Abstract

Many business men and women would like to balance profit with “giving something back to society” through CSR initiatives. To ensure the promotion of sustainable people development, certain requisite elements ought to be present: first, active participation of the target beneficiaries, as an intrinsic part of the implementation process; second, education that promotes integral formation and person-community link. The sustainability of people development is anchored on those two elements because they would ensure that, apart from the project/program outcomes, there are also people outcomes, that is, self-reliance, concern for others and whole person orientation.

The ideas that underpin the elements in the framework are drawn from a philosophical anthropology, social ethics and philosophy of education, as well as a definition of human development in the 1990 Human Development Report.

Introduction

It would not be presumptuous to affirm that the promotion of sustainable human development,- particularly the improvement of the lot of those deprived of the most basic human needs that are necessary to live in accord with the dignity of every person-, is a common aspiration of all people of good will. Among those people are business men and women who embrace the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) or Corporate Citizenship in the conduct of their business. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), defines Corporate Social Responsibility as follows,

[It] is a [strategic business] management concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and interactions with their stakeholders. CSR is generally understood as being the way through which a company achieves a balance of economic, environmental and social imperatives (“Triple-Bottom-Line- Approach”), while at the same time addressing the expectations of shareholders and stakeholders.”

Those who are advocates of CSR are convinced that it makes a lot of business sense to actively promote initiatives that contribute to the common good; thus, balancing profit with “business giving back to society,” which is how most Filipinos view CSR. In general, CSR “priorities include human rights, employee rights, environmental protection, community involvement and supplier relations.”

---

3 Holme and Watts, Corporate Social Responsibility, 10.
But while the aspiration to make a positive difference in the long-term well-being of society is shared by many people, including those who have the most varied ideological persuasions, it could not be said that the specific programs that are adopted truly promote the authentic human development of those people whose interests the CSR initiatives are supposed to serve. According to Paul VI, for human development “to be authentic it must be integral, it must develop each man and the whole man,”\(^4\) which could only be so if development is founded on the respect for human dignity and the recognition of every person’s transcendent end. In this regard, it is important that those working to advance the cause of authentic human development be cognizant of its basic requirements, which constitute the elements of the basic framework for sustainable people development.

This paper has four parts. First, it presents the fundamental ideas drawn from the three philosophical foundations- a philosophical anthropology, social ethics and philosophy of education- that underpin the elements of the framework. Second, in the light of the ideas in part I, it will examine the concept of human development adopted by the United Nations in its first Human Development Report (HDRs), as presented by Sabina Alkire.\(^5\) Third, it will present the elements of the framework, which encapsulates the ideas in the two previous parts. The framework can be used as a guide for either developing or evaluating any initiative that addresses a problem in any sphere, that is, economic, cultural, social and political. The last part illustrates the use of the framework to evaluate a human development project.

The Philosophical Foundations

A Philosophical Anthropology. At the core of the understanding how best to promote authentic human development is an anthropological question. This echoes the affirmation in Caritas in veritate that “the social question has become radically anthropological question.”\(^6\) In this regard, we can consider ideas from a personalist philosophical anthropology, which is coherent with the teachings found in the Catechism of the Catholic Church. Among its basic tenets is the principle that to promote authentic human development, we must always keep in mind the inherent dignity of the human person, which, ultimately, is based on revealed truths that every person is “made in the image and likeness of God” and called to communion with Him. This transcendent vocation should lead every person to be concerned necessarily about the welfare of others, as a tangible expression of the transformative and performative power of being in communion with God. This clearly suggests that authentic development has an inescapable moral dimension which, if ignored or placed at the margins, would not only frustrate the aspiration to authentic human development, but could even work against that very aspiration.

A corollary of the respect for the dignity of persons can be found in Pacem in terris: it “involves the right to take an active part in public affairs and to contribute one’s part to the common good of the citizens.”\(^7\) Aligned to the same idea, as Pacem in terris acknowledged, was affirmed by Pius XII in his 1944 Christmas message: “The human individual, [is] far from

---

\(^4\) Paul VI (1967), 14.


\(^6\) Benedict XVI (2009), 75. (Italics in the original text.)

