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CREATING SHARED VALUE FOR ENHANCED COLLECTIVE IMPACT

Abstract
The private sector can improve its private and social outcomes by creating shared value, linking social and financial outcomes (Porter and Kramer, 2011). For the social sector, outcomes can also improve through collective impact models, aligning input from multiple sectors towards a shared social goal (Kania and Kramer, 2011). Entrepreneurial social sector leaders like the United Way of Anchorage may seek to enhance collective impact by creating shared value. The hypothesis is that the social sector can create shared value opportunity for enhanced collective impact that may improve social outcomes. The concepts are defined, combined and operationalized in the form of an assessment tool.

Key Terms: Creating Shared Value, Collective Impact, Corporate Social Responsibility, Social Entrepreneurship, Social Enterprise
Introduction

Traditionally, the private sector focuses on creating shareholder profit while the social sector focuses on social outcomes. Recently, as the following literature review documents, a convergence of the private and social sectors has evolved. Despite the convergence, no theory presently outlines a path for the social sector to proactively employ private sector participation in the creation of social value.

United Way of Anchorage

The client for this project is the United Way of Anchorage. Like other entrepreneurial nonprofit organizations, the United Way seeks to partner with the private sector in order to improve social outcomes. They gather and report social metrics on a variety of population measures and have a unique perspective, due to their position as a funder of partnering nonprofits, to identify unique social value creation opportunities. The assignment was to explore the intersection of private and social value creation.

Problem Statement

If the social sector can help the private sector reconceive products and markets, redefine productivity in the value chain and enable local cluster development, it would help create shared value for the private sector. And, if the social sector aligned shared value opportunities toward a common agenda, it could enhance collective impact and improve social outcomes for those select areas. Therefore, the hypothesis is that creating shared value opportunity for enhanced collective impact may improve social outcomes. If shared value is well aligned with a collective impact model, no incentives for private sector participation (recognition, tax credits, public acknowledgement, etc.) should be necessary because the private sector will be driven to create social value by the interdependent private value opportunity.
Method

To test the hypothesis, the theory of creating shared value is operationalized for application and assessment. The theory relies heavily upon concepts from Porter and Kramer, and Foundation Strategy Group (FSG). For application, it will input a selection of measures from the United Way of Anchorage’s community goals. However, any social sector goals may be used in later adaptations. A scoring tool is also proposed that can distinguish between creating shared value initiatives and corporate social responsibility.

Literature Review

Some view corporate social responsibility as a “fundamentally subversive doctrine” because the only social responsibility of business is to maximize return for its investors (Friedman, 1970). Others perceive the corporation as a social change agent; where double and triple bottom lines are delivered (Savitz, 2006). In a market-driven economy, however, consumers seem most concerned with price and taste rather than ethics or social outcomes (Doane, 2005). Though many have dedicated their publications to describing the position of the corporation within society, the corporate-social-contract remains very poorly defined (Beardsley, Bonini, Mendonca and Oppenheim, 2007). The following literature review will further describe the most recent blurring of the private and social sectors. It will describe social enterprise and corporate social responsibility and distinguish each from the recent developments of collective impact and creating shared value.

Social Enterprise and Corporate Social Responsibility

When Greg Dees asked Bill Drayton why we should care about social entrepreneurship, Bill Drayton responded, “The most powerful [thing] is a big pattern change idea … in the hands
of a really good entrepreneur” (2007). In the last few decades, organizations formally innovated private enterprise tactics to meet social sector objectives; this practice became known as social entrepreneurship or social enterprise (Light, 2006; Martin and Osberg, 2007). The innovation was naturally selected within a social sector that was “growing faster than the available funding” (Austin, Gutierrez, Ogliastri, and Reficco, 2007). Organizations that evolved private sector approaches to revenue generation and integrated them into mission-focused action survived at a greater rate (2007). Soon, it became widely accepted that nonprofits needed to earn income to truly succeed and become sustainable (Boschee and McClurg, 2003). 300 years of liberal economic theory on entrepreneurship by Jean Baptist Say, Joseph A. Schumpeter, Peter Drucker and Israel Kirzner seemed to jettison the private sector and collide with the social sector (Dees, 2001; Dees and Drayton, 2007; Martin and Osberg, 2007). A new environment of blended value propositions emerged.

