one of its most important sources of long-term wealth. A construction facility allows a builder to create housing inventory. Multifamily financing supports rental supply. A home-equity loan may allow an owner to repair or improve an existing property. Each transaction sits inside a larger housing system.

This matters because housing problems increasingly affect economic competitiveness. Employers cannot easily recruit workers who cannot afford to live within reasonable distance of their jobs. Young households that cannot accumulate a down payment remain renters longer even when their incomes could support ownership. Communities with insufficient housing supply may experience rising costs that place pressure on lower- and middle-income households.

Credit unions cannot solve these structural problems alone. Land-use policy, infrastructure, construction costs, interest rates, labor availability, public subsidies, insurance costs, and many other factors shape housing supply and affordability. But credit unions can decide whether they see themselves only at the end of the transaction, originating the mortgage after a home already exists, or whether some institutions have the expertise and risk capacity to participate further upstream.

For one credit union, that may mean stronger first-time-buyer programs. For another, it may mean construction lending. For another, workforce-housing partnerships. A larger institution may participate in multifamily finance or collaborate with community organizations on affordable housing. The appropriate role will vary. The strategic shift is to view housing finance as part of the community's economic infrastructure rather than merely as a retail product category.

Financial Inclusion is About What Comes After the Account Opens

The same distinction appears in financial inclusion. It is tempting to measure inclusion by account ownership, but access to an account is only the beginning of economic participation. The FDIC found that 4.2 percent of U.S. households, approximately 5.6 million households, were unbanked in 2023. Another 14.2 percent, representing about 19 million households, were underbanked even though they had a bank or credit union account (Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) [7].

Those figures tell us something important: being inside the mainstream financial system does not necessarily mean that a

household is financially secure. A member can have a checking account and no emergency savings. A household can have direct deposit and still depend on expensive nonbank credit. A person can belong to a credit union but lack the credit history needed for a reasonably priced auto loan. Access matters, but capacity matters more.

A more meaningful inclusion strategy therefore follows the member's economic progression. The first step may be a safe transaction account. The next may be emergency savings. Then credit building. Then reliable transportation. Then homeownership, retirement savings, education, or entrepreneurship. Not every member follows the same path, and the institution should not prescribe one. But the credit union can build infrastructure that makes more paths possible.

This is where the cooperative model can be especially powerful. Financial education is useful, but education disconnected from access has limits. Telling someone how credit works does little if there is no responsible product through which that person can establish credit. Teaching homeownership is more useful when the institution can also provide a realistic savings strategy and an appropriate mortgage product. Small-business education becomes more consequential when qualified entrepreneurs can ultimately obtain financing.

The economic-engine perspective therefore treats financial inclusion as a progression from access to stability, from stability to accumulation, and from accumulation to investment. The goal is not simply to bring people into the institution. It is to increase their ability to participate in the economy on sustainable terms.

Community Commitment Must Move Beyond the Charitable Budget

Credit unions have deep traditions of philanthropy and volunteerism. They sponsor local events, support nonprofit organizations, provide scholarships, conduct financial-literacy programs, and encourage employees to volunteer. Those activities are valuable. They create relationships and often address needs that cannot be solved through commercial finance.

Yet a credit union's greatest economic resource is usually not its charitable budget. It is its balance sheet. A \$50,000 contribution to an economic-development organization can matter greatly. A \$50 million small-business portfolio operates on an entirely different scale. One provides philanthropic capital; the other deploys financial capital. Mature community strategy should understand both.

This changes the conversation inside the executive team. If affordable housing is repeatedly identified as a community priority, leaders can ask how the institution's mortgage, construction, or partnership strategies relate to that problem. If small-business development is central to the community, leaders can examine whether the credit union has the products, expertise, and risk appetite to participate. If financial inclusion is part of the mission, management can measure whether members are actually progressing into sustainable mainstream financial relationships.

The point is not that every community problem should become a lending opportunity. Many should not. Some needs require

grants, public policy, social services, or other interventions. The point is that a financial institution should be especially thoughtful about the economic problems that are, in fact, financial. Capital allocation is one of the most powerful forms of community engagement available to a credit union.

Technology can Make Mission More Economically Sustainable

The conversation about technology in credit unions is often framed around keeping up. Members expect digital account opening, mobile deposits, rapid payments, intuitive applications, and service that works at any hour. Credit unions that fail to provide those capabilities risk losing relevance. But the deeper strategic value of technology is not simply convenience. It is economics.

