

# Center for Effective Philanthropy 2016 Resource and Assessment Survey

Analysis Summary

---

## September 2016

**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.

# I. Survey Response Rates

---

Type of Survey	Response Rate	Percent
GPR	30/42	71%
DPR	6/8	75%
SPR	6/9	67%
Advisory Services	4/8	50%
General (non-tool)	231/987	23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>277/1054</b>	<b>26%</b>

## II. All Responses Analysis Summary

### 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
2% (n=5)	12% (n=32)	38% (n=104)	49% (n=136)	277

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

CEP has a <b>poor reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a <b>somewhat negative reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a <b>somewhat positive reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has an <b>excellent reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations	Don't know	n
0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	32% (n=76)	58% (n=137)	10% (n=24)	238
0% (n=)	1% (n=1)	36% (n=76)	64% (n=137)	-	214

**Exhibit 3.** In the past year, have you or someone in your organization read a CEP research publication (e.g., *Sharing What Matters: Foundation Transparency*; *Benchmarking Foundation Governance*; *Investing and Social Impact*; *Assessing to Achieve High Performance*, etc.)?

Yes	No	Don't know	n
84% (n=202)	5% (n=11)	11% (n=27)	240

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

Not at all useful (1)	Not very useful (2)	Somewhat useful (3)	Very useful (4)	Extremely useful (5)	Mean	n
0% (n=0)	1% (n=2)	49% (n=99)	42% (n=85)	8% (n=15)	3.6	201

**Exhibit 5.** In the past year, how useful have you found CEP’s research publication(s) for improving your or your foundation’s work?

Not at all useful (1)	Not very useful (2)	Somewhat useful (3)	Very useful (4)	Extremely useful (5)	Mean	n
0% (n=0)	8% (n=16)	62% (n=125)	24% (n=49)	6% (n=12)	3.3	202

**Exhibit 6.** In the past year, have you or your colleagues used any of CEP’s writings (research publications, blog posts, other communications or publications) as a basis of discussion with board members?

Yes	No	Don’t know/ Not applicable	n
31% (n=72)	60% (n=138)	9% (n=20)	230

## General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement

**Exhibit 7.** 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
0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=2)	11% (n=5)	30% (n=14)	54% (n=25)	6.4	46

**Exhibit 8.** 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
0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	20% (n=9)	80% (n=37)	6.8	46

## About Your Most Recent Report and Services

**Exhibit 9.** How satisfied are you with the extent to which the CEP staff’s interpretation of the results of your recent GPR, DPR, or SPR was meaningful for guiding reflection on your foundation’s performance overall?

Not at all satisfied (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very satisfied (7)	Mean	n
0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	19% (n=8)	48% (n=20)	29% (n=12)	6.0	42

**Exhibit 10.** 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.

	Not at all helpful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very helpful (7)	Not applicable/ Did not use	Mean*	Total n
Memorandum of Key Findings and Recommendations/ Executive Summary	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	5% (n=2)	14% (n=6)	21% (n=9)	52% (n=22)	2% (n=1)	6.1 (n=41)	42
Interactive online Report	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
Segmentation of the data by subgroup (e.g., program area, department)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=3)	5% (n=2)	10% (n=4)	26% (n=11)	48% (n=20)	5% (n=2)	6.1 (n=40)	42
Downloadable PDF of all respondent comments and suggestions for the foundation	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	7% (n=3)	24% (n=10)	62% (n=26)	2% (n=1)	6.5 (n=41)	42

\*The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

**Exhibit 11.** How well did CEP’s work reflect a clear understanding of the specific organizational context of your foundation?

