

# **Center for Effective Philanthropy 2021 Resource and Assessment Survey**

**Analysis Summary** 

# September 2021

#### **Prepared For**

Center for Effective Philanthropy

#### **Prepared By**

Learning for Action (LFA)



Learning for Action enhances the impact and sustainability of social sector organizations through highly customized research, strategy development, and evaluation services.



# **Table of Contents**

l.	Survey Response Rates	1
II.	All Responses 2016, 2018, and 2021 Analysis Summary	2
	General Impressions of CEP	2
	General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement	9
	About Your Most Recent Report and Services	10
	Creating Change with Results	15
	Background and the Overall Experience	18
III.	Client vs. Stakeholder Analysis Summary	20
	General Impressions of CEP	20
IV.	Tool/Service Analysis Summary	25
	General Impressions of CEP	25
	General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement	32
	About Your Most Recent Report and Services	33
	Creating Change with Results	38
	Background and the Overall Experience	42
V.	All Tool Users 2016 vs. 2018 vs. 2021 Analysis Summary	44
	General Impressions of CEP	44
	General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement	48
	About Your Most Recent Report and Services	48
	Creating Change with Results	51
	Background and the Overall Experience	53
VI.	Stakeholders 2016 vs. 2018 vs. 2021 Analysis Summary	54
	General Impressions of CEP	54

#### Notes:

- This report displays frequencies, means, and counts of the data in each analysis cut. Statistical significance and data trends for additional cuts of data are detailed in the full Resource and Assessment Survey Report.
- Percentages may sum to greater or less than 100% due to rounding.



# **Survey Response Rates**

Type of Survey	Response Rate	Percent
GPR	39/74	53%
DPR	13/28	46%
SPR	5/11	45%
Advisory Services	8/13	62%
Stakeholders	288/1,704	17%
Total	353/1,830	19%

LFA sent surveys to about 1,800 individuals, of which 1,700 individuals are considered to be in CEP's core audience (senior leaders at foundations with at least \$2.5 million annual giving). The remaining surveys, about 130 in total, were sent to clients who have commissioned a GPR, SPR, DPR, or advisory service project in the past few years.



#### II. All Responses 2016, 2018, and 2021 Analysis **Summary**

Dashes within the tables indicate questions that were not asked in the 2016 or 2018 Resource and Assessment Survey.

# **General Impressions of CEP**

Exhibit 1. Please indicate your overall level of familiarity with the Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP).

	I have never heard of CEP	I have heard of CEP, but I don't really know CEP's work	I am somewhat familiar with CEP's work	I know CEP's work well	n
2016	2%	12%	38%	49%	277
2016	(n=5)	(n=32)	(n=104)	(n=136)	211
2018	0.3%	8%	45%	46%	304
2010	(n=1)	(n=24)	(n=138)	(n=141)	304
2021	1%	14%	41%	44%	252
2021	(n=5)	(n=48)	(n=144)	(n=156)	353

Exhibit 2. Which statement best describes how you perceive CEP's reputation among colleagues in your professional network?

	CEP has a <b>poor</b> <b>reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking	CEP has a somewhat negative reputation among leaders of grantmaking	CEP has a somewhat positive reputation among leaders of grantmaking	CEP has an excellent reputation among leaders of grantmaking	Don't		
	organizations (1)	organizations (2)	organizations (3)	organizations (4)	know	Mean <sup>1</sup>	n
2016	0%	1%	32%	58%	10%	3.6	238
2010	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=76)	(n=137)	(n=24)	(n=214)	230
2010	0%	1%	24%	61%	14%	3.7	272
2018	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=66)	(n=165)	(n=39)	(n=233)	272
2021	0%	1%	26%	62%	11%	3.7	202
ZUZ I	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=76)	(n=181)	(n=33)	(n=259)	292

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 4.



Exhibit 3. In the past year, have you or has someone in your organization read a CEP research publication (e.g. Staying Connected: How Five Foundations Understand Those they Seek to Help; Relationships Matter: Program Officers, Grantees, and the Keys to Success; Benchmarking Program Officer Roles and Responsibilities; A Date Certain: Lessons from Limited Life Foundations; The Future of Foundation Philanthropy: The CEO Perspective; Benchmarking Foundation Evaluation Practices, etc.)?2

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
2016	84%	5%	11%	240
2016	(n=202)	(n=11)	(n=27)	240
2010	82%	8%	10%	272
2018	(n=223)	(n=22)	(n=27)	272

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In 2021, this question was updated to include other CEP resources. See Exhibits 5, 7 and 9 for 2021 data.

Exhibit 4. In the past year, have you or your organization engaged CEP's resources in any of the following ways?

- Read a CEP research publication (e.g., Foundations Respond to Crisis; New Attitudes, Old Practices: The Provision of Multiyear General Operating Support; Funder Support during the COVID-19 Pandemic; Policy Influence: What Foundations are Doing and Why)
- Read Giving Done Right by Phil Buchanan
- Listened to the Giving Done Right podcast
- Attended CEP webinars/virtual learning programs (e.g., Taking Stock: Philanthropy's Role in Supporting Racial Equity, Foundations Respond to Crisis, Global Funders: Have you Made a Plan to Listen?)
- Attended an event at which a CEP staff member spoke (excluding a presentation of the results of an assessment your organization commissioned)
- Read CEP's blog

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
2016	-	-	-	-
2018	-	-	-	-
2021	80%	14%	6%	292
ZUZ I	(n=233)	(n=41)	(n=18)	292



Exhibit 5. Please select the CEP resources your organization engaged with during the past year.

		Frequency	Percent
	2016	-	-
A CEP research	2018	-	-
publication	2021	185	63%
	2016	-	-
Giving Done Right by Phil	2018	-	-
Buchanan	2021	91	31%
	2016	-	-
The Giving Done Right	2018	-	-
podcast	2021	22	8%
	2016	-	-
CEP webinars/virtual	2018	-	-
learning programs	2021	113	39%
	2016	-	-
An event at which a CEP	2018	-	-
staff member spoke	2021	55	19%
	2016	-	-
CEP's blog	2018	-	-
3	2021	90	31%

Exhibit 6. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's research publication(s) for reflecting on your or your foundation's work?3

	Not at all useful (1)	Not very useful (2)	Somewhat useful (3)	Very useful (4)	Extremely useful (5)	Mean	n
2016	0%	1%	49%	42%	8%	3.6	201
2010	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=99)	(n=85)	(n=15)	3.0	201
2010	0%	3%	43%	46%	8%	2.6	221
2018	(n=0)	(n=7)	(n=95)	(n=102)	(n=17)	3.6	221

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> In 2021, this question was switched to a 7-point scale to be consistent with other scales throughout the survey. This exhibit has been included for reference.



Exhibit 7. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for reflecting on your or your organization's work?

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	Mean	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
A CEP research	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
publication	2021	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	3% (n=5)	8% (n=13)	27% (n=44)	38% (n=62)	23% (n=38)	5.7	163
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Giving Done Right by Phil	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Buchanan	2021	0% (n=0)	3% (n=3)	3% (n=3)	10% (n=9)	34% (n=29)	24% (n=21)	24% (n=21)	5.5	86
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The Giving Done Right	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
podcast	2021	0% (n=0)	5% (n=1)	5% (n=1)	16% (n=3)	21% (n=4)	26% (n=5)	26% (n=5)	5.4	19
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEP webinars/virtual	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_
learning programs	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=3)	7% (n=7)	34% (n=35)	36% (n=37)	20% (n=20)	5.6	102
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_
An event at which a CEP	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
staff member spoke	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	9% (n=4)	28% (n=13)	38% (n=18)	26% (n=12)	5.8	47
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CED's blog	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEP's blog	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=3)	12% (n=10)	33% (n=27)	36% (n=30)	16% (n=13)	5.5	83

Exhibit 8. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's research publication(s) for improving your or your foundation's work? 4

	Not at all useful (1)	Not very useful (2)	Somewhat useful (3)	Very useful (4)	Extremely useful (5)	Mean	n
2016	0%	8%	62%	24%	6%	2.2	202
2016	(n=0)	(n=16)	(n=125)	(n=49)	(n=12)	3.3	202
2010	1%	8%	57%	29%	6%	2.2	219
2018	(n=1)	(n=17)	(n=125)	(n=64)	(n=12)	3.3	219

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> In 2021, this question was switched to a 7-point scale to be consistent with other scales throughout the survey. This exhibit has been included for reference.



Exhibit 9. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for improving on your or your organization's work?

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	Mean	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
A CEP research	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_
publication	2021	0% (n=0)	2% (n=3)	6% (n=10)	22% (n=36)	31% (n=50)	23% (n=37)	16% (n=26)	5.2	162
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Giving Done Right by Phil	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Buchanan	2021	3% (n=3)	2% (n=2)	8% (n=7)	26% (n=22)	27% (n=23)	20% (n=17)	14% (n=12)	4.9	86
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The Giving Done Right	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
podcast	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6% (n=1)	17% (n=3)	17% (n=3)	33% (n=6)	28% (n=5)	5.6	18
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEP webinars/virtual	2018	-	-	-	<u>-</u>	-	-	-	-	_
learning programs	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=5)	27% (n=27)	36% (n=36)	18% (n=18)	15% (n=15)	5.1	101
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
An event at which a CEP	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
staff member spoke	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6% (n=3)	24% (n=12)	31% (n=15)	20% (n=10)	18% (n=9)	5.2	49
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CED's blog	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEP's blog	2021	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	6% (n=5)	33% (n=27)	35% (n=29)	11% (n=9)	13% (n=11)	4.9	82

Exhibit 10. In the past year, have you or your organization used any of CEP's resources in informing conversations with board members? 5

	Yes	No	Don't know/ Not applicable	n
2016	31%	60%	9%	230
2016	(n=72)	(n=138)	(n=20)	230
2010	34%	58%	9%	222
2018	(n=75)	(n=128)	(n=19)	222
2021	43%	43%	14%	213
ZUZ I	(n=91)	(n=92)	(n=30)	Z13

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The 2016/2018 survey question language is comparable to the 2021 language. 2016/2018 language reads as: "In the past year, have you used any of CEP's writings (research publications, blog posts, other communications or publications) as a basis of discussion with board members?"



Exhibit 11. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for reflecting on your organization's efforts related to the following?

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	N/A (I did not use CEP resources for this purpose)	Mean <sup>6</sup>	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The COVID-19 Pandemic	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	0% (n=1)	3% (n=6)	5% (n=11)	11% (n=22)	24% (n=50)	18% (n=38)	15% (n=31)	24% (n=49)	5.2 (n=159)	208
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The movement for racial iustice	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
justice	2021	0% (n=1)	2% (n=5)	7% (n=14)	9% (n=18)	23% (n=47)	23% (n=48)	14% (n=28)	21% (n=44)	5.2 (n=161)	205

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

Exhibit 12. How strongly do you associate CEP with the following statements? CEP is...

		Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)	Don't Know	Mean <sup>7</sup>	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Engaged in rigorous work	2018	0.4% (n=1)	2% (n=5)	1% (n=3)	4% (n=12)	15% (n=42)	35% (n=94)	29% (n=79)	13% (n=36)	5.9 (n=236)	272
	2021	0% (n=1)	0% (n=1)	1% (n=2)	6% (n=12)	13% (n=27)	38% (n=79)	34% (n=71)	7% (n=15)	6.0 (n=193)	208
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
An expert in the field of philanthropy	2018	0% (n=0)	2% (n=6)	2% (n=6)	3% (n=7)	13% (n=33)	36% (n=95)	39% (n=103)	5% (n=14)	6.1 (n=250)	264
, ,,	2021	0% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	1% (n=3)	3% (n=6)	12% (n=24)	37% (n=76)	45% (n=93)	2% (n=5)	6.2 (n=203)	208
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
philanthropy	2018	0% (n=0)	3% (n=8)	2% (n=6)	7% (n=18)	21% (n=58)	36% (n=97)	18% (n=50)	13% (n=35)	5.6 (n=237)	272
	2021	0% (n=0)	1% (n=2)	2% (n=5)	6% (n=13)	19% (n=40)	43% (n=89)	24% (n=49)	5% (n=10)	5.8 (n=198)	208



		Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)	Don't Know	Mean <sup>7</sup>	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trusted	2018	0% (n=0)	2% (n=5)	2% (n=5)	3% (n=9)	9% (n=23)	35% (n=96)	40% (n=107)	10% (n=26)	6.1 (n=245)	271
	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=1)	0% (n=1)	4% (n=8)	10% (n=21)	36% (n=74)	45% (n=93)	4% (n=8)	6.3 (n=198)	206
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-
Influential on foundation practice and effectiveness	2018	0% (n=0)	2% (n=5)	1% (n=3)	7% (n=19)	24% (n=64)	29% (n=76)	27% (n=71)	10% (n=25)	5.8 (n=238)	263
	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=1)	0% (n=1)	8% (n=16)	23% (n=47)	33% (n=68)	27% (n=56)	9% (n=18)	5.8 (n=189)	207
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Innovative	2018	0% (n=0)	2% (n=6)	4% (n=11)	10% (n=26)	28% (n=75)	27% (n=73)	11% (n=31)	18% (n=50)	5.3 (n=222)	272
	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=1)	5% (n=10)	18% (n=37)	23% (n=47)	35% (n=72)	13% (n=26)	7% (n=14)	5.3 (n=193)	207
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Responsive to the pressing topics of the	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	_
time	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=4)	10% (n=21)	12% (n=24)	43% (n=90)	28% (n=59)	5% (n=10)	5.9 (n=198)	208

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.