\(^7\) John XXIII (1963), 26.
being an object and, as it were, a merely passive element in the social order.” 8 The latter is related to another truth about the person: it is endowed with freedom. Thus, in society, it [the person] must continue to be its subject, its foundation and its end.” 9 The idea of freedom is still related to dignity of the person from the philosophical standpoint: the person has dignity because it has the capacity for self-determination. This is also affirmed by Clarke, who asserts that the idea of freedom is another root of human dignity in that “the person is image of God in the moral life…by freely exercising providence over his own life”. 10 This same idea is affirmed in the Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church. It sustains “the vision of man as a person, that is to say, as an active and responsible subject of his own growth process, together with the community to which he belongs.” 11

But freedom has to be understood well because, in the name of freedom, the human being is capable of causing his or her own moral self-destruction. Human freedom is a destined freedom in the sense that it is a gift given to human beings for a specific purpose: for each person to freely direct himself or herself to attain the ultimate purpose of human life, which is communion with God. Aristotle refers to that purpose as eudaimonia or human flourishing, which, according to him, is possible only with living a virtuous life. This implies that the exercise of human freedom that does not lead the person towards the attainment of human flourishing contravenes the very essence of freedom.

Another point to consider is the person is essentially a relational being. In other words, the person is social by nature. This implies what is stated in Gaudium et spes, “unless he relates himself to others, he can neither live nor develop his potential.” 12 It further implies that authentic human development could only be attained as a fruit of a collective effort founded on a “communion of persons”. 13 But as the Compendium on the Social Doctrine pointed out “the social nature of human beings does not automatically lead to communion among persons…[because there are] seeds of asocial behavior, impulses leading him to close himself with his own individuality and to dominate his neighbor.” 14 Thus, it is necessary to deliberately forge a community of persons that leads each person to give self and “to establish among themselves relationships of solidarity, communication and cooperation, in the service of man and the common good.” 15 In relation to a CSR initiative, the beneficiaries must be made to realize that the fulfillment of the destiny of every person is linked to that of others. The foregoing ideas account for the use of the term “people development,” instead of “human development,” in the framework. The former, precisely, is meant to emphasize that socio-political, cultural or economic problems are best addressed by a deliberate effort to harness the internal resources of a community of persons, who are working together, to solve their own problems.

8 John XXIII (1963), 26.
http://www.catholicsocialscientists.org/CSSR/Archival/Volume%20IX/Kraynak%20symposium—Clarke.pdf. (Italics in the original text.)
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A Social Ethics. Social Ethics may be defined as the science of the integral fulfillment of persons in society. It implies that there is a normative way of living together so that each and every person, in all its dimensions, would attain his or her integral fulfillment as a member of a society, that is, whether it is a family or a political community. This reinforces an idea mentioned earlier: man needs others to fully develop his potentials. In other words, he cannot fully develop himself or herself in solitariness. Social ethics then is a practical science that not only prescribes how we ought to live together in society, but also provides the criteria for evaluating whether specific actions would contribute to the good of each and every person in that particular society. In this regard, apart from the need to respect the dignity of every person, there is a need to consider other values, among which is the need to live solidarity, especially with those who are disadvantaged. Likewise, each and every member of a community should assume the responsibility for the common good. According to the Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church: The common good is “the sum total of social conditions which allow people, either as groups or as individuals, to reach their fulfillment more fully and more easily.”

A Philosophy of Education. Philosophy of education as an academic field has classic themes, such as essence or nature of education, purpose of education and agents of education. For the purpose of developing the framework, the relevant theme would be the nature of education. An approach to understanding the nature of education is by considering the etymology of the word. Education comes from two Latin words: educare and edúcere. The meaning in English of those two terms are presented in following Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCARE</th>
<th>EDÚCERE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To nourish; to form; to bring up; to instruct</td>
<td>To bring out; to extract; to make progress; to elevate; to move forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Edúcere is related to dúcere, which mean “to lead” in the active voice and “to grow” in the passive voice.