While the social sector began to build financial stability using private sector tactics, the private sector was beginning to create and measure their social value, ascribing to a sense of corporate social responsibility. Non-profit subsidiaries of corporations and corporate foundations multiplied, hybrid corporations blossomed, and joint-ventures leveraged an exchange of expertise across sectors (Austin, Gutierrez, Ogliastri, and Reficco, 2007). However, the results were limited; most corporate social responsibility was “neither strategic nor operational, but cosmetic” and appealing to moral obligation, sustainability, license to operate or reputation (Porter and Kramer, 2006). In this frame, the private sector binds itself to the “tension between business and society rather than on their interdependence” (2006). Again, blended value propositions are struggling to emerge.
Within the emerging blended value propositions, interdependence between the private and social sectors becomes apparent. Emerson was the first to identify that a spectrum of social-investment opportunities challenged the ‘do well’ or ‘do good’ dichotomy (2003). Soon, think tanks like the Roberts Enterprise Development Fund created guides for determining the best purpose of a social purpose business (Gair, 2005). The Seedco Policy Center published a “handy guide” on how to determine if your enterprise would be better suited for non-profit or for-profit operation (Kleiman and Rosenbaum, 2007). By 2002, $955 billion of nonprofits’ funding was recorded as commercial revenue by the IRS (Kleiman and Rosenbaum, 2007). The private and social sectors are converging.

**Collective Impact Models**

Collective impact provides even more opportunity for blended value proposition employment. *Isolated impact* is operation “oriented toward finding and funding a solution embodied within a single organization, combined with the hope that the most effective organizations will grow or replicate to extend their impact more widely.” Isolated impact is the status quo. *Collective impact* proposes to reverse the status quo. Instead of multiple actors seeking multiple solutions and scaling the most effective, in a collective impact model, a shared social goal is catalyzed by a backbone agency in order to crystalize a group of interdependent actors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem through mutually reinforcing activities. (Kania and Kramer, 2011). These interdependent actors can include players within multiple sectors.

Arguably, collective impact has a simplistic view of the collaborative interdependency. Social sector agencies rely on passionate supporters who are tied to a mission. Often, they have a legal responsibility to stay true to their corporate mission (Carson, 2012). Meanwhile, private
sector actors are accountable to their shareholders. A lack of trust between formerly independent actors can necessitate such significant relationship-building that social sector agencies may neglect client-community engagement or revert to focusing on short-term measureable data (Schmitz, 2012). According to some skeptics, collective impact models rely on faith that a “secret knowledge that magically eludes” us will emerge (Carson, 2012).

Another analysis reframes collective impact in the terms of complex interdependence theory. Here, interdependent actors to a collective impact goal ascribe to five common conditions: a common agenda, shared measurement systems, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous communication, and a backbone support organization that encourages “fidelity by the various cross-sector players to both the common agenda and rules for interaction. . . . When properly put into motion, the process of collective impact generates emergent solutions toward the intended outcome under continually changing circumstance” (Kania & Kramer, 2013). In a complex interdependency, “faith’ is superseded by the difficult process of creating a common agenda and aligning action. And the “secret knowledge” is the inevitable emergence of solutions that result from the creation of a collective knowledge-base of multiple actors as applied to the shared goal.

The United Way of Anchorage acts as such a backbone agency for a community assessment of social outcomes in education, income and health (United Way of Anchorage, 2012). It orients multiple actors to common agendas by measuring and communicating changes in the social outcomes. By doing so, United Way of Anchorage and its partners practice a form of collective impact. The following will explore how social outcomes in a collective impact model might be improved by creating shared value.
Creating Shared Value

Creation and measurement of a total or blended value proposition may reconcile the “pretend” separation of economic and social value and allow use of “financial resources to expand and sustain the core value of organization, community, and individual” (Emerson, 2003). Porter and Kramer proposed that a “mutual dependence of corporations and society” exists such that “both business decisions and social policies must follow the principle of shared value. That is, choices must benefit both sides” (Porter and Kramer, 2006). In Creating Shared Value, the seminal work on point by Porter and Kramer (2011), the authors propose three key ways that companies can create shared value: by reconceiving products and markets, by redefining productivity in the value chain and by enabling local cluster development. “Each of these is part of a virtuous circle of shared value; improving value in one area gives rise to opportunities in the others” (2011). The key ways that a company can create shared value are further described below.