## **General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement**

Exhibit 13. How satisfied were you with your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory experience overall?

	Not at all satisfied (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very satisfied (7)	Mean	n
2016	0%	0%	0%	4%	11%	30%	54%	6.4	46
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=14)	(n=25)	0.4	40
2018	0%	1%	2%	1%	7%	35%	53%	6.3	83
2010	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=6)	(n=29)	(n=44)	0.5	03
2021	0%	0%	0%	3%	17%	21%	59%	6.4	63
202 I	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=11)	(n=13)	(n=37)	0.4	05

Exhibit 14. How responsive was staff from CEP to questions your organization had during your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory process?

	Not at all responsive (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very responsive (7)	Mean	n
2016	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	6.8	46
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=9)	(n=37)	0.0	70
2018	0%	0%	0%	1%	4%	10%	85%	6.8	82
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=8)	(n=70)	0.0	02
2021	0%	0%	0%	3%	3%	13%	81%	6.7	63
2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=8)	(n=51)	0.7	03

Exhibit 15. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree that CEP accurately set expectations regarding the effort required on your end in preparations for the engagement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly agree (7)	Mean	n
2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2021	0%	2%	0%	3%	6%	16%	73%	6.5	63
2021	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=10)	(n=46)	0.5	03



## **About Your Most Recent Report and Services**<sup>8</sup>

Exhibit 16. How satisfied are you with the extent to which the CEP staff's interpretation of the results of your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory Report was meaningful for guiding reflection on your organization's performance overall?

	Not at all satisfied (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very satisfied (7)	Mean	n
2016	0%	0%	0%	5%	19%	48%	29%	6.0	42
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=8)	(n=20)	(n=12)	0.0	72
2018	0%	0%	0%	4%	15%	38%	43%	6.2	72
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=11)	(n=27)	(n=31)	0.2	12
2021	0%	0%	2%	11%	13%	26%	48%	6.1	61
2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=7)	(n=8)	(n=16)	(n=29)	0.1	01

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> In 2016 and 2018, Advisory respondents were not asked the remaining questions, with the exception of those posed in Exhibit 26 and Exhibit 27. In 2021, Advisory respondents were included, and the question language reflects that inclusion.



Exhibit 17. Please indicate which of the following services/features you used as part of your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory engagement.

CEP Service		- Fundament	Downsout
CEP Service	2016	Frequency	Percent
Memorandum of Key Findings and	2018	 72	97%
Recommendations/ Executive Summary			
	2021	59	97%
	2016	-	-
Online "Getting Ready" Guide	2018	-	-
	2021	28	46%
Segmentation of the data by subgroup	2016	-	
(e.g., program area, department)	2018	68	92%
(e.g., program area, acparament)	2021	48	79%
Consider the land of the land	2016	-	-
Separate reports by team, program area, primary contact, etc.	2018	-	-
primary contact, etc.	2021	34	56%
	2016	-	-
Open-ended respondent comments and	2018	72	97%
suggestions	2021	60	98%
	2016	-	-
Discussion and presentation of results	2018	-	-
	2021	58	95%
A 1 Por	2016	-	-
Additional analyses or consultations	2018	55	74%
after receiving your draft report	2021	40	66%
	2016	-	-
CEP research publications relevant to	2018	37	50%
your results	2021	19	31%
	2016	-	-
Interactive, online reporting system	2018	62	84%
	2021	43	70%
Analysis of results by race and ethnicity,	2016	-	-
gender, or other demographic	2018	-	-
characteristics of respondents	2021	28	46%



Exhibit 18. For each service/feature that was part of your engagement, please rate its helpfulness in deepening your organization's ability to use the GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory report to reflect on its performance.9

		Not at all helpful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very helpful (7)	Not applicable/	Mean <sup>10</sup>	Total n
	2016	0%	2%	2%	5%	14%	21%	52%	2%	6.1	42
Mamarandum of Vay Findings	2010	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=6)	(n=9)	(n=22)	(n=1)	(n=41)	<u>4</u> 2
Memorandum of Key Findings and Recommendations/	2018	0%	1%	0%	7%	12%	24%	53%	3%	6.2	74
Executive Summary		(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=9)	(n=18)	(n=39)	(n=2)	(n=72)	
•	2021	0%	0%	0%	2%	10%	24%	64%	-	6.5	58
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=6)	(n=14)	(n=37)		(n=58)	
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Online "Getting Ready" Guide	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	0%	0%	4%	4%	19%	35%	38%		6.0	26
	2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=5)	(n=9)	(n=10)	-	(n=26)	20
	2016	0%	0%	7%	5%	10%	26%	48%	5%	6.1	42
Segmentation of the data by		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=11)	(n=20)	(n=2)	(n=40)	
ubgroup (e.g., program area,	2018	0%	0%	0%	4%	16%	23%	49%	8%	6.3	74
department)		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=12)	(n=17)	(n=36)	(n=6)	(n=68)	
•	2021	0%	0%	0%	4%	9%	21%	66%	_	6.5	47
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=10)	(n=31)		(n=47)	
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Separate reports by team, program area, primary contact,	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
etc.	2021	0%	0%	0%	13%	3%	9%	75%		6.5	22
	2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=24)	-	(n=32)	32
	2016	0%	0%	0%	5%	7%	24%	62%	2%	6.5	42
	2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=3)	(n=10)	(n=26)	(n=1)	(n=41)	
Open-ended respondent	2018	0%	0%	0%	7%	14%	31%	46%	3%	6.2	74
comments and suggestions <sup>11</sup>	2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=10)	(n=23)	(n=34)	(n=2)	(n=72)	
	2021	0%	0%	2%	2%	10%	27%	59%	_	6.5	59
	2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=6)	(n=16)	(n=35)		(59)	
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Discussion and presentation of	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
results	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	5% (n=3)	18% (n=10)	12% (n=7)	63% (n=36)	-	6.3 (n=57)	57



		Not at all helpful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very helpful (7)	Not applicable/ Did not use	Mean <sup>1</sup>	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Additional analyses or consultations after receiving your	2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	9% (n=7)	24% (n=18)	39% (n=29)	27% (n=20)	6.4 (n=54)	74
draft report <sup>12</sup>	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	3% (n=1)	15% (n=6)	23% (n=9)	56% (n=22)	-	6.3 (n=39)	39
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEP research publications relevant to your results	2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	12% (n=9)	15% (n=11)	12% (n=9)	11% (n=8)	50% (n=37)	5.4 (n=37)	74
,	2021	0% (n=0)	11% (n=2)	11% (n=2)	21% (n=4)	21% (n=4)	5% (n=1)	32% (n=6)	-	5.0 (n=19)	19
	2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	12% (n=5)	31% (n=13)	50% (n=21)	0% (n=0)	6.2 (n=42)	42
Interactive, online reporting system <sup>13</sup>	2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	3% (n=2)	16% (n=12)	24% (n=18)	39% (n=29)	16% (n=12)	6.2 (n=62)	74
	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	2% (n=1)	22% (n=9)	34% (n=14)	37% (n=15)	-	6.0 (n=41)	41
ethnicity, gender, or other demographic characteristics of	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	11% (n=3)	30% (n=8)	19% (n=5)	41% (n=11)	-	5.9 (n=27)	27

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> In 2016 respondents were asked one stem question: "Please indicate which of the following services/features you used as part of your recent GPR, DPR, or SPR engagement. For each service/feature that was part of your engagement, please rate its helpfulness in deepening your foundation's ability to use the GPR, DPR, or SPR to reflect on its performance." In 2018 and 2021, respondents were asked to select services/features first, and were then asked to rate only those services/features they selected. Those who selected the service/feature (Exhibit 17) may not have rated the service/feature.

Exhibit 19. How well did CEP's work reflect a clear understanding of the specific context of your organization?

	Not at all well (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Extremely well (7)	Mean	n
2016	0%	0%	2%	7%	33%	31%	26%		
2016	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=14)	(n=13)	(n=11)	5.7	42
2018	0%	3%	0%	7%	19%	35%	36%	5.9	72
2010	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=14)	(n=25)	(n=26)	5.9	12
2021	0%	0%	2%	3%	19%	42%	34%	<i>C</i> 0	<b>C</b> 2
2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=12)	(n=26)	(n=21)	6.0	62

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> The 2016 survey question language is comparable to the 2018 and 2021 language. 2016 language reads as: "Downloadable PDF of all respondent comments and suggestions"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> The 2018 survey question language is comparable to the 2021 language. 2018 language reads as: "Additional analyses after receiving your draft report"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> The 2016/2018 survey question language is comparable to the 2021 language. 2016/2018 language reads as: "Interactive online report"



Exhibit 20. In general, how would you rate the quality of CEP's presentation? 14

	Poor						Excellent	Not		Total
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	applicable	Mean <sup>15</sup>	n
2016	0%	0%	0%	5%	5%	17%	46%	29%	6.4	11
2016	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=7)	(n=19)	(n=11)	(n=30)	41
2010	0%	0%	0%	3%	7%	14%	56%	21%	6.5	72
2018	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=10)	(n=40)	(n=15)	(n=57)	72
2021	0%	0%	0%	3%	8%	21%	60%	8%	6.5	62
2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=13)	(n=37)	(n=5)	(n=57)	62

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> The 2016/2018 survey question language is comparable to the 2021 language. 2016/2018 language reads as: "In general, how would you rate the quality of CEP's in-person presentation?"

Exhibit 21. Did CEP's presentation of results include a video presentation component?

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
2016	-	-	-	-
2018	-	-	-	-
2021	49%	41%	10%	63
2021	(n=31)	(n=26)	(n=6)	05

Exhibit 22. Please rate the extent to which CEP's video presentations were each of the following?

		Not at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very (7)	Mean	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	_
	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clear and compelling	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=3)	10% (n=3)	23% (n=7)	58% (n=18)	6.3	31
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Engaging (e.g. interactive,	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_
participatory, etc.)	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	13% (n=4)	13% (n=4)	26% (n=8)	45% (n=14)	6.0	31
Accessible to all	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
participants (e.g., high	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_
quality video and audio, appropriate for any participants with disabilities, etc.)	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	13% (n=4)	29% (n=9)	58% (n=18)	6.5	31
Responsive to experience	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
of participants (e.g., mood	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
in "room," implicit signals to dig in or move on, etc.)	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	3% (n=1)	23% (n=7)	35% (n=11)	35% (n=11)	6.0	31
umping-off point for 2 further internal	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2018	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	
	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6% (n=2)	10% (n=3)	32% (n=10)	52% (n=16)	6.3	31

<sup>15</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.



## **Creating Change with Results**

Exhibit 23. Considering the aspects of your work identified in the table below, please indicate the degree to which use of GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory report results affected change in your organization's decision-making or practices. (Please consider tangible changes in policy or strategy as well as intangible changes in culture, approach, or mindset when responding.)

		Too Soon to Tell	No Change (1)	Some Change (2)	Significant Change (3)	Evaluation of Previous Change	Not applicable	Mean <sup>16</sup>	Total n
	2016	33% (n=14)	7% (n=3)	29% (n=12)	26% (n=11)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	2.3 (n=26)	42
Communications with grantees, donors, and/or staff (e.g., clarity, methods of	2018	15% (n=11)	7% (n=5)	50% (n=36)	25% (n=18)	3% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	2.2 (n=59)	72
communication)	2021	10% (n=6)	7% (n=4)	46% (n=27)	31% (n=18)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=4)	2.3 (n=49)	59
	2016	43%	14%	21%	10%	0%	12%	1.9	42
Grantmaking processes (e.g., selection, reporting and evaluation processes)	2018	(n=18) 25%	(n=6) 14%	(n=9) 42%	(n=4) 6%	(n=0) 1%	(n=5) 13%	(n=19) 1.9	72
eporting and evaluation processes,	2021	(n=18) 12%	(n=10) 14%	(n=30) 39%	(n=4) 17%	(n=1) 5%	(n=9) 14%	2.0	59
	2016	(n=7) 31%	(n=8) 41%	(n=23) 7%	(n=10) 7%	(n=3) 2%	(n=8) 12%	(n=41) 1.4	42
Grantmaking patterns (e.g., size, type, and	2018	(n=13) 25%	(n=17) 38%	(n=3) 19%	(n=3) 3%	(n=1) 0%	(n=5) 15%	(n=23) 1.4	72
length of grants)	2021	(n=18) 25%	(n=27) 31%	(n=14) 17%	(n=2) 8%	(n=0) 5%	(n=11) 14%	(n=43) 1.6	59
	2016	(n=15) 31%	(n=18) 44%	(n=10) 10%	(n=5) 5%	(n=3) 5%	(n=8) 5%	(n=33) 1.4	39
Organization strategy (e.g., what it is you're	2018	(n=12) 22%	(n=17) 42%	(n=4) 22%	(n=2) 4%	(n=2) 3%	(n=2) 7%	(n=23) 1.5	72
trying to do, focus)	2021	(n=16) 10%	(n=30) 33%	(n=16) 38%	(n=3) 9%	(n=2) 3%	(n=5) 7%	(n=49) 1.7	58
	2016	(n=6) 33%	(n=19) 26%	(n=22) 21%	(n=5) 12%	(n=2) 2%	(n=4) 5%	(n=46) 1.8	42
Provision of assistance to grantees beyond "the check" (e.g., management assistance,	2018	(n=14) 19%	(n=11) 17%	(n=9) 43%	(n=5) 6%	(n=1) 4%	(n=2) 11%	(n=25) 1.8	72
field-related assistance, assistance securing funding from other sources)	2021	(n=14) 14%	(n=12) 27%	(n=31) 31%	(n=4) 12%	(n=3) 2%	(n=8) 15%	(n=47) 1.8	59
	2016	(n=8) 29%	(n=16) 57%	(n=18) 7%	(n=7) 2%	(n=1) 0%	(n=9) 5%	(n=41) 1.2	42
Staffing levels	2018	(n=12) 13%	(n=24) 60%	(n=3) 19%	(n=1) 3%	(n=0) 3%	(n=2) 3%	(n=28) 1.3	72
Staffing levels		(n=9) 12%	(n=43) 49%	(n=14) 20%	(n=2) 5%	(n=2) 0%	(n=2) 14%	(n=59) 1.4	
	2021	(n=7)	(n=29)	(n=12)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=8)	(n=44)	59