If we look at the meanings of both educare and edúcere, we would be able to infer that education essentially involves two processes: one tending outwards, that is, “to bring out” and “to extract” (edúcere) and another tending inwards, that is, “to nourish” and “to instruct” (educare). This is relevant in the human development that CSR initiatives would want promote. Many times, there is a need for educare in order to provide the beneficiaries with knowledge, skills and attitudes. At other times, there is a need for edúcere, that is, education would have to draw out what the beneficiaries already know borne out of their experiences. But, perhaps, they are unaware of how they can capitalize on the wealth of their “indigenous” or “native” knowledge. Hence, education can make them aware of the wealth of their untapped capabilities and help them draw out that knowledge and contribute to building their sense of efficacy to solve their own problems.

Apart from the foregoing complementary aspects of educare and edúcere, other aspects of the nature of education can be drawn. First, whether educare (“to bring up”) or edúcere (“to make progress”; “to elevate”; and “to move forward”, education necessarily promotes the positive development of the beneficiaries of a CSR initiative. We can understand “positive

development” in terms of “authentic human development”, which as mentioned above is necessarily integral, that is, the development of every person in all his or her dimensions. It could also be understood as “human flourishing”, which highlights an ethical dimension in that it necessarily involves the acquisition of virtues. Second, the meaning of both educare and edúcere imply that education takes place in a social context, that is, in educare, someone instructs (the educator) and someone is instructed (the learner). Likewise in edúcere, someone elevates (the educator) and someone is elevated (the learner). Third, it could be further gleaned that the educator’s act of instructing, elevating, nourishing, bringing out, etc. presupposes an end in mind. Once again, that end could be understood in terms of “authentic human development” and “human flourishing”.

On the Concept of Human Development in the United Nations’ Human Development Reports (HDRs)

The concept of “human development”, as adopted in the United Nations Human Development Reports (HDR) was evolving from 1990, the first year it was published, to 2009. But, in general, it could be said that the very use of the term “human development” and the accompanying Human Development Index (HDI) marked a change towards a positive direction. It clearly indicated that the idea of development is no longer conceived narrowly, that is, in exclusively economic terms, which was the prevalent view in the past. Thus, as Alkire succinctly pointed out, a survey of the evolving definition of ‘human development’ actually “sheds the richness of the concept human development.”

Among all the definitions of “human development”, Alkire seems to favor the definition found in the first HDR (1990), which “provides the richest introduction of any of the reports.”

We can now highlight the ideas that are relevant to determining the elements of the framework that is presented here. It affirms that “people are the real wealth of a nation” and “the basic objective of development is to create an enabling environment for people to live long, healthy and creative lives…,[which] is often forgotten in the immediate concern with the accumulation of commodities and financial wealth.”

Besides, it recognizes that “the expansion of output and wealth is only a means. [Instead] the end of development must be human well-being.” It also describes “human development” as “a process of enlarging people’s choices.” The “key choices” include “to lead a long and healthy life, to be educated and to enjoy a decent standard of living. Additional choices include political freedom, guaranteed human rights and self-respect.” It also mentions that development is concerned not only about outcomes, but also of the process. Likewise, it makes “a distinction between formation of human capabilities that enable people to act, and how people actually act – responsibly or not- to advance their own well-being, to contribute to economic growth and also to pursue leisure activities.”
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We can now consider the relevance of the foregoing aspects of human development from an educator’s perspective of what ought to be the elements of a basic framework for promoting sustainable people development through a CSR initiative. The goal is to ensure that such CSR initiatives that are meant to address a problem in any sphere, -be it economic, social, cultural or political-, truly promote authentic human development, which could only be so, if the initiative is anchored on the fundamental ideas presented in previous section.

First, it is inherent in an educator to see the wealth embodied in every person, especially if that person is helped to develop all his or her potentials. Besides, as educators, we are not motivated to promote the development of each person for merely economic reasons, that is, to make the person economically productive. Rather, we view the person in the totality of all his potentials, which can only be developed through an education that is integral, that is to say, directed towards the development of the whole person, in all his or her dimensions. The idea that the “end of development is human well-being,” which is found in the UN HDR, seems to be aligned to the foregoing idea. Although, in itself, it is not sufficient, given that the ultimate purpose of human life is not merely “human well-being”, -even if the concept goes beyond what used to be reduced to economic well-being-, but, as mentioned earlier, communion with God.

