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Modern corporate social contribution activities are reaching out to spreading shared values and finding solutions to social problems and environmental issues beyond the donation of the traditional concept. In line with this trend, we at the Community Chest of Korea (CCK) are developing and implementing innovative corporate social contribution programs that contribute to solving social problems while reflecting the characteristics of each company.

What matters in this process is measuring and evaluating the results of a variety of corporate social contribution activities. When the results of these activities are presented as objective indicators, it is possible to explain business performance, measures for improvement, and direction for the future. Therefore, the CCK has created assessment indicators to measure the performance of corporate social contribution programs.

With the support of GS Caltex, indicators to evaluate corporate social contribution programs jointly developed by the CCK and PLANM were first introduced in 2010, followed by a secondary research to improve the assessment method of the indicators in 2012. Seven years later, a tertiary research released the improved indicators to evaluate corporate social contribution programs.

Companies that used the second version of the indicators presented opinions such as the problem of calculating the weight of each item for the indicators and the limitation of measurement due to the large number of questions. The 2019 study solved such shortcomings and provided improved indicators that reflect the measurement of social value as the latest trend in corporate social contribution.

We hope that the improved indicators will help boost corporate social contribution activities that solve various problems in our society.

Jong Suk Ye
Chairman, Community Chest of Korea
About Community Chest of Korea

Community Chest of Korea (CCK) is the largest charity in South Korea, raising $500M annually. Since it was launched in 1998 based on Community Chest of Korea Act, it has taken a critical role in building and strengthening a South Korea’s philanthropic ecosystem, by convening cross-sector stakeholders, mobilizing resources, and serving citizens who are not helped by public welfare safety net.

CCK’s mission is to create a better world united by philanthropy. The Fruits of Love, a logo representing CCK, has been widely used nationwide and became a philanthropic symbol in South Korea. Every winter between November and January, CCK head office leads nationwide annual campaign with its 17 local chapters. By partnering with public sector and media, it displays a Thermometer of Love at central area of Seoul, and broadcast the updates. The campaign is endorsed by President and government leaders.

Of $500M that CCK raises every year, the ratio between corporate giving and individual giving is 85:15. The CCK partners with more than thousand companies, and the top corporate donors include Samsung ($50M/year), Hyundai Motors Group ($25M/year), SK, LG, and Shinhan Financial Group ($12M/year each).

CCK serves disadvantaged citizens, by partnering with more than 30,000 nonprofits and social purpose organizations. Its signature initiatives include youth employment, continuum of care for independently living older adults, and inclusive society by embracing migrant population and citizens with diverse backgrounds.

By working with knowledge experts and donors, CCK’s Research Center on Philanthropy leads a number of research projects every year. The topic ranges from corporate/individual giving trend analysis and CCK growth strategies to impact evaluation or policy advocacy.
## Contents

1. 2020 Corporate Social Contribution Program Assessment Index  
   Executive Summary  
   11

2. 2020 Corporate Social Contribution Program Assessment Index  
   Introduction  
   15

3. 2020 Corporate Social Contribution Program Assessment Index  
   Description  
   21
2020 Corporate Social Contribution Program Assessment Index

Executive Summary
**Executive Summary 1 – Background**

In 2010, Community Chest of Korea developed the first version of the Corporate Social Contribution Index, with GS Caltex's financial support. The purpose was to help align CKK staff managing corporate accounts, CSR leaders at companies, and nonprofits when partnering together to execute the community projects and use a standard language for better communication on outcomes measurement or progress. The index was updated once in 2012, and was applied to the practice between 2010-2020.

The CKK and research team made the index available for 200 corporations and nonprofit partners. And, CKK encouraged partners to apply it to the practice between 2010-2020. While having received positive feedbacks on the utility of this tool, CKK Research Center on Philanthropy saw the need and updated the index in 2019 to be more user-friendly and catch corporate donors' growing interests in creating social value.

The research team was consisted of CKK researchers, contents experts and scholars specialized in the area of corporate social responsibilities, in addition, CSR team heads of the major companies supporting CKK for long term, participated in the project as pro bono consultants.

**Executive Summary 2 – The 2020 Corporate Social Contribution Index**

The 2020 Corporate Social Contribution Index scoring system is as follows. Of 100 points, the perfect score, it gives 60 points to Social Value Category, and 40 points to Corporate Value category. The rating system follows 5 sections with 20 indicators.

**Executive Summary 3 – Utility of the Index**

The index gives formula to calculate the program's final score based on a numeric rating scale, Analysis based on subset index categories may offer insights to improve the project strategy.

**Executive Summary 4 – Implications of the Index**

The program evaluation score and ratings lead to the 5 level performance results (S, A, B, C, and F). The metrics that combined corporate value and social value gives a big picture to better understand the level program adequacy and priority.
Executive Summary 5 – Learnings from practice

According to the pilot test results, corporate donors were expecting their CSR program scores to exceed 70 points, while the average score of the project was at the level of 60 points. More empirical data needs to be collected and analyzed to draw in-depth implications in the future.

### Analysis of the assessment results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High business effectiveness</th>
<th>Medium business effectiveness</th>
<th>Low business effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implications

- **The 100-point score is a theoretical score, and scores around 80 points refer to a very excellent program.**
  - 100 points is just for finding areas to improve.

- **Considering the difficulty of creating corporate value into account.**
  - In reality, it is highly likely that low scores are given to the creation of corporate value compared to social value.
  - The primary basis for decision is social value.

- **The indicators and assessment methods can be adjusted depending on the policies of individual companies.**
1.1. Background of the index development

Review of existing assessment indices

- The program-specific corporate social contribution assessment index, jointly developed by CCK & PLANAM, was offered to more than 200 companies and NGOs in Korea.
- The index, developed in 2010 and updated in 2012 by reflecting changing trends, has been used to assess corporate social contribution programs.