		Too Soon to Tell	No Change (1)	Some Change (2)		Evaluation of Previous Change	Not applicable	Mean <sup>16</sup>	Total n
	2016	35%	18%	33%	10%	0%	5%	1.9	40
Attitudes toward work with grantees		(n=14)	(n=7)	(n=13)	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=24)	
	2018	23% (n=16)	16% (n=11)	41% (n=29)	6% (n=4)	1% (n=1)	14% (n=10)	1.8 (n=44)	71
-	2021	12% (n=7)	36% (n=21)	26% (n=15)	10% (n=6)	2% (n=1)	14% (n=8)	1.6 (n=21)	58
	2016	31% (n=13)	17% (n=7)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	45% (n=19)	1.3 (n=9)	42
attitudes toward work with donors	2018	10% (n=7)	19% (n=14)	13% (n=9)	6% (n=4)	1% (n=1)	51% (n=37)	1.6 (n=27)	72
	2021	10% (n=6)	19% (n=11)	19% (n=11)	7% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	46% (n=27)	1.7 (n=26)	59
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts inside	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
your organization	2021	10% (n=6)	28% (n=17)	27% (n=16)	15% (n=9)	0% (n=0)	20% (n=12)	1.8 (n=42)	60
	2016	-	_	_	_	-	-	_	-
Diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts <i>related</i>	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
to your programs, grantees, donors, or other – partners	2021	15% (n=9)	27% (n=16)	32% (n=19)	10% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	15% (n=9)	1.8 (n=41)	59
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Approach to understanding your impact -	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Approach to understanding your impact	2021	13% (n=8)	18% (n=11)	42% (n=25)	12% (n=7)	5% (n=3)	10% (n=6)	1.9 (n=43)	60
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Organizational/toam cultura	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Organizational/team culture —	2021	10% (n=6)	28% (n=17)	33% (n=20)	15% (n=9)	2% (n=1)	12% (n=7)	1.8 (n=46)	60
Prioritization of staff time —	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FITOTILIZATION OF STAIL HITTE	2021	12% (n=7)	20% (n=12)	42% (n=25)	14% (n=8)	0% (n=0)	12% (n=7)	1.9 (n=45)	59

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes responses for no change, some change, and significant change.



Exhibit 24. In supporting your organization's efforts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, how useful was:

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	N/A (My organizatio n didn't use this resource to support related efforts)		Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Your report and analysis (data, analysis, written	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-
narrative, etc.)	2021	0% (n=0)	7% (n=4)	2% (n=1)	14% (n=8)	10% (n=6)	8% (n=5)	22% (n=13)	37% (n=22)	5.2 (n=37)	59
Your engagement with	2016	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEP staff (presentation, discussion, facilitation, etc.)	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	0% (n=0)	7% (n=4)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	10% (n=6)	12% (n=7)	20% (n=12)	47% (n=28)	5.5 (n=31)	59

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

Exhibit 25. In supporting your organization's efforts related to the movement for racial justice, how useful was:

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	N/A (My organizatio n didn't use this resource to support related efforts)		Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Your report and analysis (data, analysis, written	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
narrative, etc.)	2021	3% (n=2)	5% (n=3)	7% (n=4)	7% (n=4)	10% (n=6)	8% (n=5)	5% (n=3)	54% (n=32)	4.3 (n=27)	59
Your engagement with	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEP staff (presentation, discussion, facilitation, etc.)	2018	-	-	<u>-</u>	-	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	-	-	-	-
	2021	3% (n=2)	5% (n=3)	5% (n=3)	5% (n=3)	7% (n=4)	10% (n=6)	7% (n=4)	58% (n=34)	4.5 (n=25)	59

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.



## **Background and the Overall Experience**

Exhibit 26. Relative to other processes your organization has undertaken to assess its overall effectiveness as a grantmaking organization, how useful was your recent GPR, DPR, or SPR?

	Much less useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Much more useful (7)	Don't know	Not applicable (no other assessment processes undertaken)	Mean <sup>19</sup>	Total n
2016	0%	0%	2%	5%	27%	24%	29%	2%	10%	5.8	41
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=11)	(n=10)	(n=12)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=36)	71
2018	0%	0%	3%	3%	17%	27%	19%	0%	31%	5.8	70
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=12)	(n=19)	(n=13)	(n=0)	(n=22)	(n=48)	70
2021	0%	0%	4%	4%	20%	25%	27%	0%	21%	5.9	E.G.
2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=11)	(n=14)	(n=15)	(n=0)	(n=12)	(n=44)	56

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

Exhibit 27. Does your organization intend to commission the GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory report again in the future?

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
2016	69%	0%	31%	42
2016	(n=29)	(n=0)	(n=13)	42
2010	72%	1%	26%	72
2018	(n=52)	(n=1)	(n=19)	72
2021	69%	0%	31%	C 1
2021	(n=42)	(n=0)	(n=19)	61

Exhibit 28. Would you recommend the GPR, DPR, SPR, or CEP Advisory Services to a colleague organization?

	Yes	No	n
2016	100%	0%	46
2016	(n=46)	(n=0)	40
2010	98%	3%	01
2018	(n=79)	(n=2)	81
2021	100%	0%	<i>C</i> 1
	(n=61)	(n=0)	61



Exhibit 29. How valuable was your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory Service relative to its cost?

	Very poor value for the cost (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Excellent value for the cost (7)	Mean	n
2016	0%	2%	2%	4%	35%	35%	22%	5.6	46
2016	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=16)	(n=16)	(n=10)	3.0	
2018	0%	0%	3%	15%	17%	36%	30%	5.8	81
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=12)	(n=14)	(n=29)	(n=24)	3.0	01
2021	0%	0%	3%	10%	27%	29%	31%	5.7	59
2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=6)	(n=16)	(n=17)	(n=18)	5.7	59



# III. Client vs. Stakeholder Analysis Summary

#### **General Impressions of CEP**

Exhibit 30. Please indicate your overall level of familiarity with the Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP).

	I have never heard of CEP (1)	I have heard of CEP, but I don't really know CEP's work (2)	I am somewhat familiar with CEP's work (3)	l know CEP's work well (4)	Mean <sup>20</sup>	n
Client	0%	0%	31%	69%	3 7***	65
Ciletit	(n=0)	(n=0) $(n=0)$ $(n=20)$		(n=45)	3.1	05
Ctalcabaldar	2%	17%	43%	39%	2.2	200
Stakeholder	(n=5)	(n=48)	(n=124)	(n=111)	3.2	288

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 4.

Exhibit 31. Which statement best describes how you perceive CEP's reputation among colleagues in vour professional network?

		CEP has a <b>somewhat</b>	CEP has a <b>somewhat</b>				
	CEP has a <b>poor</b>	negative reputation	positive reputation	CEP has an <b>excellent</b>			
	reputation among	among leaders of	among leaders of	reputation among			
	leaders of grantmaking	grantmaking	grantmaking	leaders of grantmaking	Don't		
	organizations (1)	organizations (2)	organizations (3)	organizations (4)	know	Mean <sup>21</sup>	n
Client	0%	0%	15%	72%	12%	3.8**	65
Client	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=10)	(n=47)	(n=8)	(n=57)	0.5
Stakoholdor	0%	1%	29%	59%	11%	3.7	227
Stakeholder	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=66)	(n=134)	(n=25)	(n=202)	221

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 4.

Exhibit 32. In the past year, have you or your organization engaged CEP's resources in any of the following ways?

- Read a CEP research publication (e.g., Foundations Respond to Crisis; New Attitudes, Old Practices: The Provision of Multiyear General Operating Support; Funder Support during the COVID-19 Pandemic; Policy Influence: What Foundations are Doing and Why)
- Read Giving Done Right by Phil Buchanan
- Listened to the Giving Done Right podcast
- Attended CEP webinars/virtual learning programs (e.g., Taking Stock: Philanthropy's Role in Supporting Racial Equity, Foundations Respond to Crisis, Global Funders: Have you Made a Plan to Listen?)
- Attended an event at which a CEP staff member spoke (excluding a presentation of the results of an assessment your organization commissioned)

Read CEP's blog

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
Client	83%	15%	2%	6.5
Client	(n=54)	(n=10)	(n=1)	65
Chalcala alalas	79%	14%	7%	227
Stakeholder	(n=179)	(n=31)	(n=17)	227

<sup>\*</sup>Statistically significant difference p < 0.001

<sup>\*\*</sup>Statistically significant difference p < 0.01



Exhibit 33. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for reflecting on your or your organization's work?

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	Mean	Total n
	Client	0%	0%	3%	3%	21%	46%	28%	6.0 <sup>†</sup>	39
A CEP research		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=8)	(n=18)	(n=11)		
publication	Stakeholder	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	3% (n=4)	10% (n=12)	29% (n=36)	35% (n=44)	22% (n=27)	5.6	124
		0%	0%	5%	15%	45%	15%	20%		
Giving Done Right	Client	(n=0)	(n=0)	5% (n=1)	(n=3)	45% (n=9)	(n=3)	20% (n=4)	5.3	20
by Phil Buchanan	C	0%	5%	3%	9%	30%	27%	26%		
	Stakeholder	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=2)	(n=6)	(n=20)	(n=18)	(n=17)	5.5	66
	Client	0%	0%	0%	14%	29%	14%	43%	5.9	7
The Giving Done	Cilent	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=3)	J.9	
Right podcast	Stakeholder	0%	8%	8%	17%	17%	33%	17%	5.1	12
		(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=2)	J	
CEP	Client	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	45%	30%	6.1*	20
webinars/virtual		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=9)	(n=6)	0.1	
learning programs	Stakeholder	0%	0%	4%	9%	37%	34%	17%	5.5	82
	Stakeriolder	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=7)	(n=30)	(n=28)	(n=14)	ر.ر	02
A	Client	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	6.3*	12
An event at which a CEP staff member		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=6)	0.5	12
spoke	Stakeholder	0%	0%	0%	11%	31%	40%	17%	5.6	35
	Stakenolaei	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=11)	(n=14)	(n=6)	J.0	
	Client	0%	0%	9%	9%	41%	27%	14%	5.3	22
CEP's blog	Cheffe	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=9)	(n=6)	(n=3)	J.J	
CLI 3 DIOG	•	0%	0%	2%	13%	30%	39%	16%	5.6	61
	Stakeholder	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=8)	(n=18)	(n=24)	(n=10)	5.0	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Approaches statistical significance p < 0.10

<sup>\*</sup>Statistically significant difference p < 0.05



Exhibit 34. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for improving your or your organization's work?

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	Mean	Total n
A CEP research	Client	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	21% (n=8)	39% (n=15)	16% (n=6)	21% (n=8)	5.3	38
publication	Stakeholder	0% (n=0)	2% (n=3)	7% (n=9)	23% (n=28)	28% (n=35)	25% (n=31)	15% (n=18)	5.1	124
Giving Done Right	Client	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	40% (n=8)	30% (n=6)	15% (n=3)	15% (n=3)	5.1	20
by Phil Buchanan	Stakeholder	5% (n=3)	3% (n=2)	11% (n=7)	21% (n=14)	26% (n=17)	21% (n=14)	14% (n=9)	4.8	66
The <i>Giving Done</i>	Client	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	14% (n=1)	14% (n=1)	29% (n=2)	43% (n=3)	6.0	7
Right podcast	Stakeholder	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	9% (n=1)	18% (n=2)	18% (n=2)	36% (n=4)	18% (n=2)	5.4	11
CEP	Client	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	35% (n=7)	25% (n=5)	20% (n=4)	20% (n=4)	5.3	20
webinars/virtual learning programs	Stakeholder	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6% (n=5)	25% (n=20)	38% (n=31)	17% (n=14)	14% (n=11)	5.1	81
An event at which a	Client	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=2)	33% (n=4)	17% (n=2)	33% (n=4)	5.7	12
spoke	Stakeholder	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=3)	27% (n=10)	30% (n=11)	22% (n=8)	14% (n=5)	5.0	37
CEP's blog	Client	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=1)	41% (n=9)	27% (n=6)	18% (n=4)	9% (n=2)	4.9	22
CEF S DIOG	Stakeholder	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	7% (n=4)	30% (n=18)	38% (n=23)	8% (n=5)	15% (n=9)	4.9	60

Exhibit 35. In the past year, have you or your organization used any of CEP's resources in informing conversations with board members?