Small transactions are often expensive because many elements of financial work do not shrink proportionally with the loan balance. A \$50,000 business request can require identity verification, financial statements, tax returns, ownership information, credit reports, document collection, underwriting, closing, and ongoing servicing. If each step is heavily manual, the cost of originating the loan can consume too much of its economic value.

Automation can alter that equation. Digital document collection can reduce administrative work. Account connectivity can improve cash-flow visibility. Automated spreading can accelerate analysis. Workflow systems can eliminate unnecessary handoffs. Fraud and identity tools can strengthen controls. Artificial intelligence can help organize documents, identify inconsistencies, and support monitoring. Used carefully, these tools reduce the cost of intermediation.

That reduction matters to mission. When the cost of serving a smaller borrower falls, more small transactions can become economically viable. Technology can therefore expand inclusion not by making underwriting weaker, but by making responsible underwriting less expensive.

The best technology strategy for a credit union is consequently not to imitate the interface of the largest bank. It is to use technology to strengthen the cooperative model. Routine work should become easier and faster. Human expertise should be concentrated where judgment matters. Members should encounter less friction. Lenders should have better information. Risk teams should see problems earlier. Technology should make relationships more scalable rather than make relationships unnecessary.

Artificial Intelligence Raises a Question About Identity

Artificial intelligence will accelerate this tension. Credit unions can increasingly use AI for document review, member service, fraud detection, coding, workflow support, marketing, risk monitoring, and analysis. For smaller institutions, the opportunity is significant because sophisticated capabilities that once required the resources of a national bank may become available through third-party platforms.

Yet AI also presents a strategic risk beyond cybersecurity, privacy, model governance, and bias. If every institution adopts the same tools, uses the same external data, and follows the same

automated decision pathways, financial services may become even more standardized. Credit unions could unintentionally automate away the contextual judgment that has historically supported relationship banking.

The better approach is augmentation. AI can read documents quickly; a lender can understand why a business model works in a particular market. AI can flag anomalies; an experienced credit officer can decide whether the anomaly is meaningful. AI can answer routine questions; a skilled employee can navigate the emotionally difficult conversation that follows a business setback or family financial crisis. The future cooperative advantage is unlikely to come from being less technological. It will come from being technological without becoming impersonal. That is a much harder strategy, but it is also much more defensible.

Economic Resilience is Built Before the Downturn

Financial institutions often reveal their community value most clearly when economic conditions deteriorate. During expansion, credit is broadly available, collateral values are generally supportive, borrower cash flows are stronger, and financial distress is less visible. A recession, natural disaster, major employer closure, pandemic, or interest-rate shock changes the environment quickly.

In those moments, relationship knowledge becomes economically valuable. A lender that has known a business for years may be better positioned to distinguish temporary disruption from fundamental deterioration. A credit union that understands a member's circumstances may be able to structure a modification responsibly rather than reacting mechanically to a short-term problem. This flexibility can help viable households and businesses move through temporary stress.

But flexibility is only possible when the institution itself is strong. A credit union with weak liquidity cannot confidently extend new credit. A credit union with inadequate capital cannot absorb losses. A credit union with excessive concentrations may discover that too many borrowers are exposed to the same economic shock. An institution with weak credit administration may not recognize deterioration until options have narrowed.

Economic resilience therefore begins during good times. Capital retained today creates options tomorrow. Liquidity maintained today allows the institution to act when markets tighten. Conservative concentration management protects lending capacity. Stress testing forces management to imagine conditions it would prefer not to experience. Strong underwriting preserves the balance sheet that members will need during the next downturn.

This is another reason the economic-engine concept should not be confused with aggressive growth. The institution that lends the most during an expansion is not necessarily the institution that contributes the most over an entire economic cycle. A genuinely important community lender is one that can remain present when capital becomes scarce.