Reconceiving products and markets “focuses on revenue growth, market share, and profitability that arise from the environmental, social or economic development benefits delivered by a company’s products and services” (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). “Avenues for innovation open up, and shared value is created” because companies are developing new products to meet untapped demand or developing new markets to meet existing supply (Porter and Kramer, 2011). For example, General Electric developed new medical products while serving the healthcare needs of developing economies (FSG, 2012). In doing so, the company enhanced their value proposition by creating a new markets for people who seek more service while also creating new products to meet demand elsewhere. Porter and Kramer point out that shared value can increase if both products and markets are reconceived
simultaneously (Porter and Kramer, 2011). Because social sector agencies are positioned squarely within the “environmental, social or economic development” (Porter and Kramer, 2011) world, they are, hypothetically, well positioned to identify latent opportunity and align with the private sector to create shared value.

Redefining productivity in the value chain “focuses on improvements in the internal operations that improve cost, input, access, quality and productivity. . . .” (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). To increase productivity, a company can focus on: energy use and logistics, resource use, procurement policies, distribution, employee productivity, and location (Porter & Kramer, 2011). For example, International Hotels Group created a simple online tool to help their hotels monitor and control energy costs (FSG, 2012). In doing so, the company enhanced their value proposition by improving cost and reducing the consumption of finite energy. “Opportunities to create shared value arise because societal problems can create economic costs in the firm’s value chain. Many so-called externalities actually inflict internal costs. . . .” (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Again, social sector agencies are well positioned to identify and measure the so-called, “externalities.” Therefore they are, hypothetically, well positioned identify latent opportunity and align with the private sector to create shared value.

Enabling local cluster development “derives from improving the external environment for the company through community investments and strengthening local suppliers, local institutions, and local infrastructure in ways that also enhance business productivity” (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). “Clusters include not only businesses . . . [t]hey also draw on broader public assets in the surrounding community such as schools and universities, clean water, fair-competition laws, quality standards and market transparency” (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Businesses create shared value by developing clusters that improve
company productivity while addressing gaps or failures in the framework conditions surrounding the cluster (Porter & Kramer, 2011). For example, Nestlé “has given resource-strapped farmers in developing economies financial and technical assistance to create a better supplier network” (FSG, 2012). Yet again, social sector agencies are positioned squarely within the word of “community investments in local suppliers, institutions, and infrastructure” (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). It is their perspective, position and mission of the social sector that supports the hypothesis that they are also well positioned to identify latent opportunity and align with the private sector to create shared value.

**Aligning Creating Shared Value in a Collective Impact Model**

The emergent value opportunities highlighted by the keys to creating shared value can be promoted, measured and analyzed by a backbone organization in a collective impact model. Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins proposed that the shared value measurement process is the following integration of strategy and measurement (2011). First, *identify the social issues to target* that “will increase revenues or reduce costs” through “a systematic screening of unmet social needs and gaps … that overlap with business across the three levels of shared value.” Second, *make a business case* (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). Identify of “how social improvement will directly improve business performance [. . . by] identifying the targets and specifying the activities and costs involved for each shared value opportunity” (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). Third, *track progress* using the business case to assess “inputs and business activities, outputs, and financial performance (revenues and costs) relative to projections” (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). Fourth, *measure results and use insights to unlock new value* to validate “the anticipated link between social and business results and determine whether the outlay of . . . resources . . .
produced a good joint return” (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). These steps will later be revisited in the operationalizing of creating shared value.

In order for the resources committed to measuring shared value to yield a positive return, the following six pragmatic suggestions are also offered.

Identify and measure the few high-priority social results that the shared value strategy seeks to address. . . . Determine social outcomes early in the product development process and select measurable outcomes. . . . Measure short-term and intermediate social outcomes [in order to compensate for competing time horizons for business and social results]. . . . Use proxy indicators to track business results. . . . Focus measurement of social results on contribution, not attribution. . . . Aggregate results selectively and only for the same social outcomes (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). These suggestions will guide the operationalization of the creating shared value assessment tool.