	Yes	No	Don't know/ Not applicable	n
Client	52%	25%	23%	52
Client	(n=27)	(n=13)	(n=12)	52
Ctalcabaldar	40%	49%	11%	161
Stakeholder	(n=64)	(n=79)	(n=18)	161



Exhibit 36. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for reflecting on your organization's efforts related to the following:

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	N/A (I did not use CEP resources for this purpose)	Mean <sup>22</sup>	Total n
	Client	0%	0%	0%	18%	27%	18%	22%	14%	5.5 <sup>†</sup>	49
The COVID-19		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=9)	(n=13)	(n=9)	(n=11)	(n=7)	(n=42)	
Pandemic	Stakeholder	0%	1%	4%	7%	8%	23%	18%	26%	5.1	159
	Stakeriolaei	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=6)	(n=11)	(n=13)	(n=37)	(n=29)	(n=42)	(n=117)	
The movement	- Client	0%	2%	2%	12%	26%	18%	14%	26%	5.3	50
for racial	Cheric	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=6)	(n=13)	(n=9)	(n=7)	(n=13)	(n=37)	. 50
justice	Stakeholder	1%	3%	8%	8%	22%	25%	14%	20%	5.2	155
,	Stakeriolder	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=13)	(n=12)	(n=34)	(n=39)	(n=21)	(n=31)	(n=124)	133

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

Exhibit 37. How strongly do you associate CEP with the following statements? CEP is...

		Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree			Total
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	Don't Know	Mean <sup>23</sup>	n
	Client	0%	0%	0%	6%	8%	35%	46%	6%	6.3*	52
Engaged in	Client	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=4)	(n=18)	(n=24)	(n=3)	(n=49)	52
rigorous work	Stakeholder	1%	1%	1%	6%	15%	39%	30%	8%	5.9	150
	Stakenoider	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=9)	(n=23)	(n=61)	(n=47)	(n=12)	(n=144)	156
A	Clianat	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	37%	54%	2%	6.4 <sup>†</sup>	52
An expert in the	Client	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=19)	(n=28)	(n=1)	(n=51)	52
field of	Ctaliala alalau	1%	0%	2%	3%	14%	37%	42%	3%	6.1	150
philanthropy	Stakeholder	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=4)	(n=22)	(n=57)	(n=65)	(n=4)	(n=152)	156
Focused on the	Clianat	0%	0%	2%	2%	13%	48%	27%	8%	6.0*	F2
most important	Client	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=7)	(n=25)	(n=14)	(n=4)	(n=48)	52
issues in	Cual abadala	0%	1%	3%	8%	21%	41%	22%	4%	5.7	150
philanthropy	Stakeholder	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=12)	(n=33)	(n=64)	(n=35)	(n=6)	(n=150)	156
	Clianat	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	35%	60%	2%	6.6***	F2
T a.k. a. al	Client	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=18)	(n=31)	(n=1)	(n=51)	52
Trusted	Ctaliala al dan	0%	1%	1%	5%	12%	36%	40%	5%	6.1	1
	Stakeholder	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=8)	(n=19)	(n=56)	(n=62)	(n=7)	(n=147)	154
Influential on	Cliant	0%	0%	0%	6%	31%	21%	35%	8%	5.9	F2
oundation	Client	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=16)	(n=11)	(n=18)	(n=4)	(n=48)	52
oractice and	Ctaliala al dan	0%	1%	1%	8%	20%	37%	25%	9%	5.8	155
effectiveness	Stakeholder	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=13)	(n=31)	(n=57)	(n=38)	(n=14)	(n=141)	155 )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Approaches statistical significance p < 0.10



		Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)	Don't Know	Mean <sup>23</sup>	Total n
	Client	0%	0%	2%	13%	31%	31%	15%	8%	5.5	52
Innovative	Client	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=7)	(n=16)	(n=16)	(n=8)	(n=4)	(n=48)	32
	Stakeholder	0%	1%	6%	19%	20%	36%	12%	6%	5.3	155
	Stakenoider	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=9)	(n=30)	(n=31)	(n=56)	(n=18)	(n=10)	(n=145)	155
Despensive to the	Client	0%	0%	2%	10%	4%	54%	25%	6%	6.0	52
Responsive to the	Client	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=5)	(n=2)	(n=28)	(n=13)	(n=3)	(n=49)	52
pressing topics of	Ctalcabaldar	0%	0%	2%	10%	14%	40%	29%	4%	5.9	156
the time	Stakeholder	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=16)	(n=22)	(n=62)	(n=46)	(n=7)	(n=149)	156

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Approaches statistical significance p < 0.10

<sup>\*</sup>Statistically significant difference p < 0.05

<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>Statistically significant difference p < 0.001



# IV. Tool/Service Analysis Summary

Dashes within the tables indicate questions that were not asked within the specific tool/service survey.

#### **General Impressions of CEP**

Exhibit 38. Please indicate your overall level of familiarity with the Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP).

	I have never heard of CEP	I have heard of CEP, but I don't really know CEP's work	I am somewhat familiar with CEP's work	l know CEP's work well	n
GPR	0%	0%	23%	77%	39
GFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=9)	(n=30)	39
DDD	0%	0%	38%	62%	12
DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=8)	13
CDD	0%	0%	40%	60%	_
SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=3)	5
A al: a a	0%	0%	50%	50%	0
Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=4)	8

Exhibit 39. Which statement best describes how you perceive CEP's reputation among colleagues in your professional network?

	CEP has a <b>poor</b> reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations (1)	CEP has a <b>somewhat negative reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations (2)	CEP has a <b>somewhat positive reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations (3)	CEP has an <b>excellent</b> reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations (4)	Don't know	Mean <sup>24</sup>	n
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	15% (n=6)	74% (n=29)	10% (n=4)	3.8 (n=35)	39
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	77% (n=10)	23% (n=3)	4.0 <sup>†</sup> (n=10)	13
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	60% (n=3)	40% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	3.4 (n=5)	5
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	13% (n=1)	75% (n=6)	13% (n=1)	3.9 (n=7)	8

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 4. <sup>†</sup>DPR approaches statistical significant over GPR p < 0.10



Exhibit 40. In the past year, have you or your organization engaged CEP's resources in any of the following ways?

- Read a CEP research publication (e.g., Foundations Respond to Crisis; New Attitudes, Old Practices: The Provision of Multiyear General Operating Support; Funder Support during the COVID-19 Pandemic; Policy Influence: What Foundations are Doing and Why)
- Read Giving Done Right by Phil Buchanan
- Listened to the Giving Done Right podcast
- Attended CEP webinars/virtual learning programs (e.g., Taking Stock: Philanthropy's Role in Supporting Racial Equity, Foundations Respond to Crisis, Global Funders: Have you Made a Plan to Listen?)
- Attended an event at which a CEP staff member spoke (excluding a presentation of the results of an assessment your organization commissioned)
- Read CEP's blog

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
CDD	82%	15%	3%	20
GPR	(n=32)	(n=6)	(n=1)	39
DDD	77%	23%	0%	12
DPR	(n=10)	(n=3)	(n=0)	13
CDD	100%	0%	0%	
SPR	(n=5)	(n=0)	(n=0)	5
A al: a a	88%	13%	0%	0
Advisory	(n=7)	(n=1)	(n=0)	8

Exhibit 41. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for reflecting on your or your organization's work?

		Not at all useful						Very useful		Total
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	Mean	n
	GPR	0%	0%	4%	0%	15%	52%	30%	6.0	27
A CEP research publication	GFIX	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=14)	(n=8)	0.0	21
	DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	43%	29%	29%	5.9	7
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=2)	(n=2)	5.9	7
	SPR	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	4.5	2
	SPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	4.5	۷
	A -1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	6.3	3
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	0.5	3
	CDD	0%	0%	9%	0%	45%	27%	18%	ГГ	11
	GPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=3)	(n=2)	5.5	- 11
C:	DDD	0%	0%	0%	33%	50%	0%	17%	го	6
Phil Buchanan	DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=1)	5.0	6
	SPR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	A -1	0%	0%	0%	33%	33%	0%	33%	F 2	_
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	5.3	3



		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	Mean	Total n
	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=1)	6.0	2
The Giving Done Right	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=1)	33% (n=1)	33% (n=1)	6.0	3
podcast	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	100% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4.0	1
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	100% (n=1)	7.0	1
	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	20% (n=2)	60% (n=6)	20% (n=2)	6.0	10
CEP webinars/virtual	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	20% (n=1)	40% (n=2)	40% (n=2)	6.2	5
learning programs	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=1)	5.7	3
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=1)	50% (n=1)	6.5	2
	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	25% (n=2)	38% (n=3)	38% (n=3)	6.1	8
An event at which a CEP	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=1)	50% (n=1)	6.5	2
staff member spoke	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	100% (n=1)	7.0	1
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	100% (n=1)	7.0	1
	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	15% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	46% (n=6)	31% (n=4)	8% (n=1)	5.2	13
CEP's blog	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	25% (n=1)	25% (n=1)	25% (n=1)	25% (n=1)	5.5	4
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	5.0	2
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=1)	5.7	3



Exhibit 42. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for improving on your or your organization's work?

A CEP research publication   GPR   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0			Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	Maan	Total
A CEP research publication    A CEP research publication    BOR										Mean	n
A CEP research publication    PR		GPR								5.5	26
A CEP research publication  Publication  A CEP research publication  SPR  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O											
Publication   SPR   0%   0%   0%   100%   0%   0%   0%	4 CED	DPR								5.0	7
SPR											
Advisory   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   67%   0%   33%   0.1	publication	SPR								4.0	2
Advisory   (n=0)   (n=0)   (n=0)   (n=2)   (n=0)   (n=1)   (											
GPR		Advisory								5.7	3
Giving Done Right by Phil Buchanan  Phil Buchanan  DPR  (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=4) (n=5) (n=1) (n=1) (n=1)  DPR  (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=3) (n=1) (n=1) (n=1)  SPR											
Civing Done Right by Phil Buchanan   DPR   O%   O%   O%   O%   S0%   17%   17%   17%   5.0   6		GPR								4.9	11
Phil Buchanan   SPR   (n=0)   (n=0)   (n=0)   (n=3)   (n=1)						•					_
Phil Buchanan   SPR	Givina Done Right by	DPR								5.0	6
SPR			(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=1)		_
Advisory   (n=0)   (n=0)   (n=0)   (n=1)   (n=0)   (n=1)   (		SPR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEP webinars/virtual learning programs   GPR   O%		Advisory	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	33%	33%	5.7	2
The Giving Done Right podcast  The Giving Done Right podcast  DPR  DPR  DPR  DPR  DPR  DPR  DPR  DP		Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	3.1	
The Giving Done Right podcast  The Giving Done Right podcast  DPR  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O		CDD	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	6.0	2
The Giving Done Right podcast  Podcast  SPR  O% O% O% O% 100% O%		GFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	0.0	
Podcast   Podc		DDD	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	6.2	2
SPR	The Giving Done Right	DPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	0.3	5
CEP webinars/virtual learning programs   GPR	podcast	CDD	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	4.0	1
Advisory (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=1) 7.0 1  GPR		SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	4.0	_ 1
CEP webinars/virtual learning programs   GPR   O%   O%   O%   O%   O%   O%   O%   O		A al: a a	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7.0	1
CEP webinars/virtual learning programs   O%		Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	7.0	1
CEP webinars/virtual learning programs  SPR  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O%  O		CDD	0%	0%	0%	40%	40%	10%	10%	4.0	10
CEP webinars/virtual learning programs   SPR   0% 0% 0% 0% 67% 0% 0% 0% 33%   SPR   0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 50% 0% 50% 0% 50% 0% 100% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%		GPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=1)	4.9	10
CEP webinars/virtual		DDD	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	60%	20%	г о	_
Advisory (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=2) (n=0) (n=0) (n=1) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1) (n=1) (n=1) (n=1) (n=0) (n=	CEP webinars/virtual	DPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=1)	5.8	5
Advisory  (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=2) (n=0) (n=0) (n=1)  0% 0% 0% 0% 50% 0% 50%  (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0)  (n=1) (n=0) (n=1)  (n=1) (n=1)  6.0 2  (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1)  (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0)  (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=1)  (n=1) (n=1)  5.3 8  An event at which a CEP staff member spoke  SPR  0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 100% 0%  (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=1) (n=1)  (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0)  (n=0) 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%  Advisory  Advisory  0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 100%  7.0 1	learning programs	CDD	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	33%	г о	
Advisory (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1) (n=1) (0.0 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	5.0	3
An event at which a CEP SPR			0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	6.0	_
An event at which a CEP staff member spoke SPR		Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)		6.0	2
An event at which a CEP SPR									25%		
An event at which a CEP staff member spoke SPR	An event at which a CEP staff member spoke	GPR		(n=0)						5.3	8
An event at which a CEP											
SPR         0%		DPK								6.5	2
SPR (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) 6.0 1  Advisory 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 100% 7.0 1											
0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 100% 7.0 1	•	SPR								6.0	1
Advisorv			0%							<sup>6</sup> 70	
		Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)		1



		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	Mean	Total n
	GPR	0%	0%	8%	31%	38%	23%	0% (n=0)	4.8	13
		(n=0) 0%	(n=0) 0%	(n=1) 0%	(n=4) 50%	(n=5) 0%	(n=3) 25%	(n=0) 25%		-
CED's bloo	DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	5.3	4
CEP's blog	SPR	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	4.0	2
SPR	JF IX	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	4.0	
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=1)	33% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=1)	5.3	3

Exhibit 43. In the past year, have you or your organization used any of CEP's resources in informing conversations with board members?

	Yes	No	Don't know/ Not applicable	n
GPR	53%	34%	13%	32
GPK	(n=17)	(n=11)	(n=4)	52
DDD	70%	0%	30%	10
DPR	(n=7)	(n=0)	(n=3)	10
SPR	0%	0%	100%	4
SPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	4
Advison	50%	33%	17%	6
Advisory	(n=3)	(n=2)	(n=1)	Ö



Exhibit 44. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for reflecting on your organization's efforts related to the following?