Growth is Changing the Movement, but Scale is not the Same as Relevance

The structure of the credit union industry is changing at the same time its aggregate scale is increasing. The number of federally

insured credit unions declined from 4,411 in the first quarter of 2025 to 4,250 one year later [1]. The decline continues a long-running consolidation trend. Meanwhile, membership grew in aggregate, but the experience of individual institutions was far more uneven. The NCUA's first-quarter 2026 state-level analysis reported that membership declined 0.5 percent at the median and that about 55 percent of federally insured credit unions had fewer members than a year earlier. Institutions experiencing declining membership tended to be small; more than half had less than \$50 million in assets [8]. These data reveal an industry becoming larger collectively while many individual institutions struggle to maintain scale.

There are understandable reasons for consolidation. Technology is expensive. Cybersecurity is expensive. Compliance requires specialized knowledge. Commercial lending, treasury services, data analytics, and sophisticated risk management require talent. Larger institutions can spread many of these fixed costs across a broader membership base.

Scale can therefore strengthen mission. A larger credit union may be able to offer services a smaller institution cannot. It may have the capital to finance larger businesses, the technology to serve members remotely, the expertise to manage complex risk, or the geographic diversity to withstand local economic shocks.

Yet scale also creates distance. As institutions expand across counties and states, leadership can become further removed from the communities in which lending decisions ultimately have consequences. A large cooperative can remain locally relevant, but relevance becomes something that must be designed. Market leadership, decentralized relationships, local data, community partnerships, and intentional governance become increasingly important.

The strategic goal should not be smallness for its own sake, nor growth for its own sake. It should be scale without detachment. The institution should become large enough to build the capabilities its members need without becoming so distant that it loses the contextual knowledge that made community finance distinctive in the first place. The Cooperative Difference Must Become Observable As credit unions become larger and offer many of the same products as commercial banks, an uncomfortable question becomes unavoidable: what, in practice, makes the cooperative model different? The legal answer is ownership. The strategic answer must be larger.

Member ownership has value only if it produces consequences members can experience. Those consequences may include pricing, service, access, responsiveness, financial education, long-term relationships, community investment, or the reinvestment of earnings into capabilities that benefit members. The precise mix will differ among institutions. What matters is that the distinction can be observed.

This is why economic impact may become increasingly important to the public-policy legitimacy of the movement. McKillop and Wilson documented the longstanding scholarly and policy debates surrounding taxation, regulation, common-bond requirements, deposit insurance, capital, and organizational

form [2]. Those questions do not disappear as the movement grows. They become more important.

The strongest defense of cooperative finance is therefore not simply historical. It is empirical. If credit unions argue that member ownership produces different outcomes, they should be prepared to demonstrate those outcomes. If they claim a distinctive commitment to communities, capital allocation should reveal it. If they claim to support small businesses, the portfolio should show it. If they claim to advance inclusion, members should be able to progress through the financial system in measurable ways.

A cooperative charter tells the world who owns the institution. Economic stewardship shows the world what that ownership accomplishes.

The Balance Sheet is a Statement of Strategy

Every credit union has finite resources. Deposits, capital, liquidity, people, technology, and management attention must be allocated. That means every balance sheet is also a record of strategic choices.

Funds placed in one asset are not simultaneously available for another. Capital supporting one concentration cannot support unlimited additional exposure elsewhere. Management chooses among consumer lending, mortgages, commercial loans, investments, liquidity, technology, facilities, partnerships, and acquisitions. Traditional asset-liability management evaluates these choices through return, liquidity, duration, capital, and risk. An economic-engine perspective adds another question: what does this choice make possible outside the institution?

That does not mean the highest-impact loan should always win. A credit union must manage liquidity, concentrations, pricing, credit quality, and interest-rate risk. Sometimes the most responsible choice is to hold investments rather than originate additional loans. Sometimes the institution lacks the expertise to enter a market safely. Sometimes a community need does not fit the balance sheet at all.

But when leaders compare strategies that are financially viable, economic consequence can become part of the decision. A portfolio of owner-occupied commercial real estate and equipment loans may have a different relationship to the local economy than a portfolio of passive securities. A first-time-homebuyer strategy may produce different member outcomes from purchasing mortgage assets originated elsewhere. The financial characteristics still matter. The point is that they are not the only characteristics.

Capital allocation is where mission becomes tangible. Mission statements are written in words; balance sheets are written in choices.

The Cooperative Economic Flywheel

The relationship among trust, savings, lending, and economic activity can be understood as a cooperative economic flywheel. The concept is not intended as a mathematical multiplier. It is a strategic narrative that connects the different roles of the institution.