Porter and Kramer suggest that corporations seek innovation and value within the opportunity presented in social outcomes (2011). “Shared value measurement does not rely on correlation or estimated monetary value of environmental and social outcomes. Instead, the aim is to establish a direct linkage between social outcomes and actual financial results” (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). In this new light, Friedman’s version of corporate social responsibility as “fundamentally subversive” (1970) is vastly diminished because the corporation remains true to its purpose, to increase business value for shareholders.

However, Porter and Kramer miss the opportunity inherent in the perspective of the social sector. Organizations like the United Way of Anchorage, focus solely on social opportunity improvement. The next evolution of blended value will occur when the social sector harnesses the power of the private sector to create shared value that aligns with their mission in a collective impact initiative.
Operationalizing Creating Shared Value

Social sector agencies are well positioned to identify opportunity for creating shared value by reconceiving products and markets, by redefining productivity in the value chain and by enabling local cluster development. Therefore, the following operationalizes the theory of creating shared value in order to provide an assessment tool that will discriminate between a creating shared value initiative and corporate social responsibility.

For a template, the Nestlé Prize in Creating Shared Value provides a basis for application of United Way’s priorities to Porter and Kramer’s concepts. Not unlike a social sector mission, Nestlé seeks to support social opportunities in “enterprise in the are of nutrition, water or rural development” (Nestlé 2013). This application is redefined for the social outcomes sought by the United Way of Anchorage’s Community Assessment Project. There, the Community Goals are:

Education: Anchorage children enter school ready to succeed. Anchorage youth graduate and reject violence and substance use.
Income: Anchorage residents are financially stable. Anchorage residents are housed.
Health: Anchorage residents have access to quality health care. Anchorage residents practice healthy behaviors.

(2013). Each of these goals has specific measures. For example, within “Anchorage youth graduate and reject violence and substance abuse,” the measures are:

% high school students who feel like they matter to people in the community;
% high school students who have 3 or more nonparent adults that feel comfortable seeking help from;
% high school students who participate in organized activities outside of school;
% adults who act as mentors to youth;
% adults willing to actively support youth not in their family

(2013). Until each of these measures reaches 100%, they represent a social opportunity for creating shared value. Therefore, measures are proposed as a shared value opportunity to the private sector in the Creating Shared Value Application (Appendix A).
To operationalize the creating shared value concepts, this revised application relies on the integration of strategy and measurement, as proposed by Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins (2011). First, they suggest to identify the social issues to target that “will increase revenues or reduce costs” through “a systematic screening of unmet social needs and gaps … that overlap with business across the three levels of shared value” (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). The first section, Project Description, in the Creating Shared Value Application (Appendix A and Table 1) accomplishes this first step.

1. Project Description – Descriptive, No Points

1.1 Problem definition: Describe how your project will address a community goal. (max. 500 characters, incl. spaces)

1.2 Project description and objectives: Describe how your project is addressing the community goal stated above and detail the specific objectives of the project that relate to the data corresponding to the indicator(s) selected, for example:
   - # high school students who feel like they matter to people in the community
   - # high school students who have 3 or more nonparent adults that feel comfortable seeking help from
   - # high school students who participate in organized activities outside of school
   - # adults who act as mentors to youth
   - # adults willing to actively support youth not in their family

1.3 Project implementation: Describe how your business will increase revenue or reduce costs by addressing the community goal selected. (max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)

(Table 1).

Applicants are asked to define their social value in the pre-defined social opportunity and outcomes proposed by United Way of Anchorage.

This section also addresses two challenges proposed by Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins (2011). First, it limits the challenge of addressing broad or ill-defined social issues and helps companies prioritize their social outcome(s). Second, it determines the social outcome
and measures early in the product development process (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). No points are assigned to this orienting and descriptive section. Points are assigned to business value creation and social value creation in later sections.