									N/A (I did not		
		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	use CEP resources for this purpose)	Mean <sup>25</sup>	Total n
	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	22% (n=7)	28% (n=9)	22% (n=7)	19% (n=6)	9% (n=3)	5.4 (n=29)	32
The COVID-19	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	11% (n=1)	33% (n=3)	22% (n=2)	11% (n=1)	22% (n=2)	5.4 (n=7)	9
Pandemic	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=1)	67% (n=2)	7.0 (n=1)	3
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	20% (n=1)	20% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	60% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	6.0 (n=5)	5
	GPR	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	3% (n=1)	10% (n=3)	33% (n=10)	20% (n=6)	3% (n=1)	27% (n=8)	5.0 (n=22)	30
The movement for racial justice	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=1)	20% (n=2)	20% (n=2)	30% (n=3)	20% (n=2)	5.9 (n=8)	10
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=2)	50% (n=2)	7.0 (n=2)	4
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	5.2 (n=5)	6

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.



Exhibit 45. How strongly do you associate CEP with the following statements? CEP is...

		Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)	Don't Know	Mean <sup>26</sup>	Total n
,	GPR	0%	0%	0%	6%	9%	28%	50%	6%	6.3	32
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=3)	(n=9)	(n=16)	(n=2)	(n=30)	
	DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	6.4	10
Engaged in		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=6)	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=10)	
rigorous work	SPR	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	25%	50%	0%	6.0	4
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=4)	
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	17% (n=1)	33%	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	6.2 (n=5)	6
		(n=0) 0%	(n=0) 0%	(n=0)	(n=0)		(n=2)				
	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6% (n=2)	3% (n=1)	38% (n=12)	50% (n=16)	3% (n=1)	6.4 (n=31)	32
		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	30%		0%	6.7	
An expert in the	DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	30% (n=3)	70% (n=7)	(n=0)	6.7 (n=10)	10
field of		0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	6.3	
philanthropy	SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=4)	4
		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	6.5	
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=6)	6
		0%	0%	3%	3%	6%	56%	25%	6%	6.0	
	GPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=18)	(n=8)	(n=2)	(n=30)	32
Focused on the	DDD	0%	0%	0%	0%	40%	30%	30%	0%	5.9	10
most important	DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=10)	10
issues in	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	50%	25%	6.3	1
philanthropy	3rK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=3)	4
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	17%	17%	6.2	6
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=5)	
	GPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	31%	59%	3%	6.6	32
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=10)	(n=19)	(n=1)	(n=31)	JZ
	DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	30%	70%	0%	6.7	10
Trusted		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=7)	(n=0)	(n=10)	
	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	6.5	4
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=4)	
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	6.5	6
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=6)	
	GPR	0%	0%	0%	6%	34%	22%	31%	6%	5.8	32
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=11)	(n=7)	(n=10)	(n=2)	(n=30)	
Influential on	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	20%	20%	50%	10%	6.3	10
foundation practice and		(n=0) 0%	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=1)	(n=9)	
effectiveness	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	25% (n=1)	25% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	25% (n=1)	25% (n=1)	5.3 (n=3)	4
		0%	0%	(n=0) 0%	0%	33%	(n=0) 33%	33%	(n=1) 0%	6.0	
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	33% (n=2)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	6.0 (n=6)	6
		(11=0)	(11=0)	(11=0)	(11=0)	(11=2)	(11=2)	(11=2)	(11=0)	(11=0)	



		Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree	Don't		Total
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	Know	Mean <sup>26</sup>	n
	GPR	0%	0%	3%	13%	25%	34%	16%	9%	5.5	32
	GFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=8)	(n=11)	(n=5)	(n=3)	(n=29)	32
	DDD	0%	0%	0%	10%	60%	20%	10%	0%	5.3	10
Innovetive	DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=6)	(n=2)	(n=10)	(n=0)	(n=10)	10
Innovative	CDD	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	0%	5.5	4
521	SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=4)	4
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	17%	17%	33%	17%	17%	5.6	
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=5)	6
	CDD	0%	0%	3%	9%	3%	53%	25%	6%	5.9	22
	GPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=1)	(n=17)	(n=8)	(n=2)	(n=30)	32
	DDD	0%	0%	0%	10%	0%	50%	40%	0%	6.2	10
Responsive to the	DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=10)	10
_	CDD	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	50%	0%	25%	5.3	
	SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	4
		0%	0%	0%	0%	17%	67%	17%	0%	6.0	
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=6)	6

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

# **General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement**

Exhibit 46. How satisfied were you with your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory experience overall?

	Not at all satisfied (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very satisfied (7)	Mean	n
GPR	0%	0%	0%	3%	15%	26%	56%	6.4	39
GFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=6)	(n=10)	(n=22)	0.4	33
DDD	0%	0%	0%	8%	23%	23%	46%	<i>C</i> 1	10
DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=6)	6.1	13
CDD	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	6.5	4
SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=3)	6.5	4
Advison	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%	86%	6.7	7
Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=6)	6.7	/



Exhibit 47. How responsive was staff from CEP to questions your organization had during your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory process?

	Not at all responsive (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very responsive (7)	Mean	n
	0%	0%	0%	3%	3%	10%	85%	Mean	
GPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=33)	6.8	39
DDD	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	23%	69%	C C	12
DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=9)	6.6	13
CDD	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	<i>c</i> 0	
SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	6.8	4
A -l	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%	0%	86%	C C	7
Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=6)	6.6	7

Exhibit 48. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree that CEP accurately set expectations regarding the effort required on your end in preparations for the engagement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly agree (7)	Mean	n
GPR	0%	3%	0%	5%	5%	10%	77%	6.5	39
GPK	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=30)	0.5	
DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	38%	54%	6.5	13
DPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=5)	(n=7)	0.5	15
CDD	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	6.0	4
SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	6.8	4
Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%	86%	6.7	7
Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=6)	6.7	,

#### **About Your Most Recent Report and Services**

Exhibit 49. How satisfied are you with the extent to which the CEP staff's interpretation of the results of your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory report was meaningful for guiding reflection on your organization's performance overall?

	Not at all satisfied (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very satisfied (7)	Mean	n
CDD	0%	0%	0%	11%	16%	24%	49%		
GPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=6)	(n=9)	(n=18)	6.1	37
DDD	0%	0%	8%	8%	15%	31%	38%	5.9	10
DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=5)	5.9	13
SPR	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	25%	50%	6.0	4
SPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	0.0	4
Advison	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%	29%	57%	6.3	7
Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=4)	0.5	



Exhibit 50. For each service/feature that was part of your engagement, please rate its helpfulness in deepening your organization's ability to use the GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory report to reflect on its performance.

		Not at all Helpful	(0)		(0)	(7)		Very Helpful		Total
CEP Service		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	Mean	n
	GPR	0%	0%	0%	3%	9%	23%	66%	6.5	35
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=8)	(n=23)		
Memorandum of	DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	15%	23%	62%	6.5	13
Key Findings and		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=3)	(n=8)		
Recommendations/	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	6.7	3
Executive Summary		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	0.7	
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	29%	57%	6.4	7
	710113019	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=4)	0.1	<u>'</u>
	GPR	0%	0%	7%	7%	27%	33%	27%	5.7	15
	GI IX	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=5)	(n=4)	5.1	13
0.41.4.4.6.411.4.4	DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	40%	50%	6.4	10
Online "Getting Ready" guide	DPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=5)	0.4	10
Ready guide	SPR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%		_
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	7.0	1
		0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	23%	70%		
	GPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=7)	(n=21)	6.6	30
Segmentation of the		0%	0%	0%	0%	27%	27%	45%		
data by subgroup	DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=5)	6.2	11
(e.g., program area,		0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%		
department)	SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	6.3	3
,		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%		
	Advisory								7.0	3
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)		
	GPR	0%	0%	0%	13%	0%	13%	75%	6.5	24
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=18)		
Separate reports by	DPR	0%	0%	0%	20%	20%	0%	60%	6.0	5
team, program area,		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=3)		
primary contact, etc.	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7.0	2
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)		
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7.0	1
	710113013	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	7.0	•
	GPR	0%	0%	3%	3%	0%	29%	66%	6.5	35
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=10)	(n=23)	0.5	
Open-ended	DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	38%	15%	46%	6.1	10
respondent comments and	DLV	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=2)	(n=6)	6.1	13
	CDD	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	6.5	
suggestions	SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	65	4
_	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	29%	57%		
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=4)	6.4	7



CEP Service		Not at all Helpful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Helpful (7)	Mean	Total n
	GPR	0%	0%	3%	6%	14%	9%	69%	6.3	35
	GFIX	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=3)	(n=24)	0.5	
Discussion and	DPR	0%	0%	0%	8%	23%	23%	46%	6.1	13
presentation of		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=6)	0.1	
results	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7.0	3
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	7.0	
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	17%	50%	6.2	6
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=3)		
	GPR	0%	0%	4%	4%	15%	19%	58%	6.2	26
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=5)	(n=15)		
Additional analyses	DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	6.1	8
or consultations		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=3)	(n=3)		
after receiving your draft report	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7.0	2
атап тероп		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)		
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33%	67%	6.7	3
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)		
	GPR	0%	15%	15%	23%	31%	0% (n=0)	15%	4.3	13
		(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=3)	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=2)		
CEP research	DPR	0%	0%	0%	33%	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	67%	6.0	3
publications relevant		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)		
to your results	SPR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	6.7	2
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	6.7	3
	GPR	0%	0%	4%	4%	15%	42%	35%	6.0	26
	GPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=11)	(n=9)	0.0	20
	DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	13%	38%	5.9	8
Interactive, online	DFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=3)	3.9	
reporting system	SPR	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	33%	33%	5.3	3
	3F IX	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	J.J	
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	6.3	4
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	0.5	
	GPR	0%	0%	0%	14%	29%	21%	36%	5.8	14
Analysis of results by	GFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=3)	(n=5)	J.0	14
race and ethnicity,	DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	13%	38%	5.9	8
gender, or other		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=3)	5.5	0
demographic	SPR	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	67%	6.0	3
characteristics of	JI 1\	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	0.0	J
respondents	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	6.5	2
	Auvisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	0.5	۷.



Exhibit 51. How well did CEP's work reflect a clear understanding of the specific organizational context of your organization?

	Not at all well						Extremely well		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	Mean	n
GPR	0%	0%	3%	5%	18%	42%	32%	5.9	38
GLK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=7)	(n=16)	(n=12)	5.5	30
DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	23%	54%	23%	6.0	13
DFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=7)	(n=3)	0.0	13
SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	6.3	4
SPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	0.5	4
Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	29%	57%	6.4	7
Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=4)	0.4	,

Exhibit 52. In general, how would you rate the quality of CEP's presentation?

	Poor						Excellent	Not		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	applicable	Mean <sup>27</sup>	Total n
GPR	0%	0%	0%	3%	8%	24%	58%	8%	6.5	38
GFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=9)	(n=22)	(n=3)	(n=35)	30
DPR	0%	0%	0%	8%	8%	31%	54%	0%	6.3	13
DFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=7)	(n=0)	(n=13)	13
SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	7.0	4
JFN	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=2)	4
Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%	86%	0%	6.7	7
Auvisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=6)	(n=0)	(n=7)	/

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

Exhibit 53. Did CEP's presentation of results include a video presentation component?

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
CDD	51%	36%	13%	39
GPR	(n=20)	(n=14)	(n=5)	39
DPR	46%	46%	8%	13
DPK	(n=6)	(n=6)	(n=1)	15
SPR	25%	75%	0%	4
SPK	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=0)	4
A duis on	57%	43%	0%	7
Advisory	(n=4)	(n=3)	(n=0)	



Exhibit 54. Please rate the extent to which CEP's video presentations were each of the following?

		Not at all						Very		Total
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	Mean	n
	GPR	0%	0%	0%	5%	5%	25%	65%	6.5	20
	GFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=5)	(n=13)	0.5	20
	DPR	0%	0%	0%	17%	33%	17%	33%	5.7	6
Clear and compelling	DFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=2)	3.7	
Clear and compening	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7.0	1
	JF IX	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	7.0	
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	25%	50%	6.0	4
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	0.0	
	GPR	0%	0%	5%	10%	5%	30%	50%	6.1	20
	GIK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=6)	(n=10)	0.1	20
Engaging (o.g.	DPR	0%	0%	0%	17%	50%	17%	17%	5.3	6
Engaging (e.g. interactive, participatory,	DFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=1)	(n=1)	J.J	
etc.)	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7.0	1
c.c.,	JF IX	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	7.0	_ '
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	25%	50%	6.0	4
	Auvisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	0.0	4
	GPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	25%	65%	6.6	20
Accessible to all	GPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=13)	0.0	20
participants (e.g., high	DPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6.2	6
quality video and audio,	DFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=2)	0.2	
appropriate for any	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7.0	1
participants with	3FK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	7.0	
disabilities, etc.)	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	6.3	4
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	0.5	_ 4
	GPR	0%	0%	0%	5%	20%	35%	40%	6.1	20
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=7)	(n=8)	0.1	20
Responsive to experience	DPR	0%	0%	17%	0%	33%	33%	17%	5.3	6
of participants (e.g., mood in "room," implicit	DFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=1)	J.J	
signals to dig in or move	SDR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7.0	1
on, etc.)	JF IX	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	7.0	_ '
. ,	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	6.0	4
	Auvisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	0.0	4
	GPR	0%	0%	0%	5%	5%	35%	55%	6.4	20
	GFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=7)	(n=11)	0.4	
Useful (e.g., a good	DPR	0%	0%	0%	17%	17%	33%	33%	5.8	6
jumping-off point for further internal	שרת	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=2)	٥.٥	
engagement)	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7.0	1
engagement)	JFN	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	7.0	1 
	Advisory	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	6.3	4
	Auvisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	0.5	



## **Creating Change with Results**

Exhibit 55. Considering the aspects of your work identified in the table below, please indicate the degree to which use of GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory report results affected change in your foundation's decision-making or practices. (Please consider tangible changes in policy or strategy as well as intangible changes in culture, approach, or mindset when responding.)