Category (weight) | Division (weight) | Index
--- | --- | ---
Planning (25.53) | Preliminary research & study | 7 indices
Corporateness of the plan (5.03) | 4 indices
Implementation (26.25) | Integrity of performance (10.21) | 4 indices
Program provider & satisfaction (10.34) | 6 indices
Budget execution & management (7.77) | 4 indices
Corporate value (21.21) | PRT outcome (9.81) | 4 indices
Stakeholder network (7.56) | 4 indices
Organizational culture (4.83) | 6 indices
Social value (20.74) | Social benefit (9.77) | 6 indices
Export evaluation (9.99) | 6 indices
Social trend (8.91) | 4 indices

Implications of the index

1. The only program-specific all-purpose index
   - The only wide-use index to assess corporate social contribution activities on a program basis

2. Corporate-led Index
   - Items and weights determined by the corporate’s advisory panel of social contribution team

3. Serving as a guide for social contribution
   - Focusing on its function as a guide for assessment as well as the planning and implementation of social contribution activities

Need to improve existing indices

The index was improved in three directions (tentative) based on good and bad points identified from the real application of the index. The three directions are: 1) to make it easier to do self-assessment, 2) to reduce the number of questions, 3) to reflect the current trend.

Implications for case-based index application

Good Point
- The index allows for an evaluation of the program as a whole.
- Possible to understand the current state of the year and find areas of improvement for the future by category (planning/implementation/corporate value/social value).

Bad Point
- Program-specific weights make it hard for non-experts to use.
- Hard for social contribution staff to conduct self-assessment as there are too many questions and no data available on how to measure social value.

A need for a practical and field applicable index

1.1. Background of the index development

Overview of corporate social contribution program assessment index

- The program-specific corporate social contribution assessment index, jointly developed by CCK & PLANAM, was offered to more than 200 companies and NGOs in Korea.
- The index, developed in 2010 and updated in 2012 by reflecting changing trends, has been used to assess corporate social contribution programs.

Category (weight) | Division (weight) | Index
--- | --- | ---
Planning (25.53) | Preliminary research & study | 7 indices
Corporateness of the plan (5.03) | 4 indices
Implementation (26.25) | Integrity of performance | 4 indices
Program provider & satisfaction | 6 indices
Budget execution & management | 4 indices
Corporate value (21.21) | PRT outcome | 4 indices
Stakeholder network | 4 indices
Organizational culture | 6 indices
Social value (20.74) | Social benefit | 6 indices
Export evaluation | 6 indices
Social trend | 4 indices

Corporate social contribution trend analysis

A new trend of corporate social contribution that reaches out to creating social jobs and supporting social enterprises has appeared in addition to traditional charitable donation and social contribution to meet the change and needs of the times.

Changing areas of corporate social contribution

2008-2010 | 2016-2015
--- | ---
Support for the vulnerable populations | 50.3% | 33.5%
Culture & Arts Sports | 6.6% | 16.4%
Other | 16% | 30.1%

Increased interests in and support for areas not covered by traditional methods

Major designated giving programs since 2013

| Company | Program & Support (year started) | Key words
|---|---|---
Samsung | Sharing & Growth Initiative (2010) | Social change, innovation
Hyundai Motors | Employment support for experienced female workers (2010) | Gender equality
SK | Community Development - Independent Foreign Aid Task Force (2016) | Financial support
POSCO | Cultural programs -海外 Aid Task Force (2014) | Overseas aid
GS Caltex | Regional support programs - GS Green Team (2010) | Environment
KT | Support for Steam Train for People with Disabilities (2015) | Disability
KB | Social contribution programs for socially impaired (2015) | Social impact
LG | Social contribution programs for socially impaired (2015) | Social impact

Source: The Community Chest of Korea (CCK), 2018 Giving & Social Issues Trend Analysis
2-1. Corporate social contribution trend analysis

Emphasis on social value

- The most prominent trend in corporate social contribution in recent years is social value. What matters the most in social value is to solve societal problems through outcome rather than through input.

Example case: Social Progress Credit (SPC) Program

- Motivate social enterprises to innovate
- Promote the growth of social enterprises and activate the ecosystem
- SPC (Social Progress Credit) concept to measure and compare social enterprises’ social performance has been proposed and applied in previous years
- Performance measurement and compensation for 2 years per company, and currently more than 200 companies are participating.

Social Impact

- The main service and problem are solved by solving the social value
- Focused on whether the problem was resolved, rather than whether the service was done properly

Social innovation

- The growing trend in social value is increasing the service quantity or providing the same service with fewer resources and solving the same social problems with less resources
- Social value measurement and compensation for more than 2 years per company, and currently more than 200 companies are participating.

A system of performance and evaluation

- Social value measurement
- Social performance measurement
- Social impact measurement

2-2. Corporate social contribution index trend

Domestic and international corporate social contribution assessment index

Many organizations in Korea and beyond have developed and used indices to measure corporate social contribution activities and their social and environmental impacts.

Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea Corporate Social Value</td>
<td>Organization and description of corporate social value activities in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEI (Social Value Index)</td>
<td>Measures social value performance in companies in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI (Global Reporting Initiative)</td>
<td>Measures social value performance in companies worldwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG (Sustainable Development Goals)</td>
<td>Measures social value performance in line with the SDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA (Corporate Social Impact)</td>
<td>Measures the social value performance of companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBA (Corporate Social Impact)</td>
<td>Measures the social value performance of companies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V2 of the social contribution assessment index V3 has been produced after adjusting the indicator items and weights based on the opinions from corporate advisors and experts.

3-1. Index direction development

Index framework

V2 was composed of 4 categories and 12 divisions. It has been updated on the basis of performance, reflecting the stakeholders’ opinions and the results from a recent review of social contribution indices.

Update of Categories & Divisions

- Social Value
  - Did you choose and solve the identified social problem?
  - Conceived of the category of Social Value in V2
  - Including basic in Planning/Implementation category and effect social value

- Value Appropriateness of the problem
  - Preliminary research & study
  - Performance of the category

- Contribution to problem solving
  - Social benefit

- Value of corporate capacity
  - Contribution to shared value creation

3-1. Final version of the improved index

The final version of the social contribution program assessment index V3, has been produced after adjusting the indicator items and weights based on the opinions from corporate advisors and experts.
4-2. The utility of the index

The improved index can clearly produce a program’s final score and rating for program evaluation as follows, and implications for each division can be used for improvement in the future.