The flywheel begins with trust. Members are willing to place their money with an institution because they believe it will safeguard their funds, provide access when need, protect information, and behave competently. Trust supports deposits and relationships. Deposits contribute to funding capacity. Funding capacity supports lending. Lending finances households and enterprises. Successful households and businesses generate income, savings, and wealth. Some of those resources return to the financial system, strengthening future capacity.

The cycle is not automatic. Poor underwriting can interrupt it by destroying capital. Poor service can weaken trust. Weak liquidity can limit lending. Economic distress can impair borrowers. Technology failures can damage relationships. That is precisely why the flywheel is useful: it shows that the institution's financial health and its community role are connected. Growth, in this framework, is not the ultimate objective. Healthy circulation is. A credit union creates enduring value when it can repeatedly convert trust into financial capacity and financial capacity into responsible economic opportunity while preserving enough capital and liquidity to begin the cycle again.

What Should Executives Measure?

If credit unions are to describe themselves credibly as economic engines, they will need to measure more than activity. This may be the most important practical challenge in the entire argument.

Financial reporting is already sophisticated. Boards know asset growth, loan growth, deposits, net worth, return on assets, margin, delinquency, charge-offs, concentrations, liquidity, and efficiency. Those measures answer a critical question: is the institution financially healthy? They do not fully answer a second question: what economic role is the institution playing?

The answer does not require speculative multiplier studies. It can begin with facts the institution can verify. A commercial portfolio can be described by the number of businesses financed, industries represented, borrower size, geography, loan purpose, and whether real estate is owner occupied. A mortgage program can track first-time buyers. Construction lending can identify units financed. Financial-inclusion programs can track whether participants establish savings or graduate into mainstream credit products. Community-development lending can be mapped geographically.

The language used to report these outcomes matters. A credit union should not say that it "created" 5,000 jobs merely because businesses in its portfolio employ 5,000 people. The financing may support those businesses, but causal attribution requires much stronger evidence. Similarly, financing 200 housing units does not mean the institution single-handedly created 200 units. Developers, equity investors, contractors, public agencies, and many others may have contributed.

Credible reporting should therefore distinguish between capital provided, activity financed, people or businesses served, and outcomes that can actually be attributed to the financing. Restraint will make the economic-engine narrative more persuasive, not less.

The Boardroom Conversation Has to Change

The move from community institution to economic engine is ultimately a governance transition. Boards do not originate loans or run branches, but they determine the strategic boundaries within which management acts. They approve risk appetite, capital priorities, major technology investments, policies, and long-term direction.

A board focused only on growth can encourage expansion without enough attention to capability. A board focused only on near-term earnings can discourage investments whose strategic returns take longer to emerge. A board focused only on mission can underestimate the financial discipline required to sustain that mission. Good governance requires integration.

Directors should understand the economies their credit unions serve. They should know major employers, demographic trends, housing conditions, industries, and emerging risks. They should understand where portfolio concentrations overlap with local economic concentrations. They should know which capabilities management is building and why. They should ask whether the institution's stated purpose can be seen in its actual allocation of resources.

This does not require directors to become economists. It requires them to see the credit union in context. The institution does not operate in a vacuum. Its financial performance is partly a reflection of the households, businesses, and communities around it, and its own choices feed back into those same communities.

The Executive of the Future Is a Steward of Economic Capacity

For executive leaders, the implications are even more direct. The modern credit union executive is already expected to understand strategy, regulation, finance, risk, technology, culture, talent, and member experience. The economic-engine model adds another dimension: the executive is also a steward of economic capacity.

That phrase should not be romanticized. It means something practical. Executives decide whether the institution develops commercial lending. They decide whether a small-loan process is automated. They decide whether the credit union invests in treasury services for business members. They determine whether a housing partnership fits the institution's strategy. They allocate talent. They choose vendors. They establish risk culture. They decide whether community engagement sits on the periphery of the organization or is connected to the balance sheet.

The strongest executives will therefore be integrators. They will reject false choices between mission and profitability, between technology and relationships, or between growth and risk discipline. A credit union cannot serve its community for long if it is financially weak. It cannot remain relevant if it refuses to modernize. It cannot preserve cooperative distinction if growth becomes detached from purpose.