Foundation Functions		Too Soon to Tell	No Change (1)	Some Change (2)	Change (3)	Evaluation of Previous Change		Mean <sup>28</sup>	Total n
	GPR	11%	3%	51%	32%	0%	3%	2.3	37
		(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=19)	(n=12)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=32)	
Communications with grantees,	DPR	8%	0%	38%	46%	0%	8%	2.6	13
donors, and/or staff (e.g., clarity,		(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=6)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=11)	
methods of communication)	SPR	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	67%	1.0	3
		(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	
	Advisory	17%	33%	50%	0%	0%	0%	1.6	6
		(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=5)	
	GPR	16%	0%	54%	24%	5%	0%	2.3	37
		(n=6)	(n=0)	(n=20)	(n=9)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=29)	
Grantmaking processes (e.g.,	DPR	8%	39%	8%	8%	8%	31%	1.4	13
selection, reporting and		(n=1)	(n=5)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=7)	
evaluation processes)	SPR	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	67%	1.0	3
·		(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	
	Advisory	0%	33%	33%	0%	0%	33%	1.5	6
		(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=4)	-
	GPR	35%	24%	24%	11%	5%	0%	1.8	37
		(n=13)	(n=9)	(n=9)	(n=4)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=22)	
	DPR	15%	46%	8%	8%	0%	23%	1.3	13
Grantmaking patterns (e.g., size,		(n=2)	(n=6)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=8)	
type, and length of grants)	SPR	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	67%	1.0	3
		(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	
	Advisory	0%	33%	17%	0%	0%	50%	1.3	6
	, tavisory	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=3)	
	GPR	11%	47%	31%	3%	6%	3%	1.5	36
		(n=4)	(n=17)	(n=11)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=29)	
Organization strategy (e.g., what _ it is you're trying to do, focus)	DPR	8%	0%	62%	23%	0%	8%	2.3***	13
		(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=8)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=11)	.5
	SPR	0%	33%	33%	0%	0%	33%	1.5	3
	J. 10	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	
	Advisory	17%	17%	33%	17%	0%	17%	2.0	6
	, (a v /30 i y	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=4)	<u> </u>

Table continues on the next page.



			No	Some	Significant	Evaluation			
		Too Soon	Change	Change	Change	of Previous	Not		Total
Foundation Functions		to Tell	(1)	(2)	(3)	Change	applicable	Mean <sup>28</sup>	n
	GPR	16%	24%	41%	16%	3%	0%	1.9	37
Provision of assistance to	GPK	(n=6)	(n=9)	(n=15)	(n=6)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=30)	51
grantees beyond "the check"	DPR	15%	23%	15%	8%	0%	38%	1.7	12
(e.g., management assistance,	DPK	(n=2)	(n=3)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=6)	13
field-related assistance,	CDD	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	67%	1.0	
assistance securing funding	SPR	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	3
from other sources)	۸ مار باه م بس	0%	50%	17%	0%	0%	33%	1.3	_
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=4)	6
	CDD	14%	54%	22%	5%	0%	5%	1.4	27
	GPR	(n=5)	(n=20)	(n=8)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=30)	37
	DDD	15%	38%	23%	8%	0%	15%	1.6	4.5
C. (f)	DPR	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=3)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=9)	13
Staffing levels	CDD	0%	33%	33%	0%	0%	33%	1.5	_
	SPR	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	3
		0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	1.0	
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=3)	6
		14%	33%	39%	11%	3%	0%	1.7	
	GPR	(n=5)	(n=12)	(n=14)	(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=30)	36
		15%	38%	8%	8%	0%	31%	1.4	
Attitudes toward work with	DPR	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=7)	13
grantees		0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	67%	1.0	
	SPR	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	3
		0%	50%	0%	17%	0%	33%	1.5	
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=4)	6
		14%	19%	11%	3%	0%	54%	1.5	
	GPR	(n=5)	(n=7)	(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=20)	(n=12)	37
		8%	8%	54%	23%	0%	8%	2.2	
Attitudes toward work with	DPR	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=7)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=11)	13
donors		0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	67%	1.0	
	SPR	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	3
		0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	67%	1.0	_
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=2)	6
		11%	38%	27%	8%	0%	16%	1.6	
	GPR	(n=4)	(n=14)	(n=10)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=6)	(n=27)	37
		15%	8%	23%	31%	0%	23%	2.4 <sup>‡</sup>	
Diversity, equity, and inclusion	DPR	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=8)	13
efforts inside your organization									
	SPR	0% (n=0)	25%	25%	25% (n=1)	0%	25% (n=1)	2.0	4
		(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	17%	33%	17%	0%	33%	1.0	6
		(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=4)	

Table continues on the next page.



Foundation Functions		Too Soon to Tell	Change (1)	Change (2)	Change (3)	Evaluation of Previous Change	Not applicable	Mean <sup>28</sup>	Total n
	GPR	16%	38%	35%	3%	0%	8%	1.5	37
		(n=6)	(n=14)	(n=13)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=28)	
Diversity, equity, and inclusion	DPR	23%	0%	31%	31%	0%	15%	2.5	13
efforts related to your programs,		(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=8)	
grantees, donors, or other	SPR	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	67%	1.0	3
partners		(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	
	Advisory	0%	17%	33%	17%	0%	33%	2.0	6
	7 (a v 1301 y	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=4)	
	GPR	19%	22%	41%	11%	8%	0%	1.9	37
		(n=7)	(n=8)	(n=15)	(n=4)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=27)	
	DPR	8%	15%	54%	15%	0%	8%	2.0	13
Approach to understanding you	, DFK	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=7)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=11)	13
mpact	SPR	0%	25%	25%	0%	0%	50%	1.5	4
	3F IX	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	
	Advisory	0%	0%	33%	17%	0%	50%	1.5	6
	Auvisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=3)	
	GPR	11%	32%	38%	8%	0%	11%	1.7	37
	GFK	(n=4)	(n=12)	(n=14)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=29)	51
	DPR	8%	23%	31%	31%	0%	8%	2.1	13
Overanizational/tagm sultura	DPK	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=4)	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=11)	15
Organizational/team culture	SPR	0%	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	2.5	1
	SPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	4
	A duice m	17%	33%	17%	17%	0%	17%	1.8	6
	Advisory	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=4)	0
	CDD	14%	27%	41%	8%	0%	11%	1.8	27
	GPR	(n=5)	(n=10)	(n=15)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=28)	37
	DDD	8%	8%	46%	31%	0%	8%	2.3	12
No. 20 and a second and the con-	DPR	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=6)	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=11)	13
Prioritization of staff time	CDD	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	33%	2.0	
	SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	3
		17%	17%	33%	17%	0%	17%	2.0	6
	Advisory	1770	11,0						

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes responses for no change, some change, and significant change.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> DPR statistically significant difference over GPR p < 0.001

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup> Indicates notable trend of DPR over GPR. Statistical significance testing was not conducted due to insufficient response rates.



Exhibit 56. In supporting your organization's efforts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, how useful was:

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	N/A (My organization didn't use this resource to support related efforts)	Mean <sup>29</sup>	Total n
	GPR	0%	5%	0%	13%	13%	11%	24%	34%	5.4	38
	GPK	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=5)	(n=4)	(n=9)	(n=13)	(n=25)	50
Your report and	DPR	0%	15%	0%	23%	8%	8%	0%	46%	3.9	13
analysis (data,	DPK	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=6)	(n=7)	15
analysis, written	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	7.0	3
narrative, etc.)	SPK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	
	Advisory	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	60%	20%	6.0	5
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=1)	(n=4)	
	GPR	0%	5%	0%	0%	13%	16%	18%	47%	5.7	38
		(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=6)	(n=7)	(n=18)	(n=20)	50
Your engagement	DPR	0%	15%	0%	8%	8%	8%	8%	54%	4.3	13
with CEP staff	DFIX	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=7)	(n=6)	13
(presentation, discussion,	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	7.0	3
facilitation, etc.)	31 IV	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	3
,	Advisory	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	60%	20%	6.0	5
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=1)	(n=4)	5

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

Exhibit 57. In supporting your organization's efforts related to the movement for racial justice, how useful was:

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	N/A (My organization didn't use this resource to support related efforts)	Mean <sup>30</sup>	Total
	GPR	5%	3%	3%	11%	13%	8%	8%	50%	4.6	38
	GFK	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=5)	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=19)	(n=19)	30
Your report and	DPR	0%	15%	15%	0%	0%	15%	0%	54%	3.7	13
analysis (data,	DFK	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=7)	(n=6)	13
analysis, written	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	N/A	3
narrative, etc.)	SFN	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	IN/A	
	Advisory	0%	0%	20%	0%	20%	0%	0%	60%	4.0	5
	Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=2)	J
	GPR	5%	3%	3%	5%	11%	11%	11%	53%	4.8	38
	GFK	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=4)	(n=4)	(n=20)	(n=18)	30
Your engagement	DPR	0%	15%	8%	8%	0%	8%	0%	62%	3.4	13
with CEP staff (presentation,	DFK	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=8)	(n=5)	15
discussion,	SPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	NI/A	3
facilitation, etc.)	3rk	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	N/A	3
, ,	Advisory	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	20%	0%	60%	4.5	5
	Auvisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=2)	)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.



## **Background and the Overall Experience**

Exhibit 58. Relative to other processes your organization has undertaken to assess its overall effectiveness as a grantmaking organization, how useful was your recent GPR, DPR, or SPR?

	Much less useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Much more useful (7)	Don't know	Not applicable (no other assessment processes undertaken)	Mean <sup>31</sup>	Total n
GPR	0%	0%	3%	3%	23%	21%	33%	0%	18%	6.0	39
GFK	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=9)	(n=8)	(n=13)	(n=0)	(n=7)	(n=32)	39
DDD	0%	0%	8%	0%	8%	38%	15%	0%	31%	5.8	13
DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=5)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=9)	13
CDD	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	25%	0%	0%	25%	5.0	
SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	4
Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

Exhibit 59. Does your organization intend to commission the GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory report again in the future?

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
CDD	67%	0%	33%	39
GPR	(n=26)	(n=0)	(n=13)	39
DDD	77%	0%	23%	12
DPR	(n=10)	(n=0)	(n=3)	13
CDD	50%	0%	50%	4
SPR	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=2)	4
A al: a a	80%	0%	20%	_
Advisory	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=1)	5

Exhibit 60. Would you recommend the GPR, DPR, SPR, or CEP's Advisory Services to a colleague organization?

	Yes	No	n
CDD	100%	0%	20
GPR	(n=39)	(n=0)	39
DDD	100%	0%	12
DPR	(n=13)	(n=0)	13
CDD	100%	0%	4
SPR	(n=4)	(n=0)	4
A dvice n	100%	0%	5
Advisory	(n=5)	(n=0)	Э



Exhibit 61. How valuable was your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory Service relative to its cost?

	Very poor value for the cost (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Excellent value for the cost (7)	Mean	n
CDD	0%	0%	0%	11%	32%	29%	29%	го	20
GPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=12)	(n=11)	(n=11)	5.8	38
DDD	0%	0%	8%	8%	23%	38%	23%	Г.С	12
DPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=5)	(n=3)	5.6	13
CDD	0%	0%	33%	0%	33%	0%	33%	F 0	
SPR	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	5.0	3
A -l	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	20%	60%	<i>c</i> 2	_
Advisory	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	6.2	5



# V. All Tool Users 2016 vs. 2018 vs. 2021 Analysis Summary

#### **General Impressions of CEP**

Exhibit 62. Please indicate your overall level of familiarity with the Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP).

	I have never heard of CEP (1)	I have heard of CEP, but I don't really know CEP's work (2)	I am somewhat familiar with CEP's work (3)	l know CEP's work well (4)	Mean <sup>32</sup>	n
2016	0%	0%	11%	89%	3.9*	46
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=41)		70
2018	0%	0%	37%	64%	3.6	85
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=31)	(n=54)		0.5
2021	0%	0%	31%	69%	3.7	65
ZUZ I	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=20)	(n=45)		03

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 4.

Exhibit 63. Which statement best describes how you perceive CEP's reputation among colleagues in your professional network?

		CEP has a <b>somewhat</b>	CEP has a <b>somewhat</b>				
	CEP has a <b>poor</b>	negative reputation	positive reputation	CEP has an excellent			
	reputation among	among leaders of	among leaders of	reputation among			
	leaders of grantmaking	grantmaking	grantmaking	leaders of grantmaking	Don't		
	organizations (1)	organizations (2)	organizations (3)	organizations (4)	know	Mean <sup>33</sup>	n
2016	0%	0%	24%	74%	2%	3.8	46
2016	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=11)	(n=34)	(n=1)	(n=45)	40
2018	0%	0%	17%	74%	10%	3.8	84
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=14)	(n=62)	(n=8)	(n=76)	04
2021	0%	0%	15%	72%	12%	3.8	65
	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=10)	(n=47)	(n=8)	(n=57)	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup>The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 4.