### Analysis based on index categories

- **Sustainability**
  - Overall rating: B
    - 5 (Excellent)
    - 4 (Outstanding)
    - 3 (Good)
    - 2 (Fair)
    - 1 (Poor)

- **Integrity of operation**
  - S (Excellence)
  - A (Outstanding)
  - B (Good)
  - C (Fair)
  - D (Poor)

- **Suggest directions via an evaluation of whether the activity was suitable for the indicators and sub-indicators by division**

- Need for this index: Given the experience, it is necessary to develop a strategy for the past few years to find a step-wise development path.
- Measuring with college students who have high potential and ready to be the company can produce a genuine cycle of operation.
- It is necessary to incorporate indicators that are considered to be important for the development of future advertising and platforms for each annual business unit.

### Score-based ratings and descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below 50</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program adequacy by distribution of ratings

- **Corporate value**
  - Shared Value Program ( Likely to give the first priority)
  - Low program adequacy
  - Social value/corporate value
### Measuring method by indicator

#### Social value indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social value</th>
<th>Appropriateness of the issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Appropriateness of issue identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview:**
- Does the program aim at solving a serious and urgent social issue?
- The seriousness of a social problem is judged based on social consensus (SDGs), difficulty in solving it, and the extent of the problem's impact.

#### Measuring Method

The appropriateness of social issues is evaluated according to the following sub-indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 point</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a social issue that is in line with the SDGs</td>
<td>Matches a specific goal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not match any of the goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This issue is hard to solve now.</td>
<td>Absolutely yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one is working to solve the issue.</td>
<td>Almost no one</td>
<td>There are some entities</td>
<td>There are many entities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 (1 point)</th>
<th>Level 2 (2 points)</th>
<th>Level 3 (3 points)</th>
<th>Level 4 (4 points)</th>
<th>Level 5 (5 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total score 1 point and below</td>
<td>Total score 2 points</td>
<td>Total score 3 points</td>
<td>Total score 4 points</td>
<td>Total score 5 points and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Measuring method by indicator

#### Social value indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social value</th>
<th>Appropriateness of the issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Differentiation is it a differentiated program that does not overlap?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview:**
- A program's differentiation is important in social performance as it means that it does not overlap with policies or programs carried out by the government, NGOs, and companies and have high social value.
- It may not be desirable for corporate social contribution to take over the role of the government, but it is desirable to play a part in complementing the role of the government.

#### Measuring Method

The differentiation is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 point</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a similar program outside,</td>
<td>Almost none</td>
<td>There are some entities</td>
<td>There are many entities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It does not overlap with the government's policies</td>
<td>Overlap with no policies</td>
<td>Overlap with some policies</td>
<td>Overlap with the government's policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are similar programs, but it has differentiating elements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 (1 point)</th>
<th>Level 2 (2 points)</th>
<th>Level 3 (3 points)</th>
<th>Level 4 (4 points)</th>
<th>Level 5 (5 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total score 1 point and below</td>
<td>Total score 2 points</td>
<td>Total score 3 points</td>
<td>Total score 4 points</td>
<td>Total score 5 points and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Measuring method by indicator

#### Social value indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social value</th>
<th>Appropriateness of the issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
- Social value creation begins with the right definition of the problem.
- The problem to be solved must be clear in the planning stage, so that the ultimately created social value can be recognized and measured accurately.
- When it comes to conformity with the SDGs, 2 points are given if the ultimate goals of the program clearly match one or more of the 17 SDGs, and no points are given if there is no such goal at all. The SDGs are available from the Sustainability Portal (site).
- A social problem is considered to be solved more urgently when the problem persists and there is almost no one working on the solution. Scores are given depending on how much the problem has been solved now and whether there is anyone involved in the process to solve it.
- Whether the problem is currently being solved is determined based on the trend. 2 points are given if damage caused by the problem continues to increase, 1 point if the damage exists but remains flat, and 0 point if the damage decreases.
- Note that the existence of an entity that solves the same problem should not be judged by the overlapping of the solution, but by the entity solving the problem. Evaluate with scores ranging from high (2 points), medium (1 point), and low (0 point) depending on the degree throughout the government, business, and civil society as a whole.

**Remarks:**
- Example: Issue of weekend care for children with disabilities
- Conformity with the SDGs: Consistent with sub-goals of issues 10 and 11 (2 points)
- Whether the problem is solved: Hard to see the problem being solved, but the damage is not spreading (1 point)
- The pace of solving the problem: There are a number of institutions across public and private sectors related to the care for children with disabilities (9 points)
- Total score (points): Level 3 (3 points)
2020 Corporate Social Contribution Program Assessment Index Description

### Measuring method by indicator

#### Social value indicator

**S1** Sustainability: Is it solving an issue in a sustainable manner?

- **Overview**
  - A social contribution program’s sustainability is defined as the continuity of the program itself, that of the program effectiveness, and that of the establishment of a plan to ensure its sustainability.
  - Typically, a social contribution program should last for more than three years to realize its social value.

#### Measuring Method

- **The sustainability** is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:
  - **Indicator**: 2 points 1 point 0 point Score
    - The program continues to operate,
      - For more than 3 years
      - For more than 1 year
      - New project
    - The program’s effectiveness is sustainable,
      - Sustainable
      - To some degree
      - It is a one-off project
    - There is a concrete mid- to long-term plan in place,
      - Concrete
      - To some degree
      - No plan in place

#### Social value indicator

**S4** Variability of the plan: Is it systematically designed to meet the problem definition?

- **Overview**
  - The purpose and goal of a program is to create social value by specifically planning the value to be created.
  - From the beginning, a clear quantitative or qualitative goal should be defined as to what kind of problem and how much the program will be solved.