The second step is to make a business case. Identify “how social improvement will directly improve business performance [. . . by] identifying the targets and specifying the activities and costs involved for each shared value opportunity” (Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). The second section, Creating Value, in the Creating Shared Value Application (Appendix A and Table 2) accomplishes this second step.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. CREATING VALUE – 9 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(PLEASE COMPLETE AT LEAST ONE SUBSECTION AND RELATE IT TO SECTION 1.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Reconceiving Products or Markets: Describe revenue growth, market share, and/or profitability that arise from the environmental, social or economic development benefits delivered by a company’s products and services. (max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)

2.2 Redefining productivity in the value chain: Describe improvements in the internal operations that improve cost, input, access, quality and productivity; such as energy use and logistics, resource use, procurement policies, distribution, employee productivity, and location. (max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)

2.3 Enabling Local Cluster Development: Describe improvements in the external business environment in ways that also enhance business productivity; community investments in local suppliers, local institutions, and local business infrastructure may include schools and universities, fair-competition laws, quality standards, market transparency and/or others. Use proxy measures, if necessary. (max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)

2.3 Other: (max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)

(Table 2).

This section also asks the applicant to identify how they are creating shared value, by reconceiving products and markets, by redefining productivity in the value chain and/or by enabling local cluster development, as defined by Porter and Kramer (2011).
Successful responses in this second section will clearly define a business value pursued by the applicant. Better responses will be well aligned with improvements in business as described in the corresponding section. The superior responses will be accompanied by better responses in either of the other two sections. This coupling of scores will reward the “virtuous circle of shared value” and encourage “improving value in one area [in order to] give[] rise to opportunities in the others” (Porter and Kramer, 2011). These suggestions will guide the one, two and three-point scores, respectively, in the Creating Shared Value Assessment (Appendix B).

The third step is to track progress using the business case to assess “inputs and business activities, outputs, and financial performance (revenues and costs) relative to projections” (Porter, Hills, Pfizter, Patscheke and Hawkins, 2011). The third section, Project Budget, in the Creating Shared Value Application (Appendix A, Table 3) accomplishes this third step.

### 3. BASIC PROJECT BUDGET – 3 POINTS

3.1 **Track Progress:** Describe the basic inputs and business activities, outputs, and financial performance (revenues and costs) relative to projections described in Section 2, Creating Business Value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses:</th>
<th>List estimated expenses for the project, for example:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Personnel (incl. cost of wages, salaries, etc. associated with the project):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Materials and equipment (needed to carry out activities):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Training and Workshop (if any):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Travel (required by personnel in the implementation of the project):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project monitoring and evaluation activities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- General administration (e.g. office rent, utilities, etc.):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Any other expenses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total expenses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue:</th>
<th>List revenue or proxy measures of revenue projected for this project, for example:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Income generated:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Costs improved:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total income:**
Specifically, this section asks the applicant to monetize the business value described in the previous section. Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins caution that business value can have a “time horizon” that is different from social value. They suggest using intermediate short-term measures for social outcomes (2011). Therefore the third and fourth sections of the application also asks the applicant to measure the social outcomes independently from the business value in this application and to use proxy measures when necessary.

Successful responses in this third section will clearly show business investment by the applicant. Proxy measures may be used to establish business outcomes. The best responses will project a positive financial return from the activity. These suggestions will guide the two and three-point scores, respectively, in the Creating Shared Value Assessment (Appendix B).

The fourth step is to measure results and use insights to unlock new value. Porter, Hills, Pfitzer, Patscheke and Hawkins suggest we validate “the anticipated link between social and business results and determine whether the outlay of . . . resources . . . produced a good joint return” (2011). The fourth section, Project Impact, in the Creating Shared Value Application (Appendix A, Table 4) accomplishes this fourth step.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. PROJECT IMPACT – 9 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1 Tangible results to date:</strong> Please describe what results the project will demonstrate over the long-run using the project description and objectives described in section 1.2., including approximate number of beneficiaries and direct impact on improving outcomes for beneficiaries. Provide clear, measurable data. (max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1 Intermediate results:</strong> Please describe what results the project will (has) demonstrate(d) over the short-term using the project description and objectives described in section 1.2., including to approximate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
number of beneficiaries and direct impact on improving outcomes for beneficiaries. Provide clear, measurable data and use proxy measures when necessary. *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*

4.2 **Measurability:** Describe the specific method(s) and indicators that you are using to measure project success and implementation. *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*

(Table 4).