 $<sup>^*</sup>$ 2016 statistically significant difference over 2021 p < 0.05



Exhibit 64. In the past year, have you or has someone in your organization read a CEP research publication?34

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
2016	94%	4%	2%	46
2016	(n=43)	(n=2)	(n=1)	40
2010	88%	7%	5%	0.4
2018	(n=74)	(n=6)	(n=4)	84

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> This language reflects the 2016 and 2018 version of the survey. This exhibit has been included for reference when reviewing Exhibit 63.

Exhibit 65. Please select the CEP resources your organization engaged with during the past year.

• Read a CEP research publication (e.g., Foundations Respond to Crisis; New Attitudes, Old Practices: The Provision of Multiyear General Operating Support; Funder Support during the COVID-19 Pandemic; Policy Influence: What Foundations are Doing and Why)35

	Yes	No	n
2016	-	-	-
2018	-	-	-
2021	80%	20%	54
2021	(n=43)	(n=11)	54

<sup>35</sup> This table shows those who did and did not select "Read a CEP research publication". Other resources were not asked about in 2016 and 2018, and thus, cannot be compared.

Exhibit 66. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's research publication(s) for reflecting on your or your foundation's work?36

	Not at all useful (1)	Not very useful (2)	Somewhat useful (3)	Very useful (4)	Extremely useful (5)	Mean	n
2016	0%	0%	37%	49%	14%	3.8	43
2016	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=16)	(n=21)	(n=6)	5.0	43
2010	0%	0%	37%	50%	14%	2.0	74
2018	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=27)	(n=37)	(n=10)	3.8	74

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> In 2021, this question was switched to a 7-point scale to be consistent with other scales throughout the survey. This exhibit has been included for reference.

Exhibit 67. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for reflecting on your or your organization's work?

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	Mean	Total n
A CEP research publication	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-
	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	0%	0%	3%	3%	21%	46%	28%	6.0	20
	2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=8)	(n=18)	(n=11)	6.0	39



Exhibit 68. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's research publication(s) for improving your or your foundation's work?37

	Not at all useful (1)	Not very useful (2)	Somewhat useful (3)	Very useful (4)	Extremely useful (5)	Mean	n
2016	0%	9%	56%	21%	14%	3.4	43
2010	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=24)	(n=9)	(n=6)	5.4	43
2010	0%	1%	52%	36%	11%	2.0	72
2018	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=38)	(n=26)	(n=8)	3.6	73

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> In 2021, this question was switched to a 7-point scale to be consistent with other scales throughout the survey. This exhibit has been included for reference.

Exhibit 69. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for improving on your or your organization's work?

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	Mean	Total n
A CEP research publication	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_
	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	0%	0%	3%	21%	39%	16%	21%	5.3	20
	2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=8)	(n=15)	(n=6)	(n=8)		38

Exhibit 70. In the past year, have you or your organization used any of CEP's resources in informing conversations with board members?38

	Yes	No	Don't know/ Not applicable	n
2016	44%	50%	7%	46
2016	(n=20)	(n=23)	(n=3)	40
2010	38%	53%	10%	74
2018	(n=28)	(n=39)	(n=7)	74
2021	52%	25%	23%	52
2021	(n=27)	(n=13)	(n=12)	52

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> The 2016/2018 survey question language is comparable to the 2021 language. 2016/2018 language reads as: "In the past year, have you used any of CEP's writings (research publications, blog posts, other communications or publications) as a basis of discussion with board members?"



Exhibit 71. How strongly do you associate CEP with the following statements? CEP is...

		Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)	Don't Know	Mean <sup>39</sup>	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Engaged in rigorous work	2018	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	1% (n=1)	4% (n=3)	14% (n=12)	32% (n=27)	45% (n=38)	2% (n=2)	6.2 (n=82)	84
	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6% (n=3)	8% (n=4)	35% (n=18)	46% (n=24)	6% (n=3)	6.3 (n=49)	52
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
An expert in the field of philanthropy	2018	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	7% (n=6)	33% (n=28)	55% (n=46)	2% (n=2)	6.4 (n=82)	84
	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=2)	4% (n=2)	37% (n=19)	54% (n=28)	2% (n=1)	6.4 (n=51)	52
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Focused on the most important issues in	2018	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	1% (n=1)	1% (n=1)	14% (n=12)	49% (n=41)	26% (n=22)	7% (n=6)	6.0 (n=78)	84
philanthropy	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	13% (n=7)	48% (n=25)	27% (n=14)	8% (n=4)	6.0 (n=48)	52
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Trusted	2018	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	1% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=4)	39% (n=32)	52% (n=43)	2% (n=2)	6.4 (n=81)	83
	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=2)	35% (n=18)	60% (n=31)	2% (n=1)	6.6 (n=51)	52
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Influential on foundation practice and effectiveness	2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	5% (n=4)	20% (n=17)	32% (n=27)	36% (n=30)	6% (n=5)	6.0 (n=79)	84
	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6% (n=3)	31% (n=16)	21% (n=11)	35% (n=18)	8% (n=4)	5.9 (n=48)	52
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Innovative	2018	0% (n=0)	2% (n=2)	1% (n=1)	8% (n=7)	29% (n=24)	35% (n=29)	14% (n=12)	11% (n=9)	5.5 (n=75)	84
20 71	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	13% (n=7)	31% (n=16)	31% (n=16)	15% (n=8)	8% (n=4)	5.5 (n=48)	52

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.



## **General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement**

Exhibit 72. How satisfied were you with your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory experience overall?

	Not at all satisfied (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very satisfied (7)	Mean	n
2016	0%	0%	0%	4%	11%	30%	54%	6.4	46
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=14)	(n=25)	0.4	40
2018	0%	1%	2%	1%	7%	35%	53%	6.3	83
2010	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=6)	(n=29)	(n=44)	0.5	03
2021	0%	0%	0%	3%	17%	21%	59%	6.3	63
2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=11)	(n=13)	(n=37)	0.5	03

Exhibit 73. How responsive was staff from CEP to questions your foundation had during your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory process?

	Not at all responsive (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very responsive (7)	Mean	n
2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	20% (n=9)	80% (n=37)	6.8	46
2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	4% (n=3)	10% (n=8)	85% (n=70)	6.8	82
2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=2)	3% (n=2)	13% (n=8)	81% (n=51)	6.7	63

#### **About Your Most Recent Report and Services**

Exhibit 74. How satisfied are you with the extent to which the CEP staff's interpretation of the results of your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory report was meaningful for guiding reflection on your organization's performance overall?

	Not at all satisfied (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very satisfied (7)	Mean	n
2016	0%	0%	0%	5%	19%	48%	29%	6.0	42
	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=8)	(n=20)	(n=12)		
2018	0%	0%	0%	4%	15%	38%	43%	6.2	72
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=11)	(n=27)	(n=31)	0.2	12
2021	0%	0%	2%	11%	13%	26%	48%	6.1	61
2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=7)	(n=8)	(n=16)	(n=29)	0.1	ΟI



Exhibit 75. Please indicate which of the following services/features you used as part of your recent GPR, DPR, or SPR engagement.

		Frequency	Percent
Memorandum of	2016	-	-
Key Findings and Recommendations/	2018	72	97%
Executive Summary	2021	59	97%
Segmentation of the data by	2016	-	-
subgroup (e.g., program area,	2018	68	92%
department)	2021	48	79%
	2016	-	-
Open-ended respondent comments and suggestions	2018	72	97%
	2021	60	98%
Additional analyses or	2016	-	-
consultations after receiving	2018	55	74%
your draft report	2021	40	66%
	2016	-	-
CEP research publications relevant to your results	2018	37	50%
,	2021	19	31%
	2016	-	-
Interactive online reporting system	2018	62	84%
-1	2021	43	70%



Exhibit 76. For each service/feature that was part of your engagement, please rate its helpfulness in deepening your organization's ability to use the GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory to reflect on its performance.

		Not at all helpful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very helpful (7)	Not applicable/ Did not use	Mean <sup>40</sup>	Total n
Memorandum of	2016	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	5% (n=2)	15% (n=6)	22% (n=9)	54% (n=22)	0% (n=0)	6.1 (n=41)	41
Key Findings and Recommendations/	2018	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=5)	12% (n=9)	24% (n=18)	53% (n=39)	3% (n=2)	6.2 (n=72)	74
Executive Summary	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	10% (n=6)	24% (n=14)	64% (n=37)	-	6.5 (n=58)	58
Segmentation of the	2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=3)	5% (n=2)	10% (n=4)	28% (n=11)	50% (n=20)	0% (n=0)	6.1 (n=40)	40
data by subgroup (e.g., program area,	2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=3)	16% (n=12)	23% (n=17)	49% (n=36)	8% (n=6)	6.3 (n=68)	74
department)	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=2)	9% (n=4)	21% (n=10)	66% (n=31)	-	6.5 (n=47)	47
Onen ended	2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	7% (n=3)	24% (n=10)	63% (n=26)	0% (n=0)	6.5 (n=41)	41
Open-ended respondent comments and suggestions <sup>41</sup>	2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=5)	14% (n=10)	31% (n=23)	46% (n=34)	3% (n=2)	6.2 (n=72)	74
	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	10% (n=6)	27% (n=16)	59% (n=35)	-	6.4 (n=59)	59
Additional analyses or	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
consultations after receiving your draft	2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	9% (n=7)	24% (n=18)	39% (n=29)	27% (n=20)	6.4 (n=54)	74
report <sup>42</sup>	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	3% (n=1)	15% (n=6)	23% (n=9)	56% (n=22)	-	6.3 (n=39)	39
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEP research publications relevant	2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	12% (n=9)	15% (n=11)	12% (n=9)	11% (n=8)	50% (n=37)	5.4 (n=37)	74
to your results	2021	0% (n=0)	11% (n=2)	11% (n=2)	21% (n=4)	21% (n=4)	5% (n=1)	32% (n=6)	-	4.9 (n=19)	19
Interactive online reporting system <sup>43</sup>	2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	12% (n=5)	31% (n=13)	50% (n=21)	0% (n=0)	6.2 (n=42)	42
	2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	3% (n=2)	16% (n=12)	24% (n=18)	39% (n=29)	16% (n=12)	6.2 (n=62)	74
40 T	2021	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	2% (n=1)	22% (n=9)	34% (n=14)	37% (n=15)	-	6.0 (n=41)	41

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> The 2016 survey question language is comparable to the 2018 language. 2016 language reads as: "Downloadable PDF of all respondent comments and suggestions"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> The 2016/2018 survey question language is comparable to the 2021 language. 2016/2018 language reads as: "Additional analyses after receiving your draft report"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> The 2016/2018 survey question language is comparable to the 2021 language. 2016/2018 language reads as: "Interactive online report"



Exhibit 77. How well did CEP's work reflect a clear understanding of the specific context of your organization?

	Not at all well (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Extremely well (7)	Mean	n
	0%	0%	2%	7%	33%	31%	26%		
2016	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=3)	(n=14)	(n=13)	(n=11)	5.7	42
2010	0%	3%	0%	7%	19%	35%	36%	г о	70
2018	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=14)	(n=25)	(n=26)	5.9	72
2021	0%	0%	2%	3%	19%	42%	34%	6.0	62
2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=12)	(n=26)	(n=21)	6.0	62

Exhibit 78. In general, how would you rate the quality of CEP's presentation? 44

	Poor						Excellent	Not		Total
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	applicable	Mean <sup>45</sup>	n
2016	0%	0%	0%	5%	5%	17%	46%	27%	6.4	41
2016	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=7)	(n=19)	(n=11)	(n=30)	41
2010	0%	0%	0%	3%	7%	14%	56%	21%	6.5	72
2018	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=10)	(n=40)	(n=15)	(n=57)	72
2021	0%	0%	0%	3%	8%	21%	60%	8%	6.5	<b>C</b> 2
2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=13)	(n=37)	(n=5)	(n=57)	62

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup> The 2016/2018 survey question language is comparable to the 2021 language. 2016/2018 language reads as: "In general, how would you rate the quality of CEP's in-person presentation?"

#### **Creating Change with Results**

Exhibit 79. Considering the aspects of your work identified in the table below, please indicate the degree to which use of GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory report results affected change in your organization's decision-making or practices. (Please consider tangible changes in policy or strategy as well as intangible changes in culture, approach, or mindset when responding.)