#### Measuring Method

- **The validity of the plan** is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:
  - **Indicator**: 2 points 1 point 0 points Score
    - Needs are taken into account by classifying the subtasks.
    - Based on the needs of the subject
    - Based on theoretical needs
    - Not considered
    - A concrete goal has been presented,
    - There is a clear qualitative or quantitative goal
    - There is a goal, but not concrete
    - The presented goal has nothing to do with the problem definition
    - The outcome has been managed effectively,
    - A concrete evaluation method is in use
    - There is no plan, but a result has been reported
    - Not managed

---

### Measuring method by indicator

#### Social value indicator

**S5** Social value: Assessing the social value created by the program.

- **Description**
  - The sustainability of social contribution programs is measured in three aspects. It is defined as the continuity of the program itself, that of the program effectiveness, and the establishment of a plan that can guarantee the continuity. For a social contribution program to achieve an actual social performance, it is necessary to secure a certain period of time. That is, at least 3 years in general.
  - It is recommended to design a social contribution program that meets the one-time needs of the participants but also continues to bring about impact leading to fundamental changes. No point is given to programs that end up as one-time events such as support for food, clothing, and shelter or cultural programs. 1 point for programs helping to improve the psychological or emotional well-being of the program participants, and 2 points for programs aiming to build up the capacity to create a better future.
  - This mini-long-term plan for a social contribution program means a roadmap presenting a documented plan for more than 3 years of the program, which should include an effective plan that can be carried out autonomously by the program provider institution. It helps ensure the program even after the program provider no longer provides support. Sustainable terminology plan should be included. Social value creation should be reflected in government policies and implementation by the partner agency’s own budget. Two points are given if there is a concrete plan and 1 point if a plan exists but the plan is not concrete enough.

- **Assessment issues**: There may be a difference in judgment between 2 points and 1 point depending on the evaluator.
  - It is recommended to use the subject’s change category as key criteria.
  - One point is given to a program that ends with an internal change of the participant (improved psychological or emotional well-being, enhanced empathy, etc.). Even if an internal change is expected to bring about a fundamental change in the future, it is considered a sustainable solution only when the causal relationship is evident.

#### Remarks

- **Example**: Company A wanted to provide a leisure program because the local children’s center had no program for children during the vacation. Not many local children’s center applied for it, so the program ended with several visits to a water park.
  - The goal was to provide support for leisure activities during the vacation, but local children’s center in the community had programs already prepared that year, so they were unable to participate. Due to the absence of a needs survey (1 point), there was no other goal besides going to the water park (3 points), and only a simple satisfaction survey was conducted after having fun at the water park (1 point), without any significance. No matter how high the satisfaction was, 1 point is given, without any significance. No matter how high the satisfaction was, 1 point is given.
**Measuring by method by indicator**

**Social value indicator**

**Description**

- If a company chooses a partner agency simply for donation purposes or refer to social problems without clarifying roles of each party, this may lead to dissatisfaction of each party's role and ultimately decrease in outcomes of the project.
- So it is recommended to clarify each party's role as a partner in a joint project, rather than a donation agreement.
- Also, building the capacity of the partner agency is a hidden goal of a corporate social contribution program so that the outcome of the program can be enhanced and assets can be formed for the partner agency to solve social problems on their own. Two points are given if the program includes activities to build the capacity of the partner agency and their staff, to give related education programs, and to provide support for psycho-emotional stability.
- The intent of continued partnership is considered to show mutual satisfaction and is assessed by considering whether or not the parties not only want to maintain the program but also continue the partnership, if possible, even after the program ends.

**Remarks**

- This index is often hard for both parties to answer particularly in case that the program continues because it is highly likely that they may feel uncomfortable giving a negative response about satisfaction.
- This indicator assesses satisfaction, give both parties sufficient time for interview before indicating their response and for a self-reported assessment, indicate the company's satisfaction only.

---

**Measuring by method by indicator**

**Social value indicator**

**Description**

- The management of recipients is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:
- The management of recipients is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:
- The management of recipients is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:
- The management of recipients is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:

**Remarks**

- If the program was defined properly from the beginning, recruiting appropriate participants can result in significantly achieving social value through the program. Failure to do so can be seen as the lack of problem definition and the failure of identifying the needs. In many cases, the participants' needs are considered high on the theoretical grounds in the planning stage, but recruitment does not work well in reality. This is because there are needs among the general population in society, but situations of the community for which the program will take place are more important factors.
- Check if the participants are satisfied or not with the process and outcome of the program via a common survey of which score should surpass an average of 4.0-4.3 on a 5-point scale. As supporting indicators, attendance and dropout rates are checked. If attendance rates are low and dropout rates are high, no matter how high satisfaction turns out, 1 point is given, not 2 points. (Targets for assessing attendance and dropout rates should be presented at the planning stage.)
- Rights and interests of the participants mean the right to the protection of personal information, provision of necessary knowledge and information, and prior consultation and consent to the participation in promotion. However, 1 point is given if basic laws are followed only, and if a proactive protection which guarantees that the recipients can actively participate in the program and present their views is recommended and documented. 2 points are given.
- A corporate social contribution program is often promoted. For promotion, in the media, partnership promotion (e.g. appearance on TV, etc.), the partner agency or PR department must contact the participants first to know how far the promotion event can go and obtain their consent before hand.
Measuring method by indicator

Social value indicator

Social value: Integrity of operation

**57 Program Management**

*Was the program systematically operated as planned?*

- A program should proceed systematically under a plan and attain goals as planned.
- However, this does not mean that everything in the plan must be put into practice, but things can be adjusted flexibly depending on situations over the course of the program through a reasonable decision-making process.