Leadership is the mechanism that holds these tensions together. Financial sustainability gives the institution endurance. Risk management protects capacity. Technology creates scale. Human

judgment creates context. Cooperative purpose gives direction. Economic impact gives the institution a reason to matter beyond itself.

Talent may be the Most Important form of Capital

Discussions about economic development naturally focus on money, but capital without capability can become dangerous. A credit union can have abundant deposits and still be unable to deploy them productively into complex markets if it lacks the people and systems to manage the risk.

Commercial lending requires experienced lenders, underwriters, portfolio managers, credit administrators, and problem-loan specialists. Housing finance requires expertise in markets, underwriting, operations, and compliance. Artificial intelligence requires model governance, cybersecurity, privacy, and vendor oversight. Treasury services require operational and fraud expertise. Community development requires people who understand both finance and partnership.

Talent should therefore be treated as part of economic infrastructure. An institution that wants to expand its role must invest in the people capable of financial resources into sound decisions. Hiring a producer without strengthening credit administration may increase volume but weaken the institution. Purchasing technology without employees capable of governing it may increase complexity rather than efficiency. The economic-engine credit union is not simply a larger lender. It is a more capable institution.

Partnerships Allow Credit Unions to do more Without Pretending they can do Everything

No credit union can solve a regional economy's problems alone, and it should not try. Housing shortages involve developers, municipalities, land-use policy, infrastructure, contractors, employers, and public agencies. Small-business development involves entrepreneurs, training, markets, technical assistance, workforce, and capital. Financial inclusion may involve language, transportation, education, employment, documentation, and trust.

Partnership is therefore not a secondary community-relations activity. It can be a core economic strategy. A nonprofit organization may be better equipped to provide intensive business coaching. A community college may train workers. A municipality may provide development incentives. A CDFI may reach borrowers that require specialized assistance. A credit union can bring financing, financial expertise, and relationships to the table.

The value of partnership is that it allows institutions to remain focused on what they do well while participating in solutions larger than their own balance sheets. The credit union does not need to become an economic-development agency. It needs to understand how its financial capabilities fit into the larger economic ecosystem.

A National Movement Built One Local Economy at a Time

Calling credit unions economic engines might initially sound too ambitious for institutions whose identity is rooted in communities. Yet national economies are aggregates of local

ones. The American economy consists of households, businesses, labor markets, housing markets, industries, and supply chains operating across thousands of communities.

Small businesses alone demonstrate the connection. With 62.3 million employees and an estimated 43.5 percent of U.S. economic activity, their financial health is not merely a local concern (SBA Office of Advocacy, 2026). A viable business in a small city may employ dozens of households, purchase from regional suppliers, pay local taxes, and provide services that keep other businesses functioning. Multiply that activity across millions of firms and community finance becomes part of national productive capacity.

The same is true of households. Financially resilient families are better positioned to absorb shocks, remain current on obligations, invest in education, purchase homes, and participate in consumption. Housing finance affects labor mobility. Entrepreneurship affects job creation and innovation. Financial inclusion affects who can participate in the formal economy.

The credit union movement should therefore be more confident in describing its community mission as economically significant. Local does not mean marginal. A network of institutions serving local economies can collectively become national infrastructure.

The Real Test is Not How Large the Credit Union Becomes

There is a natural tendency in financial services to equate growth with success. Larger assets, more loans, more deposits, more members, and broader markets are easy to measure. They can also be important indicators of relevance and sustainability. But they do not answer the most important question raised by this article.

An institution can grow through mergers without materially increasing the economic capacity of its communities. It can grow loans through channels that have little relationship to member needs. It can expand geographically while becoming less locally knowledgeable. None of those outcomes is necessarily wrong, but none proves impact.

The more demanding test is to ask what became possible because the credit union existed. Did a viable business obtain capital on sustainable terms? Did a household move from financial fragility toward stability? Did a member purchase a first home? Did technology make it possible to serve borrowers who previously cost too much to reach? Did the institution continue lending when a downturn caused others to retreat? Did cooperative ownership produce value that members could actually, see? Those questions turn the measurement of success outward. Growth measures what happened to the institution. Impact measures what happened around it.

Conclusion

from Institution to Infrastructure

The American credit union movement began with a practical insight rather than an abstract theory. People who lacked sufficient financial power individually could pool their resources and create something stronger together. Savings could become credit. Credit could become opportunity. The cooperative institution was the mechanism that made the transformation possible.