It asks the applicant to describe the tangible results anticipated through the measures outlined in section 1.2 **Project Description and Objective.**

Successful responses will clearly identify a social value pursued by the applicant. Better responses will also define the business value pursued by the applicant. The best responses will be well aligned with the collective impact outcomes proposed by the backbone agency. These suggestions will guide the one, two and three-point scores, respectively, in the Creating Shared Value Assessment (Appendix B).

The last few sections, sections five – seven, are vestigial from the Nestlé Prize in Creating Shared Value. They exist to provide some additional context and consideration for evaluators and applicants. They are not scored.

**Findings**

If the social sector can help the private sector reconceive products and markets, redefine productivity in the value chain and enable local cluster development, it would help create shared value for the private sector. And, if the social sector aligned shared value opportunities toward a common agenda, it could enhance collective impact and improve social outcomes for those select areas. Therefore, creating shared value opportunity for enhanced collective impact may improve social outcomes. Having operationalized the theories above and in the attachments, an entrepreneurial social agency might enhance collective impact by proactively creating shared
value. The assessment tool, created herein, is intended to distinguish creating shared value initiatives.

Conclusion

This hypothesis also proposes an expansion of the backbone role in a collective impact model. Formerly the role of a backbone agency was to drive the interdependent partners while measuring and reporting the outcomes. Now, the backbone role also includes the identification and marketing of shared value opportunities that may help improve collective impact measures. Should the United Way of Anchorage pursue shared value creation, additional work will be necessary to proactively market the creating shared value proposition. A pilot application of this process would probably require a business liaison who is fluent with the concepts of creating shared value as well as United Way of Anchorage’s community assessment measures and collective impact model.

Though it may be easiest to apply the concepts and measure the results to known programs, new value will only be created when new ventures emerge. These concepts are new. This is the biggest limitation to the testing of the hypothesis and application of the combined theories of creating shared value for collective impact. There are no known creating shared value initiatives that meet United Way of Anchorage’s social outcome measures at this time. Emergent knowledge gathered by the backbone agency, from the interdependent partners may identify and promote participation in creating shared value for enhanced collective impact.
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Appendix A: United Way of Anchorage Creating Shared Value Application

Creating Shared Value; A Primer for Business Partnership

Executive Summary

Creating shared value is the linking of social and financial outcomes. By aligning input from multiple sectors, selected partners can help United Way of Anchorage enhance the collective impact of multiple sectors towards the shared goals as described in the 2012 Community Assessment Survey. Meanwhile these selected partners will also meet their business objectives.

Application Process

Applications must be submitted to Anchorage United for Youth by completing this form.

The form may be submitted via e-mail to ________________.

Applications will be reviewed as they are received. Receipt of the form will be confirmed by e-mail.

For further question please contact ________________.

Before completing this Nomination Form, please read the following articles:

Application Form

Social Outcome: *EDUCATION*

Goal: *Anchorage youth graduate and reject violence and substance use*

Indicator: *Youth Connection to School and Community*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOUR CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project contact last name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contact first name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contact email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position within organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization type / sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization description</td>
<td>(max. 700 characters, incl. spaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How did you learn about this application for Creating Shared Value?  
(e.g. Anchorage United for Youth, press article, search engine, social media, word of mouth, other)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title of project proposal:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Goal(s):</strong> Education, Health, or Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal(s):</strong> (See 2012 Community Assessment Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator(s):</strong> (See 2012 Community Assessment Project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION – DESCRIPTIVE, NO POINTS**

3.1 **Problem definition:** Describe how your project will address a community goal. *(max. 500 characters, incl. spaces)*

1.2 **Project description and objectives:** Describe how your project is addressing the community goal stated above and detail the specific objectives of the project that relate to the data corresponding to the indicator(s) selected, for example:
   - # high school students who feel like they matter to people in the community
   - # high school students who have 3 or more nonparent adults that feel comfortable seeking help from
   - # high school students who participate in organized activities outside of school
   - # adults who act as mentors to youth
   - # adults willing to actively support youth not in their family

1.3 **Project implementation:** Describe how your business will increase revenue or reduce costs by addressing the community goal selected. *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*

4. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION – DESCRIPTIVE, NO POINTS**