**Overview**

- Program management is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:
  - The initial goals were attained, 2 points
  - The program went smoothly as planned, 3 points
  - The budget was executed reasonably, 4 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Level 1 (1 point)</th>
<th>Level 2 (2 points)</th>
<th>Level 3 (3 points)</th>
<th>Level 4 (4 points)</th>
<th>Level 5 (5 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The initial goals were attained.</td>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program went smoothly as planned.</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The budget was executed reasonably.</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total score**

- Total score 1 point and below
- Total score 2 points
- Total score 3 points
- Total score 4 points
- Total score 5 points and above

**Remarks**

- The index assessment results may vary depending on the levels of initial goals, if the goals are too excessive and vice versa, the same outputs may produce different goal attainment rates. But as this indicator does not aim to compare with other programs, the program management (in changes) should keep in mind that it is more important to set internally reasonable goals.
### Measuring method by indicator

**Social value indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social value</th>
<th>Contribution to problem solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Practical solution to the issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Overview
- The fundamental objective of a corporate social contribution program is to solve social problems, which is the very essential social value.
- This indicator is to check if changes of the S9 recipients were managed so that the intended goals were attained.
- Not only whether the participants changed as intended but also whether their problems were solved fundamentally should be checked.
- However, the scope of problem solving should be limited to the target group of the program, not society as a whole.

#### Measuring Method
- Practical solution to the issue is evaluated according to the following sub-indicators:
  - Level 1 (1 point): Changes of the program participants were measured before and after, but there was almost no change.
  - Level 2 (2 points): The program participants changed positively and the problem defined at the planning stage was solved in part.
  - Level 3 (3 points): The program participants changed positively and the problem defined at the planning stage was mostly solved.
  - Level 4 (4 points): The program participants changed positively and the social issue is almost solved.
  - Level 5 (5 points): The program participants changed positively and the social issue is completely solved.

---

### Measuring method by indicator

**Social value indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social value</th>
<th>Contribution to problem solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Social benefit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Overview
- By calculating social benefits in monetary value, it is possible to evaluate if the program was run effectively given the invested budget and created outcomes.
- Conversion to monetary value can be made in the method of S-ROI (Social Return On Investment).

#### Measuring Method
- Social benefit is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:
  - Level 1 (1 point): Monetary value of the program’s social outcome is below 95% of the budget.
  - Level 2 (2 points): Monetary value of the program’s social outcome is 95% or over of the budget.
  - Level 3 (3 points): Monetary value of the program’s social outcome is similar to the budget invested (below 105%).
  - Level 4 (4 points): Monetary value of the program’s social outcome is bigger than the budget invested.
  - Level 5 (5 points): Satisfy Level 4 and S-ROI increased year on year.

---

### Measuring method by indicator

**Social value indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social value</th>
<th>Contribution to problem solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Remarks
- Example: Self-sufficiency support program for employment education and emotional support for low-income single-parent households
  - Level 1: The program after the program, the participants turned out highly satisfied, but there is no basis to check their change.
  - Level 2: The participants’ changes before and after the program were measured but almost no change.
  - Level 3: The participants’ desire to work and will of independence changed positively and they are willing to get a job and start a business.
  - Level 4: The participants’ desire to work and will of independence changed positively, and some of them were successfully hired.
  - Level 5: Most of the program participants started economic activities as a basis for independence.

---

### Measuring method by indicator

**Social value indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social value</th>
<th>Contribution to problem solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S12 | Description | By calculating social benefits in monetary value, it is possible to evaluate if the program was run effectively given the invested budget and created outcomes. Regarding conversion to monetary value, S-ROI (Social Return On Investment) method is widely known, and its cases are easily found, but applying this method to all programs is realistically difficult, so the following method can be used to infer the benefits and evaluate them. [How to calculate the benefits in a self-reported assessment]
  1) Calculate ‘total budget for the program / beneficiaries of the program’ per person budget.
  2) Assume that instead of offering the program, the amount in 1) was distributed to individual persons in cash.
  3) Choose the most universal method which the individuals could have used the amount to have the same effect as the program (chooses the goods and services that can be purchased with the money in reality).
  4) If the amount is not enough to buy the services, the benefit is seen as bigger than the budget (4 points), 3 points are given if the services can be used with almost the same amount, and 1 point is given if better services can be purchased, as this means a lower effect than distributing money.
  5) 3 points are given if in reality, similar services cannot be purchased even with money and ROI cannot be calculated. (No such services available is different than the future to measure.)
* For assessment by external experts, make sure that the principles of S-ROI method are followed for measurement and evaluation. |

---

### Measuring method by indicator

**Social value indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social value</th>
<th>Contribution to problem solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
2020 Corporate Social Contribution Program Assessment Index Description

Measuring method by indicator

Social value indicator

**S11** Innovation Did the program offer innovative value?

- Any of the following is rated as innovative.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 point</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Absolute yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subject or social problem was not often addressed in the area of corporate social contribution before,</td>
<td>Absolute yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content of the program was newly developed via an independent R&amp;D,</td>
<td>Absolute yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more effective delivery method or tool is used than before,</td>
<td>Absolute yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is more effective than general solutions to solve the same social problem,</td>
<td>Absolute yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**Overview**

- Innovation, unlike differentiation, refers to being innovative compared to the existing solutions or covering blind spots.

Measuring Method

- The subject or social problem was not often addressed in the area of corporate social contribution before, absolute small improvement, some small degree of improvement, no
- The content of the program was newly developed via an independent R&D, absolute small improvement, some small degree of improvement, no
- A more effective delivery method or tool is used than before, absolute small improvement, some small degree of improvement, no
- It is more effective than general solutions to solve the same social problem, absolute small improvement, some small degree of improvement, no

**Level**

- Level 1 (1 point): Total score 1 point
- Level 2 (2 points): Total score 2 points
- Level 3 (3 points): Total score 3 points and above
- Level 4 (4 points): There are 1 or more 2-point items
- Level 5 (5 points): Total score 5 point and below

2020 Corporate Social Contribution Program Assessment Index Description

Measuring method by indicator

Social value indicator

**S12** Impact Did the program outcome give an external impact?

- Ripple effect is determined by the following sub-indicators:
  - The program became other company’s benchmark or was introduced in a conference outside.
  - The program was reflected in the government’s policy or affected the improvement of laws and systems.
  - The program resulted in improved awareness of the public.
  - The program helped produce professionals of the field concerned.
  - The program helped form a new network or a corporation or organization of the field.
  - The physical infrastructure or content developed by the program continued to be used.