Other features of “human development” in the UN HDR that we need to consider are the reference to “expanding choices”; the importance given to process, rather than just the outcomes, and, finally, the value given to the development of human capabilities. The first point, that is “expanding choices”, inevitably leads us to the idea of freedom. Of course, educators are interested in making every person more free, in the sense that, as educators, eventually, we want to be dispensable. We consider ourselves successful in our work, if the learners no longer need us and they could be on their own, doing what we have taught them through the exercise of their freedom. But such an affirmation must be understood from a particular ethical standpoint, that is, if the exercise of that freedom is to contribute to the true good of every person and even of society as a whole. That ethical tradition considers authentic freedom as the capacity to choose what is morally good. From that standpoint, it is not enough that human development expands choices, without any qualification. The latter is important given that the UN is known to advocate pseudo-human rights, such as the right to abortion or the right to same-sex marriage. Applying the idea to a CSR initiative, it would be a folly to support, for example, a project that funds abortion to address the poverty problem.

Second, for educators, the process of learning can be considered more important than the actual achievement of the outcomes because even failures may be regarded as a learning opportunity. Besides, it is in the process of learning when learners are able to develop virtues, which will build their moral character. This implies that it is possible to embed learning objectives within the process adopted to promote learning. An example of that idea is exemplified in cooperative learning. It is an instructional strategy that is ideal for developing pro-social skills and attitudes because each member of the group is made to feel responsible for the learning of the other members of the group. Thus, the setting favors the acquisition of collaborative skills and virtues, like concern for others, patience, and generosity. In the context of CSR initiatives, it would be ideal, for example, to adapt the principles of collaborative learning to favor the development of a community of persons. This eventually leads to the growth of social capital. According to the Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Catholic
Church, social capital is “the capacity of a collective group to work together”, which is so essential for the long-term ability of a community to attain sustainable development through the practice self-reliance in solving their own problems.

Finally, it is worthwhile to consider the capability approach, which draws from the writings of Amartya Sen. According to Alkire, it “provides the most visible philosophical foundation for the concept of human development.”

A most interesting idea, which is incorporated in the basic framework for people development, is its “focus on individual people… and yet relies on actions of groups, institutions and communities in addition to individuals to generate capabilities.”

As educators, we acknowledge that each learner is a person, whose inherent uniqueness must be taken into account. But at the same time, we believe that the maximum development of the individual is best achieved in a social context, which includes community settings where CSR initiatives may be implemented.

Furthermore, Alkire identified key features of the capability approach, which actually coincide with ideas mentioned in the section of philosophical foundations. Hence, they have a place in the basic framework for people development. Those key features include the following: “a focus on people as the ‘ends’ of development… [In other words, it is] people-centered; [it has] a substantive notion of freedom related to well-being (capabilities) and agency (empowerment); … a well-being objective that included multiple capabilities – that need not be unidimensional; … [and] a focus on supporting people as active agents, not passive victims, of development.”

It is easy to see how the approach is related to education in that, for educators, learning is necessarily directed towards building capabilities. In addition, as Alkire pointed out, Sen believed that, in the capability approach, “inequalities should be considered in the space of capabilities, rather in resources, utility and even functionings”. This implies that the focus on improving capabilities, which can be achieved through education, is the best way to address inequalities that might be present in either social, economic, political or cultural spheres. A further benefit is, by improving capabilities, the sense of efficacy of individuals and, consequently, of groups to solve their own problems is enhanced. Thus, self-reliance, which is a requirement for the sustainability of people development, is further nurtured.

Another important aspect in the capability approach is the “attention to process freedoms,” which are distinguished from what is referred to as opportunity freedoms. The latter are essentially linked to capabilities such that an increase in capabilities would also increase opportunities that are open to a person’s choice. Process freedom, on the other hand, considers the importance of participation as inherent to the very process of development, given that the latter is viewed essentially as “a participatory and dynamic process.” Hence, it highlights the need to give priority to harnessing the agency of the beneficiaries of a CSR initiative so that they always remain the protagonists in the process of addressing any problem in the socio-economic, political and culture sphere. The reason for this is clear: the greater the participation of the
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beneficiaries in the process of development, the more opportunities there are to build their capabilities to assume responsibility for sustaining the process of development.