4.1 **Problem definition:** Describe how your project will address a community goal. *(max. 500 characters, incl. spaces)*

1.2 **Project description and objectives:** Describe how your project is addressing the community goal stated above and detail the specific objectives of the project that relate to the data corresponding to the
indicator(s) selected, for example:
# high school students who feel like they matter to people in the community
# high school students who have 3 or more nonparent adults that feel comfortable seeking help from
# high school students who participate in organized activities outside of school
# adults who act as mentors to youth
# adults willing to actively support youth not in their family

1.3 Project implementation: Describe how your business will increase revenue or reduce costs by addressing the community goal selected. (max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)

5. Creating Value – 9 Points
(Please complete at least one subsection and relate it to Section 1.2)

2.1 Reconceiving Products or Markets: Describe revenue growth, market share, and/or profitability that arise from the environmental, social or economic development benefits delivered by a company’s products and services. (max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)

2.2 Redefining productivity in the value chain: Describe improvements in the internal operations that improve cost, input, access, quality and productivity; such as energy use and logistics, resource use, procurement policies, distribution, employee productivity, and location. (max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)

2.3 Enabling Local Cluster Development: Describe improvements in the external business environment in ways that also enhance business productivity; community investments in local suppliers, local institutions, and local business infrastructure may include schools and universities, fair-competition laws, quality standards, market transparency and/or others. Use proxy measures, if necessary. (max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)

2.3 Other: (max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)

3. Basic Project Budget – 3 Points

3.1 Track Progress: Describe the basic inputs and business activities, outputs, and financial performance (revenues and costs) relative to projections described in Section 2. Creating Business Value.

Expenses: List estimated expenses for the project, for example:
### Personnel (incl. cost of wages, salaries, etc. associated with the project):

### Materials and equipment (needed to carry out activities):

### Training and Workshop (if any):

### Travel (required by personnel in the implementation of the project):

### Project monitoring and evaluation activities:

### General administration (e.g. office rent, utilities, etc.):

### Any other expenses:

Total expenses:

**Revenue:** List revenue or proxy measures of revenue projected for this project, for example:

- Income generated:
- Costs improved:

Total income:

**Financial Summary** (Total income – Total expenses):

3.3 Further comments about the estimated budget (if necessary) *(max. 500 characters, incl. spaces)*

---

### 5. Project Impact – 9 Points

#### 4.1 Tangible results to date:
Please describe what results the project will demonstrate over the long-run using the project description and objectives described in section 1.2., including approximate number of beneficiaries and direct impact on improving outcomes for beneficiaries. Provide clear, measurable data. *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*

#### 4.1 Intermediate results:
Please describe what results the project will (has) demonstrate(d) over the short-term using the project description and objectives described in section 1.2., including to approximate number of beneficiaries and direct impact on improving outcomes for beneficiaries. Provide clear, measurable data and use proxy measures when necessary. *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*

#### 4.2 Measurability:
Describe the specific method(s) and indicators that you are using to measure project success and implementation. *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*

---

### 6. Scaling Up – Optional

#### 5.1 Growth potential:
Describe the project's potential for growth. Is the project feasible on a broader scale or can it be replicated in other social, cultural or geographical settings? *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*
5.2 Development plan: Explain how you plan to expand the project (e.g. through scaling it up to an increased number of beneficiaries or by replicating it to other social, cultural or geographical settings). Provide an overview of the mid-term and long-term development plan of the project. *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*

5.3 Expected impact: Describe the tangible expected results of the project in the area or region of growth, including its expected direct impact on improving outcomes for its beneficiaries. *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. <strong>LONG-TERM VIABILITY – OPTIONAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Financial viability: Describe the characteristics of your project that will ensure its long-term financial viability (i.e. how the project will continue to grow and expand beyond the phase of the CSV application). You may provide a business plan as an annex. <em>(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Organisational capacity and leadership: Provide information about the organisation or individual's track record or experience in the field of the project. This may include information about the project’s leader(s), their background, and the history of their involvement. <em>(max. 1000 characters, incl. spaces)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Challenges to long-term viability: Indicate potential challenges to long-term viability (both financial and organisational) and how you will overcome them. <em>(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. <strong>ENDORSEMENT - OPTIONAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Awards, funding, and other recognition: Where relevant, provide information about significant awards, funding or recognition received by your organisation or its leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Third party endorsement: You are encouraged to provide letters or other communications from individuals or organisations familiar with the project who can attest to its value, viability, current or future impact as well as personal recommendations regarding the leadership of the project. These may be sent separately to ______________________.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A: Creating Shared Value Assessment