**Overview**

- Corporate social contribution programs, considering the characteristics that they are voluntary activities of the private sector and that the capacity of them is different from the civil society, are regarded excellent when they are more experimental and can affect the general public.

Measuring Method

- Example: The program’s ripple effect is determined by the following sub-indicators:
  - The program became other company’s benchmark or was introduced in a conference outside.
  - The program was reflected in the government’s policy or affected the improvement of laws and systems.
  - The program resulted in improved awareness of the public.
  - The program helped produce professionals of the field concerned.
  - The program helped form a new network or a corporation or organization of the field.
  - The physical infrastructure or content developed by the program continued to be used.

**Level**

- Level 1 (1 point): Efforts were made to meet one or more of the items above
- Level 2 (2 points): Efforts were made to meet one or more of the items above and at least one more item
- Level 3 (3 points): Efforts were made to meet one or more of the items above and at least three more items
- Level 4 (4 points): Efforts were made to meet one or more of the items above and at least five more items
- Level 5 (5 points): Efforts were made to meet one or more of the items above and at least seven more items

2020 Corporate Social Contribution Program Assessment Index Description

Measuring method by indicator

Social value indicator

**S11** Innovation Did the program offer innovative value?

- Innovation, unlike differentiation, refers to being innovative compared to the existing solutions or covering blind spots.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 point</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Absolute yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subject or social problem was not often addressed in the area of corporate social contribution before,</td>
<td>Absolute yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content of the program was newly developed via an independent R&amp;D,</td>
<td>Absolute yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more effective delivery method or tool is used than before,</td>
<td>Absolute yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is more effective than general solutions to solve the same social problem,</td>
<td>Absolute yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**Overview**

- Any of the following is rated as innovative.

Measuring Method

- The subject or social problem was not often addressed in the area of corporate social contribution before, absolute small improvement, some small degree of improvement, no
- The content of the program was newly developed via an independent R&D, absolute small improvement, some small degree of improvement, no
- A more effective delivery method or tool is used than before, absolute small improvement, some small degree of improvement, no
- It is more effective than general solutions to solve the same social problem, absolute small improvement, some small degree of improvement, no

**Level**

- Level 1 (1 point): Total score 1 point
- Level 2 (2 points): Total score 2 points
- Level 3 (3 points): Total score 3 points and above
- Level 4 (4 points): There are 1 or more 2-point items
- Level 5 (5 points): Total score 5 point and below

2020 Corporate Social Contribution Program Assessment Index Description

Measuring method by indicator

Social value indicator

**S12** Impact Did the program outcome give an external impact?

- Ripple effect is determined by the following sub-indicators:
  - The program became other company’s benchmark or was introduced in a conference outside.
  - The program was reflected in the government’s policy or affected the improvement of laws and systems.
  - The program resulted in improved awareness of the public.
  - The program helped produce professionals of the field concerned.
  - The program helped form a new network or a corporation or organization of the field.
  - The physical infrastructure or content developed by the program continued to be used.

**Overview**

- Corporate social contribution programs, considering the characteristics that they are voluntary activities of the private sector and that the capacity of them is different from the civil society, are regarded excellent when they are more experimental and can affect the general public.

Measuring Method

- Example: The program’s ripple effect is determined by the following sub-indicators:
  - The program became other company’s benchmark or was introduced in a conference outside.
  - The program was reflected in the government’s policy or affected the improvement of laws and systems.
  - The program resulted in improved awareness of the public.
  - The program helped produce professionals of the field concerned.
  - The program helped form a new network or a corporation or organization of the field.
  - The physical infrastructure or content developed by the program continued to be used.

**Level**

- Level 1 (1 point): Efforts were made to meet one or more of the items above
- Level 2 (2 points): Efforts were made to meet one or more of the items above and at least one more item
- Level 3 (3 points): Efforts were made to meet one or more of the items above and at least three more items
- Level 4 (4 points): Efforts were made to meet one or more of the items above and at least five more items
- Level 5 (5 points): Efforts were made to meet one or more of the items above and at least seven more items
2020 Corporate Social Contribution Program Assessment Index Description

Measuring method by indicator

**Corporate value indicator**

**Corporate social contribution strategies**

**Is the program linked to the company's social contribution strategies?**

- A company's social contribution program can be run in a sustainable manner when implemented on the basis of the company's strategies.
- This index aims to check if a program's basis for implementation is put in place stably.

**Overview**

- Corporate social contribution strategies are evaluated by the following sub-indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2 point</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 point</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social contribution strategies exist</td>
<td>Written agreement strategies exist</td>
<td>Strategies of the responsible department only in place</td>
<td>No strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objectives and goals of the program are linked to directions and key targets set by social contribution strategies.</td>
<td>Absolutely yes</td>
<td>Some elements are linked</td>
<td>No connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a basis for the program's mid- to long-term implementation</td>
<td>Absolutely yes</td>
<td>There is a basis but the stability is high</td>
<td>No basis at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total score**

- Total score 1 point and below
- Total score 2 points
- Total score 3 points
- Total score 4 points
- Total score 5 points and above

---

**Participation of decision makers**

**Are the key stakeholders in the company aware of and participating in the program?**

- May seem like that there is no need for the final decision makers to make any comment as the program has continued for long, the key decision makers of the company need to continue to show interest in the program no matter how long it has lasted.