The foregoing discussion leads us to acknowledge two kinds of outcomes when a CSR initiative is implemented to address any problem: project/program outcome and people outcomes. The desired project/program outcome depends on the problem that the project or program would like to address. For example, the program outcome of a feeding program could be the reduction or elimination of malnutrition. In the case of a disaster preparedness program, the program outcome could be to have zero loss of lives when a calamity occurs, such as strong typhoon and flooding. In the case of a project that addresses human trafficking, the project outcome could be the elimination of human trafficking in a particular community.

But the proponents of any CSR initiative should not be interested only in the project outcomes, if they want to sustain the gains that could be achieved through a development project. For that, they ought to be interested in what is referred to in the framework as people outcomes, which include self-reliance, concern for others and whole-person orientation. People outcomes arise when the beneficiaries of the CSR initiative are positively transformed, as a consequence of a deliberate effort to educate them in order to maximize their participation, not only in the implementation of a program/project, but, if possible, also in the design and evaluation of a program/project.

We digress at this point to briefly discuss the characteristics of an “out-of-school education” in order to have a good ideas of how education would fit in the project design of a CSR initiative. In that context, education is defined as “any overt, organized effort to influence individuals or groups that improves the quality of life.” The relevance of education is focused on the “impact on people’s daily lives.” The latter may include “both material and nonmaterial conditions.” Thus, the purpose being pursued by a program or project is very diverse: improve quality of work-life, improve agricultural techniques, foster social equity, to cite a few examples. In that regard, education could aim at transmitting knowledge, “change basic attitudes and practices” in a wide range of issues such as “use of energy, growing of food…use of leisure time.” The reach of the influence that is being pursued could be local, regional or national. Besides, the proponents of the program or project may involve “work organizations, political, community and government organizations, recreational, volunteer and inspirational organization.” We could very well add in that list a CSR initiative supported by a business enterprise. But the common denominator is that education is viewed as a necessary ingredient to the attainment of the purpose being pursued. The authors noted that it could happen that the proponents of the program or project would not acknowledge that education is an integral component of the design of the project; but, in fact, it is there. In particular, they said “for the most part, if one were to ask practitioners in these fields whether they consider themselves teachers or whether they would like to study teacher training techniques, they would consider the
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question odd in the extreme.” Thus, they concluded that first, “a great number educate as part of their overall function and/or use educational techniques as part of the major change efforts” and [second], a significant majority of the education occurring outside schools is highly integrated into other purposed and activities of organizations.” All these ideas apply to education, which is an indispensable element in the design of a CSR initiative, if it is to promote a sustainable people development.

A Basic Framework for Promoting Sustainable People Development through a CSR initiative

All the ideas presented above are encapsulated in the following basic framework.

PHASES IN PROJECT EXECUTION

Design → Implementation → Assessment

Based on the diagram, education is a necessary element. It is supposed to enhance the capabilities of the beneficiaries by promoting integral formation, which is another element. The latter means that, through education, each beneficiary must develop in all his or her dimensions, that is, not only the mind, but also the heart and the hands. Likewise, education must deliberately promote the formation of a community of persons, that is, a community characterized by members who live solidarity and actively contribute to the common good. As educators, we believe that learning is actually maximized in a social setting. It will also be noted that the framework recommends that the participation of the beneficiaries be fostered in all the phases of the program or project from design, execution and even in the assessment phase. This is based on the belief that capabilities are developed best in a participative process where the beneficiaries learn-by-doing, apart from participation being most coherent with the dignity of persons.

If the elements education, integral formation, person-community link and participation are present, then apart from the program/project outcomes, we could expect that the people outcomes would be realized as well. First, the beneficiaries of the program or project should end up being self-reliant, that is, capable of assuming responsibility for solving their own problems. Second, each member of the community must have a deeply ingrained concern for the other

---
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members of the community and realize that their strength and their ability to sustain the gains in their development efforts lie in their ability to effectively work together in solving any problem in their community. And finally, whole person orientation, which considers development as authentic if it has in fact promoted the development of each person in all his or her dimensions.