More than a century later, the mechanism remains, but the scale has changed dramatically. Federally insured credit unions now hold approximately \$2.48 trillion in assets, maintain \$1.73 trillion in loans, and serve 145.8 million members [1]. At that scale, it is no longer enough to think of the movement simply as an alternative retail channel. Credit unions are significant allocators of American household capital.

That capital reaches the economy every day. It reaches families purchasing homes. It reaches entrepreneurs acquiring equipment. It reaches businesses managing working capital. It reaches consumers financing transportation. It reaches communities through construction, housing, financial inclusion, and local enterprise. The credit union does not create every outcome that follows, and responsible leaders should resist exaggerated claims. But the institution undeniably influences which economic activities gain access to financing.

The opportunity now is to become more deliberate about that influence. Credit unions can connect strategic planning with the economic conditions of the communities they serve. They can build commercial expertise where it fits their markets. They can treat housing as infrastructure, not merely a product. They can use technology to reduce the cost of inclusion. They can measure the economic characteristics of their portfolios without pretending that correlation is causation. They can enter partnerships that extend their reach. Above all, they can preserve the capital, liquidity, and trust that allow them to remain present across economic cycles.

This is not mission drift. It is a more complete interpretation of the original cooperative idea. The earliest credit unions did not exist because their founders wanted to create financial institutions for their own sake. They existed because people needed economic opportunity and discovered that cooperative finance could help provide it.

The modern movement faces the same fundamental question on a larger scale. Will credit unions define themselves principally by the products they sell, the assets they accumulate, and the markets they enter? Or will they define themselves by the economic capacity they help members and communities build? The second path is more demanding. It requires better data, stronger governance, deeper expertise, disciplined risk management, and a willingness to measure outcomes honestly. It also offers a more compelling future.

The credit union of tomorrow can still be the institution where a member deposits a paycheck, finances a car, buys a first home, or builds an emergency fund. It can also be the institution that helps a local manufacturer expand, an entrepreneur opens a business, a community add housing, or a financially vulnerable household enter the mainstream economy. Those roles are not separate from the traditional mission. They are the economic expression of it.

The progression is therefore not from community institution away from community. It is from community institution toward a fuller understanding of what community finance can accomplish. Trust becomes savings. Savings become financial capacity. Financial capacity becomes responsible credit. Responsible credit becomes economic possibility. And, when that cycle is managed with discipline and purpose, a credit union becomes more than a place where money is held. It becomes part of the infrastructure through which a community builds its future.

References

1. National Credit Union Administration. NCUA releases first quarter credit union system performance data. 2026a. <https://ncua.gov/newsroom/press-release/2026/ncua-releases-first-quarter-2026-credit-union-system-performance-data>
2. McKillop DG, & Wilson JOS. Credit unions: A theoretical and empirical overview. *Financial Markets, Institutions & Instruments*. 2011. 20: 79-123.
3. Van Rijn J. The cooperative identity at U.S. credit unions. *Journal of Co-operative Organization and Management*. 2022. 10: 100152.
4. U.S. Small Business Administration, Office of Advocacy. Frequently asked questions about small business. 2026. <https://advocacy.sba.gov/2026/02/03/frequently-asked-questions-about-small-business-2026/>
5. Berger AN, Udell GF. The economics of small business finance: The roles of private equity and debt markets in the financial growth cycle. *Journal of Banking & Finance*. 1998. 22: 613-673.
6. Gómez-Biscarri J, López-Espinosa G, Mesa-Toro A. The risk implications of the business loan activity in credit unions. *Journal of Financial Stability*. 2021. 56: 100932.
7. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. 2023 FDIC national survey of unbanked and underbanked households. 2024. <https://www.fdic.gov/analysis/household-survey>
8. National Credit Union Administration. NCUA quarterly U.S. map review—First quarter 2026. 2026b. <https://ncua.gov/analysis/credit-union-corporate-call-report-data/ncua-quarterly-us-map-review/first-quarter-2026>
9. McKillop DG, French D, Quinn B, Sobiech A L, & Wilson JOS. Cooperative financial institutions: A review of the literature. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 71. 2020. 101520.
10. National Credit Union Administration. (n.d.-a). Historical timeline. <https://ncua.gov/about/historical-timeline>