**Overview**

- Participation of decision makers is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2 point</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 point</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report was submitted to the key decision makers about the program.</td>
<td>Reported to the final decision makers.</td>
<td>Reported to the responsible executive</td>
<td>Reported to the department head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offshore of the executive level or higher of the company were involved in the program.</td>
<td>CEO was involved</td>
<td>Offshore of the executive level or higher were involved</td>
<td>No involvement at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular reports were made about the program and the program is seen as important in the company.</td>
<td>Absolutely yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total score**

- Total score 1 point and below
- Total score 2 points
- Total score 3 points
- Total score 4 points
- Total score 5 points and above

---

**Description**

- It is the interest and involvement of the CEO that affects a company's social contribution most. It may seem like that there is no need for the final decision makers to make any comment as the program has continued for long, the key decision makers of the company need to continue to show interest in the program no matter how long it has lasted.
- The final decision makers should take part in volunteer services in the same manner as other executives and employees do, making real communication take place.
- If the final decision maker is hard to take part actively in a program given its nature, he or she may visit the site and cheer the program participants and employees, and directly communicate with the person in charge of the program.
- Also, company-wide interest and participation are needed to mobilize corporate resources effectively, so if a program is considered important, it should be on the key agenda of managerial meetings of the company so that it can be discussed continuously in the decision-making process.

**Remarks**

- Examples:
  - A scholarship program was reported to the representative director, who then attended the scholarship giving ceremony and reported to managerial meetings on a regular basis (Level 4).
  - B volunteer service program was reported to the representative director and the representative director visited the site, but no further discussions were made about the program in the company (Level 4).
  - C education program for youths from low-income families was reported to the representative director and the responsible executive visited the site and participated in it (Level 3).
  - D program was approved by the responsible executive for implementation and the executive visited the site and took part in the volunteer service (Level 2).
### Measuring method by indicator

#### Corporate value Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate value</th>
<th>Connection to strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Reflection of business features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reflecting business features on a company’s social contribution activities is widely known as a universal value, but the method to do so can be defined in varied ways.

#### Overview

- Reflection of business features is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:
  - Reflection of business features in the company's stated value system.
  - Reflection of business features in the company’s brand and program name.
  - Reflection of business features in the company’s marketing materials.
  - Reflection of business features in the company’s facilities and infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 point</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflection of business features in the company’s stated value system.</td>
<td>Absolutely yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection of business features in the company’s brand and program name.</td>
<td>Absolutely yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection of business features in the company’s marketing channels.</td>
<td>Absolutely yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection of business features in the company’s facilities and infrastructure.</td>
<td>Absolutely yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (1 point)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (2 points)</td>
<td>Total score 2 points and above</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (3 points)</td>
<td>Total score 1 point</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (4 points)</td>
<td>One or more of the level 1 items exist</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measuring method by indicator

#### Corporate value Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate value</th>
<th>Connection to strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Input of business capabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Investing corporate capabilities in its operation effectively can increase a program’s outcome.
- A company’s capabilities refer to everything of the company such as business process, human resources, and facilities infrastructure except for financial aspects.

#### Overview

- Use of corporate capabilities is assessed by the following sub-indicators:
  - The person in charge actively participated in the program operation.
  - The executive and employees participated in the program funding with donations.
  - The executives and employees participated in the program as volunteer work.
  - The employees’ volunteer work played a key role in the program.
  - The company’s marketing channels were used for the program operation.
  - The company’s facilities and infrastructure were used.
  - Other company’s capabilities and how have been used (describe separately)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1 points)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Met one or more</td>
<td>Met two or more</td>
<td>Met three or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2 points)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3 points)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4 points)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5 points)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measuring method by indicator

#### Corporate value Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate value</th>
<th>Connection to strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Leveraging corporate capabilities in its operation effectively can increase a program’s outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This index also shows how the corporate social contribution trend in Korea has changed compared to its early stage. At the beginning, in Korea’s corporate social contribution, the involvement of executives and employees was regarded as important and served as an indicator to determine the success of a social contribution activity, but lately, it has become growingly a non-essential element. Thus, involvement of executives and employees is used as an element to make use of a company’s capabilities, but higher scores are given if the executives and employees play a key role in the program, rather than simply being part in.

- In addition, using the company’s marketing channels can give various effects such as promoting the program, recruiting the participants, and inducing customers’ interest and participation. Regarding facilities, all types of infrastructure constructed and operated by the company such as its workplace and training centers can be used for this purpose. Other intangible assets such as know-hows may be used as well, but as the methods can be various, they are classified as ‘Other’.

#### Remarks

- Sub-indicator 1 of Use of Corporate Capabilities was defined as active involvement of the person in charge. Many companies conduct their social contribution program to the partner agency and they do not involve, but the interview findings showed that partner agencies want the responsible person to be involved actively. However, given that most persons in charge would choose sub-indicator 1 in their response to the assessment, ‘Met 3 or more’ is set for level 5. But as the person in charge assesses a number of programs, he or she needs to compare fully between programs they took part in and those they didn’t.

### Measuring method by indicator

#### Corporate value Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate value</th>
<th>Connection to strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Assessment issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Assessment issues
  - Sub-indicator 1 of Use of Corporate Capabilities was defined as active involvement of the person in charge. Many companies conduct their social contribution program to the partner agency and they do not involve, but the interview findings showed that partner agencies want the responsible person to be involved actively. However, given that most persons in charge would choose sub-indicator 1 in their response to the assessment, ‘Met 3 or more’ is set for level 5. But as the person in charge assesses a number of programs, he or she needs to compare fully between programs they took part in and those they didn’t.
Measuring method by indicator

Corporate Value Creation of Shared Value

B5 Stakeholder network Has it affected the company’s stakeholders?

Overview
- Corporate social contribution and social responsibility is a concept defined on the basis of the value of stakeholders rather than the value of shareholders. Consideration of stakeholders contribute enormously to a company’s value based on social contribution.

Measuring Method
- Stakeholder network is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 point</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The company's stakeholders participated in the program.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Participated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program contributed to improving the relationship with the company's stakeholders.</td>
<td>Absolutely yes</td>
<td>Contributed to maintaining the existing relationship.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new stakeholder network was formed.</td>
<td>Absolutely yes</td>
<td>Related attempt was made</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total score
- Level 1 (1 point) | Total score 2 points
- Level 2 (2 points) | Total score 3 points
- Level 3 (3 points) | Total score 4 points
- Level 4 (4 points) | Level 5 (5 points)

There are one or more 2-point items

Measuring method by indicator

Corporate value indicator

B6 Contribution to corporate reputation Has the program contributed to enhancing the company’s reputation and image?