**An Illustration of the Use of the Basic Framework**

As mentioned in the beginning, the framework can be used either to develop a CSR initiative or to assess whether an existing program or project has the elements of a sustainable people development. We can illustrate the latter by looking at an actual project developed by the Community and Family Services International (CFSI), a Philippine-based international humanitarian non-government organization (NGO), involving a “post-conflict transition project in Mindanao, Philippines… [using] an alternative paradigm of participation” and “the approach to intervention…was based on a human rights perspective and a psychosocial framework.” The project’s avowed aim is “to find pathways of lasting peace and sustainable development for internally displaced people…and to build a model of post-conflict transition.” Here are some of its positive features, which can be culled from an article that presents CFSI’s evaluation of the project.

The features that point to the presence of the elements of the basic framework are highlighted. It is not being claimed, however, that the proponents of the project had the framework in mind when they conceived it. First, it is noteworthy that the problem of displacement was viewed as having many dimensions, -economic, health and sanitation, security, social and cultural--; hence, the proponents ensured that the solution was multi-pronged as well. Besides, it recognized that “displacement due to armed conflict has the added task of addressing inequity, exclusion and indignity.” Second, the beneficiaries are regarded as the main protagonists; hence, their participation was treated as intrinsic to the process of addressing the problem of displacement. In fact, it was explicitly said that “a key element to promote sustainability of positive change is participation.” It was reported that “IDPs engaged with the project through different pathways.” For example, in the first stage of the pilot project, there was a deliberate effort to form “community participation structures…[that included] the building of Pulungan Centers (community information centers) [which] gave IDPs a place to meet as a community… [to] discuss issues of common concern… [Besides], the IDPs participated in the construction of these centres, as an early signal of their right to participate in decisions which affected their lives within the project.” All these aspects of the project indicate that process freedom is an integral part of the design of the project. In particular, the article says “the process engages the [internally displaced people] IDP from the moment of displacement…. Individuals are empowered to make their own decisions commencing with whether to return to their homes or settle elsewhere.”

---
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deliberately “almost one year prior to the commencement of the project”. This approach is based on the belief that “participation itself is psychologically beneficial to restore people’s dignity and sense of control”.

Third, education is an integral part of the project and participation was viewed as the means to build capabilities. This is reflected in the fact that “virtually all the community organizers…all brought knowledge and skill to the programme as well as being able to build their own capability through the training and supervision offered… All IDP committee members received training in their respective programme areas to facilitate their participation.” Another component of the project is to provide parents and community volunteers “with training to assist in running the school and training as psychosocial caregivers and tutors.”

There is also a focus on person-community link in that the IDPs in “refugee or evacuation centers are still [regarded as] a community… [such that] the community organization strategy to restore and build social capital began… [even before] they returned to their lands.” Besides, all the four major components of the project were “implemented through community organizing.” In other words, “social cohesion…was regarded as a key intervening variable”. Consequently, “at the completion of the project, the intervention had stimulated further initiatives for building social capital and community in affected areas.” In particular, “small communities supported to gain economic independence and to utilize social institutions to achieve ongoing sustainability.” It can then be inferred that concern for others and self-reliance are desired people outcomes. Furthermore, “the project included four programme components: psychosocial, livelihood, information and security, and peace education and reconciliation” indicating that the project had a whole person orientation.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that CFSI had “a clear exit strategy”. An element of that strategy is to encourage the communities to participate in the “Philippine government’s Minimum Basic Needs Survey…[that] resulted in the affected communities learning more about themselves and identifying their own priorities of need at local community levels”. In addition, “leaders of the IDPs communities were assisted to take on advocacy roles for their communities” so that they can take the baton after the NGO has completed the project. They also “established “community committees with the capability to deal with local governments to promote the rights of the community.” The proponents concluded that they accomplished their mission because they succeeded in laying the groundwork for empowerment and sustainable development.
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Conclusion

In order for a CSR initiative to promote sustainable people development, it is necessary to aim at realizing not only at the project outcome/s, but also in attaining people outcomes, which include self-reliance, concern for others and whole person orientation. Sustainability is actually anchored on the people outcomes. To attain that, two elements are indispensable: first, education that promotes integral formation, as well as person-community link and second, participation that is an intrinsic part of the process of development.
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