

Case Studies in Corporate Social Good Evaluation & Learning

GETTING PRACTICAL

Until recently, social impact measurement and evaluation were typically associated with the nonprofit and private philanthropy sectors, with little incentive for corporate entities to assess the quality and impact of their social contributions. But as Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has evolved into a more strategic and professionalized function central to helping businesses advance their missions (and be responsive to several rating agencies), these practices are needed to ensure credibility and value. However, the historic philanthropic approach to evaluation cannot just be transplanted into the corporate sector.

In 2024, TCC Group and Raya Cooper Impact Consulting administered a benchmarking survey on behalf of the [Corporate Measurement & Evaluation Community of Practice \(CoP\)](#), which sought to understand the current state of Impact Measurement and Evaluation across the corporate landscape. Findings from this study are presented in the 2025-released report, [“Understanding the Emerging Field of Evaluation in Corporate Social Good.”](#) The team then interviewed the philanthropic arms of three companies (CoP members BHP Foundation, Maple Leaf Centre for Food Security, and Humana Foundation) to develop a series of case studies that illustrate how they gather social impact data in ways tailored to private-sector needs and contexts. The case studies are not intended to be read as “best practices”, but as examples of how companies have developed thoughtful and responsive approaches to evaluation while still evolving and growing their work.

As we compiled the case studies, four main themes emerged that bring evaluation to life, revealing how organizations are sharing impact data, making strategic decisions, and spreading their learnings.

1

While there is no one “right way” to do evaluation, intentionality is central to good practice.

Evaluation is used as a robust toolkit to support the effective implementation of social impact work, and the case studies show us that there is no one-size-fits-all way to do corporate evaluation. Although the specifics of the companies’ practices differ, **all three companies demonstrate intentionality in the design and execution of evaluation.** Each engaged in an upfront planning process that guided them in deliberate decision-making about where and how to be rigorous. While each has a theory of change or impact measurement framework, unique stakeholder needs and priorities shape how these tools are used in their company. For example, the analytics team might be able to provide unique data otherwise not available; the product team might see interesting cross-over support they could provide; the accounting and finance teams might have interesting ways to think about analysis; and the communications team is a critical partner in disseminating findings.

Our own experiences have demonstrated that within corporate philanthropies, having deliberate conversations that include corporate voices beyond the social impact team can be highly effective.

2

Incorporating grantee perspectives across the evaluation process builds trust and ensures that the philanthropic approach is relevant and meaningful.

All three companies **view grantees not as data sources, but as active partners in their evaluation process.** From co-development of a theory of change and measures (Maple Leaf Centre for Food Security and BHP Foundation), to bringing in grantees as participants in learning and sense-making (Humana Foundation). Specifically designated evaluation capacity building (dollars or technical assistance) also helps grantees deliver higher quality data, increases relevance by ensuring evaluation activities meet grantees’ own learning needs, and sets the stage for more strategic conversations with corporate partners.

A practice that we’ve seen be highly valuable both within corporate and private philanthropy is providing financial and other deliberate supports to develop grantee capacity for Measurement & Evaluation.

3

Facilitating a learning mindset supports adaptive strategies and meets stakeholder needs.

Whether through learning huddles (BHP Foundation), learning agendas (Maple Leaf Centre for Food Security), or a regular cadence of reflection and analysis (Humana Foundation), **each company has developed and implemented an intentional learning cycle**. For some companies, this means emphasizing internal alignments and management of social impact, while others center community-level insights that support both the philanthropy and the business needs. The regularity of these exercises supports interconnectivity with business partners, strengthens the learning muscle, and builds the internal value proposition of measurement & evaluation activities.

Creating annual learning cadences through which business teams and social impact teams come together to understand relevant data and insights (i.e., grantee data, population-level, business data) and strategize together helps create an environment of continual learning and strategic decision-making.

4

There are no solo-actors in the world of social impact and the practice of evaluation helps to place CSR in its system and context.

Social impact work is never done alone – there is always a dynamic ecosystem of actors and influences. **Each company takes individualized steps to understand their role, place, and interaction within the broader landscape**. Whether it's through developing an "Accountability Line" in their theory of change (BHP Foundation), conducting an annual Landscape Analysis (Humana Foundation), or sharing learning questions with the field (Maple Leaf Centre for Food Security), they operate with an awareness of the overall environment, community conditions, and system factors working with and against their goals. The case studies show examples of Humana Foundation aligning with [community health plans](#), Maple Leaf Centre for Food Security aligning with the [Government of Canada's food security work](#), and BHP Foundation aligning with the [United Nations Sustainable Development Goals](#).

An effective way of using evaluation is to tie social impact work both to the company's strategy/mission and to a framework that is external to the company but important to the issue or community.

About the Corporate Measurement & Evaluation Community of Practice

The CoP is a free, open, and welcoming community for those who have responsibility for social impact measurement within businesses, including corporate foundations, as a part of their social benefit efforts. The CoP meets virtually every quarter to share common experiences and concerns, learn from industry professionals and improve our individual and collective effectiveness. If you or someone in your company would like to learn more about membership, please visit the [CoP website](https://www.tccgrp.com/our-work/our-experience/corporate-measurement-evaluation-me-community-of-practice/) (https://www.tccgrp.com/our-work/our-experience/corporate-measurement-evaluation-me-community-of-practice/).

Whether you are new to Corporate Evaluation, or a long-time practitioner, we invite you to read through each case study to see how each company brings these principles to life with practical examples. We thank these corporate evaluation practitioners for sharing their valuable learnings, tools, and experiences with us!

Humana Foundation

BHP | Foundation



NEWYORK

333 7th Avenue
9th Floor
New York, NY 10001
P: 212.949.0990

PHILADELPHIA

123 South Broad Street
Suite 1800
Philadelphia, PA 19109
P: 215.568.0399

www.tccgrp.com

info@tccgrp.com

facebook.com/tccgrp

linkedin.com/company/tcc-group

www.rayacooperconsulting.com

[Explore the complete Case Study series here www.tccgrp.com/resource/csr-case-studies/](https://www.tccgrp.com/resource/csr-case-studies/)