Overview
- A company’s social contribution program may affect its enhanced reputation by exposing to many stakeholders.

Measuring Method
- Contribution to corporate reputation is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 point</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program was introduced by the media.</td>
<td>Covered as an important event.</td>
<td>The program name was mentioned in the article</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program was positively exposed in an online or print media.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate online and SNS promotion channels exist.</td>
<td>Separate channels exist and are activated.</td>
<td>Separate channels exist(stand).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officially recognized by awards and certificates.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Recognized by an accredited organization</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total score
- Level 1 (1 point) | Total score 1 point
- Level 2 (2 points) | Total score 2 points
- Level 3 (3 points) | Total score 3 points
- Level 4 (4 points) | Level 5 (5 points)

There are one or more 2-point items

Measuring method by indicator

Corporate value indicator

- Active involvement of stakeholders’ includes cash, in-kind and pro bono, participation in the program operation process and volunteer works, and presenting views on or providing advice for social contribution programs such as clients or donors taking part in a program as a volunteer or clients donating to social contribution programs, to name a few.

- In the context of improving the relationship with stakeholders, stakeholders cover all stakeholders not only the service recipient such as welfare facilities but also labor unions, civil society, public offices, and the media. Corporate social contribution programs may often help improve a risky relationship or continue to maintain any existing friendly relationship, and create a new relationship. Two points are given when a new network is formed and a cooperative relationship is officially established, and 1 point is given if efforts were made, but no visible outcome came out yet.

- Examples:
  - A company developed a forest in the community where it is located and is offering a resistant-participatory environment education center in collaboration with an environment advisory organization (Level 5).
  - B company offers a project contest for welfare facilities in the community in which judges from the private and public sectors in the community are participating in the selection board (Level 4).
  - C company provides support for a volunteers group consisting of the locals to help senior citizens in the community together (Level 3).
  - D company hosts classical music performances in a mountain village where its factory is located, which is open to the villagers (Level 2).

- Remarks

- Award and certification mean that the outcome of the program has been recognized by accredited organizations, which is considered to contribute to the company’s reputation. In case that the company receives an award or certification, it is recognized only when the contribution of the program is clearly stated.

- Example:
  - An article about a company’s social contribution does not necessarily lead to the company’s enhanced reputation. It is reasonable to see this indicator as suggesting the minimal requirement for a corporate social contribution program to contribute to the company’s reputation.

- Also, despite controversies over advertisements of corporate social contribution programs, there have been many cases that such ads help promote social contribution programs to the public, and delivering warm social messages to the public itself can be seen as meaningful.
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Measuring method by indicator

Corporate value indicator

Corporate value

B7

Organizational culture

Are there any factors contributing to the internal organizational culture?

- It is important to promote a social contribution program to the executives and employees to make it contribute to the company's organizational culture.
- This indicator assesses a program in terms of its company-wide promotion activities and resulting awareness and satisfaction in the company.

Overview

- Organizational culture is evaluated by the following sub-indicators:
  - Indicator: Organizational culture evaluated by the following sub-indicators
  - Evaluation: 3 point: 2 point: 1 point: 0 point: Score
  - Indicator: Activity promotes using internal PR channels
    - Promotes via various channels
    - Posts an article about it on the company's internal media
    - Never promoted
  - The company's executives and employees know about the program:
    - Absolutely yes
    - To some degree
    - Not satisfied (NA)
  - Staffs involved in the program are satisfied (donation/volunteer work, etc.):
    - Absolutely satisfied
    - Satisfied
    - Not satisfied (not NA)

Measuring Method

- Total score
  - Level 1 (1 point)
  - Level 2 (2 points)
  - Level 3 (3 points)
  - Level 4 (4 points)
  - Level 5 (5 points)

Total score: 5 points

- In some cases, the program contributed to business performance of other companies (describe separately)

Measuring method by indicator

Corporate value indicator

Corporate value

B8

Contribution to business

Are there any factors that contributed to the business performance of the company?

- Contribution to business is assessed by the following sub-indicators:
  - The social contribution program contributed to the company's revenues directly.
  - The social contribution program increased (increased) the effect.
  - Outcomes of the program helped develop the company's tangible and intangible business assets.
  - The program contributed to the expansion of the business ecosystem by fostering professionals, etc.
  - The program played a key role in finding new markets for the company.
  - The program helped build the employee's capacity.
  - In some cases, the program contributed to business performance of other companies (describe separately)

Overview

- Contribution to business is assessed by the following sub-indicators:
  - The social contribution program contributed to the company's revenues directly.
  - The social contribution program increased (increased) the effect.
  - Outcomes of the program helped develop the company's tangible and intangible business assets.
  - The program contributed to the expansion of the business ecosystem by fostering professionals, etc.
  - The program played a key role in finding new markets for the company.
  - The program helped build the employee's capacity.
  - In some cases, the program contributed to business performance of other companies (describe separately)

Measuring Method

- Contribution to business is assessed by the following sub-indicators:
  - The social contribution program contributed to the company's revenues directly.
  - The social contribution program increased (increased) the effect.
  - Outcomes of the program helped develop the company's tangible and intangible business assets.
  - The program contributed to the expansion of the business ecosystem by fostering professionals, etc.
  - The program played a key role in finding new markets for the company.
  - The program helped build the employee's capacity.
  - In some cases, the program contributed to business performance of other companies (describe separately)
Application of the index

According to the pilot test results, corporate donors were expecting their CSR program scores to exceed 70 points, while the average score of the project was at the level of 60 points. More empirical data needs to be collected and analyzed to draw in-depth implications in the future.

Analysis of the assessment results

Implications

1) Index that combines corporate value scores and social value scores; 2) Index that combines planning scores and implementation scores