		Too Soon to Tell	No Change (1)	Some Change (2)	Significant Change (3)	of Previous		Mean <sup>46</sup>	Total n
	2016	33%	7%	29%	26%	2%	2%	2.3	42
Commented the control		(n=14)	(n=3)	(n=12)	(n=11)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=26)	
Communications with grantees, donors, and/or staff (e.g., clarity,	2010	15%	7%	50%	25%	3%	0%	2.2	72
methods of communication)	2010	(n=11)	(n=5)	(n=36)	(n=18)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=59)	12
methods of communication)	2021	10%	7%	46%	31%	0%	7%	2.3	59
	2021	(n=6)	(n=4)	(n=27)	(n=18)	(n=0)	(n=4)	(n=49)	
	2016	43%	14%	21%	10%	0%	12%	1.9	42
	2010	(n=18)	(n=6)	(n=9)	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=19)	42
Grantmaking processes (e.g.,	2018	25%	14%	42%	6%	1%	13%	1.9	72
selection, reporting and evaluation processes)	2010	(n=18)	(n=10)	(n=30)	(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=9)	(n=44)	12
	2021	12%	14%	39%	17%	5%	14%	2.0	59
	2021	(n=7)	(n=8)	(n=23)	(n=10)	(n=3)	(n=8)	(n=41)	59

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup>The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7



		Too Soon to Tell	No Change (1)	Some Change (2)	Significant Change (3)	of Previous	Not applicable	Mean <sup>46</sup>	Total n
	2016	31%	41%	7%	7%	2%	12%	1.4	42
	2016	(n=13)	(n=17)	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=1)	(n=5)	(n=23)	42
Grantmaking patterns (e.g., size,	2018	25%	38%	19%	3%	0%	15%	1.4	72
type, and length of grants)	2010	(n=18)	(n=27)	(n=14)	(n=2)	(n=0)	(n=11)	(n=43)	12
	2021	25%	31%	17%	8%	5%	14%	1.6	59
	2021	(n=15)	(n=18)	(n=10)	(n=5)	(n=3)	(n=8)	(n=33)	29
	2016	31%	44%	10%	5%	5%	5%	1.4	39
	2016	(n=12)	(n=17)	(n=4)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=23)	39
Organization strategy (e.g., what	2018	22%	42%	22%	4%	3%	7%	1.5	72
it is you're trying to do, focus)	2010	(n=16)	(n=30)	(n=16)	(n=3)	(n=2)	(n=5)	(n=49)	12
	2021	10%	33%	38%	9%	3%	7%	1.7	го
	2021	(n=6)	(n=19)	(n=22)	(n=5)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=46)	58
Provision of assistance to	2016	33%	26%	21%	12%	2%	5%	1.8	42
grantees beyond "the check"	2016	(n=14)	(n=11)	(n=9)	(n=5)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=25)	42
e.g., management assistance, eld-related assistance, ssistance securing funding	2018	19%	17%	43%	6%	4%	11%	1.8	72
		(n=14)	(n=12)	(n=31)	(n=4)	(n=3)	(n=8)	(n=47)	72
	2021	14%	27%	31%	12%	2%	15%	1.8	59
from other sources)	2021	(n=8)	(n=16)	(n=18)	(n=7)	(n=1)	(n=9)	(n=41)	59
	2016	29%	57%	7%	2%	0%	5%	1.2	42
	2016	(n=12)	(n=24)	(n=3)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=28)	42
Claff and lands	2010	13%	60%	19%	3%	3%	3%	1.3	70
Staffing levels	2018	(n=9)	(n=43)	(n=14)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=59)	72
	2021	12%	49%	20%	5%	0%	14%	1.4	Γ0
	2021	(n=7)	(n=29)	(n=12)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=8)	(n=44)	59
	2016	35%	18%	33%	10%	0%	5%	1.9	40
	2016	(n=14)	(n=7)	(n=13)	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=24)	40
Attitudes toward work with	2010	23%	16%	41%	6%	1%	14%	1.8	71
grantees	2018	(n=16)	(n=11)	(n=29)	(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=10)	(n=44)	71
	2021	12%	36%	26%	10%	2%	14%	1.6	Ε0
	2021	(n=7)	(n=21)	(n=15)	(n=6)	(n=1)	(n=8)	(n=42)	58
ttitudes toward work with	2016	31%	17%	2%	2%	2%	45%	1.3	42
	2016	(n=13)	(n=7)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=19)	(n=9)	42
	2010	10%	19%	13%	6%	1%	51%	1.6	72
donors	2018	(n=7)	(n=14)	(n=9)	(n=4)	(n=1)	(n=37)	(n=27)	72
	2024	10%	19%	19%	7%	0%	46%	1.7	<b>F</b> 0
	2021	(n=6)	(n=11)	(n=11)	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=27)	(n=26)	59

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup>The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes responses for no change, some change, and significant change.



## **Background and the Overall Experience**

Exhibit 80. Relative to other processes your foundation has undertaken to assess its overall effectiveness as a grantmaking organization, how useful was your recent GPR, DPR, or SPR?

	Much less useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Much more useful (7)	Don't know	Not applicable (no other assessment processes undertaken)	Mean <sup>47</sup>	Total n
2016	0%	0%	2%	5%	27%	24%	29%	0%	12%	5.8	
2016	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=11)	(n=10)	(n=12)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=36)	41
2010	0%	0%	3%	3%	17%	27%	19%	0%	31%	5.8	70
2018	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=12)	(n=19)	(n=13)	(n=0)	(n=22)	(n=48)	70
2021	0%	0%	4%	4%	20%	25%	27%	0%	21%	5.9	56
202 I	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=2)	(n=11)	(n=14)	(n=15)	(n=0)	(n=12)	(n=44)	36

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

Exhibit 81. Does your organization intend to commission the GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory report again in the future?

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
2016	69%	0%	31%	42
2010	(n=29)	(n=0)	(n=13)	42
2010	72%	1%	26%	72
2018	(n=52)	(n=1)	(n=19)	12
2021	69%	0%	31%	C 1
2021	(n=42)	(n=0)	(n=19)	61

Exhibit 82. Would you recommend the GPR, DPR, SPR, or CEP's Advisory Services to a colleague organization?

	Yes	No	n
2016	100%	0%	46
2016	(n=46)	(n=0)	40
2010	98%	3%	0.1
2018	(n=79)	(n=2)	81
2021	100%	0%	61
2021	(n=61)	(n=0)	61

Exhibit 83. How valuable was your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or Advisory Service relative to its cost?

	Very poor value for the cost (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Excellent value for the cost (7)	Mean	n
2016	0%	2%	2%	4%	35%	35%	22%	5.6	46
	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=16)	(n=16)	(n=10)		
2018	0%	0%	3%	15%	17%	36%	30%	5.8	81
2010	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=12)	(n=14)	(n=29)	(n=24)	5.0	01
2021	0%	0%	3%	10%	27%	29%	31%	г О	Ε0
2021	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=6)	(n=16)	(n=17)	(n=18)	5.9	59



## VI. Stakeholders 2016 vs. 2018 vs. 2021 Analysis Summary

#### **General Impressions of CEP**

Exhibit 84. Please indicate your overall level of familiarity with the Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP).

	I have never heard of CEP	I have heard of CEP, but I don't really know CEP's work	I am somewhat familiar with CEP's work	l know CEP's work well	n
2016	2%	14%	43%	41%	231
2010	(n=5)	(n=32)	(n=99)	(n=95)	231
2010	1%	11%	49%	40%	219
2018	(n=1)	(n=24)	(n=107)	(n=87)	219
2021	2%	17%	43%	39%	288
2021	(n=5)	(n=48)	(n=124)	(n=111)	200

Exhibit 85. Which statement best describes how you perceive CEP's reputation among colleagues in your professional network?

	CEP has a <b>poor</b> reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations (1)	CEP has a <b>somewhat negative reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations (2)	CEP has a <b>somewhat positive reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations (3)	CEP has an <b>excellent</b> reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations (4)	Don't know	Mean <sup>48</sup>	n
2016	0%	1%	34%	54%	12%	3.6	192
2010	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=65)	(n=103)	(n=23)	(n=169)	192
2010	0%	1%	28%	55%	17%	3.6	100
2018	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=52)	(n=103)	(n=31)	(n=157)	188
2021	0%	1%	29%	59%	11%	3.7	227
2021	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=66)	(n=134)	(n=25)	(n=202)	227

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 4.

Exhibit 86. In the past year, have you or has someone in your organization read a CEP research publication? 49

	Yes	No	Don't know	n	
2016	82%	5%	13%	104	
2016	(n=159)	(n=9)	(n=26)	194	
2010	79%	9%	12%	100	
2018	(n=149)	(n=16)	(n=23)	188	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> This language reflects the 2016 and 2018 version of the survey. This exhibit has been included for reference when reviewing Exhibit 84.



Exhibit 87. Please select the CEP resources your organization engaged with during the past year.

• Read a CEP research publication (e.g., Foundations Respond to Crisis; New Attitudes, Old Practices: The Provision of Multiyear General Operating Support; Funder Support during the COVID-19 Pandemic; Policy Influence: What Foundations are Doing and Why)50

	Yes	No	n
2016	-	-	-
2018	-	-	-
2021	79%	21%	179
2021	(n=142)	(n=37)	179

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> This table shows those who did and did not select "Read a CEP research publication". Other resources were not asked about in 2016 and 2018, and thus, cannot be compared.

Exhibit 88. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's research publication(s) for reflecting on your or your foundation's work? 51

	Not at all useful (1)	Not very useful (2)	Somewhat useful (3)	Very useful (4)	Extremely useful (5)	Mean	n
2016	0%	1%	53%	41%	6%	3.5	158
2010	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=83)	(n=64)	(n=9)	5.5	130
2010	0%	5%	46%	44%	5%	2 5	147
2018	(n=0)	(n=7)	(n=68)	(n=65)	(n=7)	3.5	147

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> In 2021, this question was switched to a 7-point scale to be consistent with other scales throughout the survey. This exhibit has been included for reference.

Exhibit 89. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for reflecting on your or your organization's work?

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	Mean	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A CEP research	2018	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-
publication	2021	0%	1%	3%	10%	29%	35%	22%	F 6	124
	2U2 I	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=12)	(n=36)	(n=44)	(n=27)	5.6	124

Exhibit 90. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's research publication(s) for improving your or your foundation's work? 52

	Not at all useful (1)	Not very useful (2)	Somewhat useful (3)	Very useful (4)	Extremely useful (5)	Mean	n
2016	0%	8%	64%	25%	4%	3.3	159
2016	(n=0)	(n=12)	(n=101)	(n=40)	(n=6)	5.5	159
2010	1%	11%	60%	26%	3%	2.2	1.46
2018	(n=1)	(n=16)	(n=87)	(n=38)	(n=4)	3.2	146

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup> In 2021, this question was switched to a 7-point scale to be consistent with other scales throughout the survey. This exhibit has been included for reference.



Exhibit 91. In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's resources for improving your or your organization's work?

		Not at all useful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very useful (7)	Mean	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_
A CEP research	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
publication	2021	0%	2%	7%	23%	28%	25%	15%	Г 1	124
	2021	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=9)	(n=28)	(n=35)	(n=31)	(n=18)	5.1	124

Exhibit 92. In the past year, have you used any of CEP's resources in informing conversations with board members? 53

	Yes	No	Don't know/ Not applicable	n
2016	28%	63%	9%	184
2010	(n=52)	(n=115)	(n=17)	104
2010	32%	60%	8%	1 / 0
2018	(n=47)	(n=89)	(n=12)	148
2021	40%	49%	11%	161
2021	(n=64)	(n=79)	(n=18)	161

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>53</sup> The 2016/2018 survey question language is comparable to the 2021 language. 2016/2018 language reads as: "In the past year, have you used any of CEP's writings (research publications, blog posts, other communications or publications) as a basis of discussion with board members?"

Exhibit 93. How strongly do you associate CEP with the following statements? CEP is...

		Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)	Don't Know	Mean <sup>54</sup>	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-
Engaged in rigorous work	2018	1% (n=1)	2% (n=4)	1% (n=2)	5% (n=9)	16% (n=30)	36% (n=67)	22% (n=41)	18% (n=34)	5.8 (n=154)	188
	2021	1% (n=1)	1% (n=1)	1% (n=2)	6% (n=9)	15% (n=23)	39% (n=61)	30% (n=47)	8% (n=12)	5.9 (n=144)	156
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
An expert in the field of philanthropy	2018	0% (n=0)	3% (n=5)	3% (n=6)	3% (n=6)	15% (n=27)	37% (n=67)	32% (n=57)	7% (n=12)	5.9 (n=168)	180
	2021	1% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=3)	3% (n=4)	14% (n=22)	37% (n=57)	42% (n=65)	3% (n=4)	6.1* (n=152)	156
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
philanthropy	2018	0% (n=0)	4% (n=7)	3% (n=5)	9% (n=17)	24% (n=46)	30% (n=56)	15% (n=28)	15% (n=29)	5.4 (n=159)	188
	2021	0% (n=0)	1% (n=2)	3% (n=4)	8% (n=12)	21% (n=33)	41% (n=64)	22% (n=35)	4% (n=6)	5.7* (n=150)	156

Table continues on next page.



		Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)	Don't Know	Mean <sup>54</sup>	Total n
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Trusted	2018	0% (n=0)	2% (n=4)	2% (n=4)	5% (n=9)	10% (n=19)	34% (n=64)	34% (n=64)	13% (n=24)	6.0 (n=164)	188
	2021	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	1% (n=1)	5% (n=8)	12% (n=19)	36% (n=56)	40% (n=62)	5% (n=7)	6.1 (n=147)	154
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Influential on foundation practice	2018	0% (n=0)	3% (n=5)	1% (n=2)	8% (n=15)	26% (n=47)	27% (n=49)	23% (n=41)	11% (n=20)	5.6 (n=159)	179
and effectiveness	2021	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	1% (n=1)	8% (n=13)	20% (n=31)	37% (n=57)	25% (n=38)	9% (n=14)	5.8 (n=141)	155
	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Innovative	2018	0% (n=0)	2% (n=4)	5% (n=10)	10% (n=19)	27% (n=51)	23% (n=44)	10% (n=19)	22% (n=41)	5.2 (n=147)	188
_	2021	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	6% (n=9)	19% (n=30)	20% (n=31)	36% (n=56)	12% (n=18)	6% (n=10)	5.3 (n=145)	155

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup> The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

<sup>\*</sup>Statistically significant difference p < 0.05