### 1. Project Description – Descriptive, No Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Problem definition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No points assigned to this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Project description and objectives: Describe how your project is addressing the community goal stated above and detail the specific objectives of the project that relate to the data corresponding to the indicator(s) selected:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If social value is not created, this project is not creating shared value. Stop the assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Project implementation: Describe how your business will increase revenue or reduce costs by addressing the community goal selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If business value is not created, this project is not creating shared value. Stop the assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Creating Value – 9 Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Reconceiving Products or Markets: Describe revenue growth, market share, and/or profitability that arise from the environmental, social or economic development benefits delivered by a company’s products and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-point response: a business value is identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-point response: plus improvement in business products or markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-point response: plus a 2-point response in sections 2.2 or 2.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Redefining productivity in the value chain: Describe improvements in the internal operations that improve cost, input, access, quality and productivity; such as energy use and logistics, resource use, procurement policies, distribution, employee productivity, and location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-point response: a business value is identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-point response: plus improvement in business products or markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-point response: plus a 2-point response in sections 2.1 or 2.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Enabling Local Cluster Development: Describe improvements in the external business environment in ways that also enhance business productivity; community investments in local suppliers, local institutions, and local business infrastructure may include schools and universities, fair-competition laws, quality standards, market transparency and/or others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-point response: a business value is identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-point response: plus improvement in business products or markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-point response: plus a 2-point response in sections 2.1 or 2.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Basic Project Budget – 3 Points

**3.1 Track Progress:** Describe the basic inputs and business activities, outputs, and financial performance (revenues and costs) relative to projections described in Section 2. Creating Business Value.

1-point response: revenue is clearly identified (with proxy measures, as necessary.)
2-point response: plus applicant investment in the project is clearly identified.
3-point response: plus a positive financial outcome is projected.

#### 3.4 Further comments about the estimated budget (if necessary) *(max. 500 characters, incl. spaces)*

Comments evaluated in the assessment of section 3.1.

### 4. Project Impact – 9 Points

**4.1 Tangible results to date:** Please describe what results the project will demonstrate over the long-run using the project description and objectives described in section 1.2., including approximate number of beneficiaries and direct impact on improving outcomes for beneficiaries. Provide clear, measurable data. *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*

1-point response: social value is clearly identified (with proxy measures, as necessary.)
2-point response: plus business value is clearly identified.
3-point response: plus social value measures are aligned with the backbone agency’s collective impact.

#### 4.1 Intermediate results:

Please describe what results the project will (has) demonstrate(d) over the short-term using the project description and objectives described in section 1.2., including to approximate number of beneficiaries and direct impact on improving outcomes for beneficiaries. Provide clear, measurable data and use proxy measures when necessary. *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*

1-point response: social value is clearly identified (with proxy measures, as necessary.)
2-point response: plus business value is clearly identified.
3-point response: plus social measures are aligned with the backbone agency’s collective impact.

#### 4.2 Measurability:

Describe the specific method(s) and indicators that you are using to measure project success and implementation. *(max. 1500 characters, incl. spaces)*

1-point response: social value is clearly identified (with proxy measures, as necessary.)
2-point response: plus business value is clearly identified.
3-point response: plus social measures are aligned with the backbone agency’s collective impact.

### 5. Scaling Up – Optional

**5.1 Growth potential.**

No points assigned to this section.

**5.2 Development plan:**
No points assigned to this section.

5.3 Expected impact:
No points assigned to this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. LONG-TERM VIABILITY – OPTIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Financial viability:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No points assigned to this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Organisational capacity and leadership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No points assigned to this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Challenges to long-term viability:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No points assigned to this section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. ENDORSEMENT - OPTIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Awards, funding, and other recognition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No points assigned to this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Third party endorsement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No points assigned to this section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>