Not at all well (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Extremely well (7)	Mean	n
0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	7% (n=3)	33% (n=14)	31% (n=13)	26% (n=11)	5.7	42

**Exhibit 12.** In general, how would you rate the quality of CEP’s in-person presentation?

Poor (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Excellent (7)	Not applicable	Mean*	Total n
0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	5% (n=2)	17% (n=7)	46% (n=19)	29% (n=11)	6.4 (n=30)	41

\*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 13.** Considering the aspects of your work identified in the table below, please indicate the degree to which use of GPR, DPR, or SPR 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)	Significant Change (3)	Evaluation of Previous Change	Not applicable	Mean*	Total n
Communications with grantees, donors, and/or staff (e.g., clarity, methods of communication)	33% (n=14)	7% (n=3)	29% (n=12)	26% (n=11)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	2.3 (n=26)	42
Grantmaking processes (e.g., selection, reporting and evaluation processes)	43% (n=18)	14% (n=6)	21% (n=9)	10% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	12% (n=5)	1.9 (n=19)	42
Grantmaking patterns (e.g., size and length of grants)	31% (n=13)	41% (n=17)	7% (n=3)	7% (n=3)	2% (n=1)	12% (n=5)	1.4 (n=23)	42
Foundation strategy (e.g., what it is you're trying to do, focus)	31% (n=12)	44% (n=17)	10% (n=4)	5% (n=2)	5% (n=2)	5% (n=2)	1.4 (n=23)	39
Provision of assistance to grantees beyond "the check" (e.g., management assistance, field-related assistance, assistance securing funding from other sources)	33% (n=14)	26% (n=11)	21% (n=9)	12% (n=5)	2% (n=1)	5% (n=2)	1.8 (n=25)	42
Staffing levels	29% (n=12)	57% (n=24)	7% (n=3)	2% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	1.2 (n=28)	42
Attitudes toward work with grantees	35% (n=14)	18% (n=7)	33% (n=13)	10% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	1.9 (n=24)	40
Attitudes toward work with donors	31% (n=13)	17% (n=7)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	45% (n=19)	1.3 (n=9)	42
Allocation of resources for a particular program area or department	29% (n=12)	50% (n=21)	7% (n=3)	5% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=4)	1.3 (n=26)	42
Addressing performance of a particular program officer/other staff member	31% (n=13)	31% (n=13)	17% (n=7)	7% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	14% (n=6)	1.6 (n=23)	42
Addressing performance of or approach to a particular program area or department	33% (n=14)	29% (n=12)	21% (n=9)	10% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=3)	1.7 (n=25)	42

\*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 14.** 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)	I don't know	Not applicable (no other assessment processes undertaken)	Mean*	Total n
0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	5% (n=2)	27% (n=11)	24% (n=10)	29% (n=12)	2% (n=1)	10% (n=4)	5.8 (n=36)	41

\*The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

**Exhibit 15.** Does your foundation intend to commission the GPR, DPR, or SPR again in the future?

Yes	No	Don't know	n
69% (n=29)	0% (n=0)	31% (n=13)	42

**Exhibit 16.** Would you recommend the GPR, DPR, SPR, or CEP's customized engagements to a colleague foundation?

Yes	No	n
100% (n=46)	0% (n=0)	46

**Exhibit 17.** How valuable was your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or customized engagement relative to its cost?

Very poor value for the cost (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Excellent value for the cost (7)	Mean	n
0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	4% (n=2)	35% (n=16)	35% (n=16)	22% (n=10)	5.6	46

### III. Analysis Summary by Service

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

#### General Impressions of CEP

**Exhibit 18.** 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
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	13% (n=4)	87% (n=26)	30
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	100% (n=6)	6
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	83% (n=5)	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	100% (n=4)	4
General	2% (n=5)	14% (n=32)	43% (n=99)	41% (n=95)	231

**Exhibit 19.** Which statement best describes how you perceive CEP's reputation among colleagues in your professional network?

	CEP has a <b>poor reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a <b>somewhat negative reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a <b>somewhat positive reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has an <b>excellent reputation</b> among leaders of grantmaking organizations	Don't know	n
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	27% (n=8)	70% (n=21)	3% (n=1)	30
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	83% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	6
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	67% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	100% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	4
General	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	34% (n=65)	54% (n=103)	12% (n=23)	192



**Exhibit 20.** In the past year, have you or someone in your organization read a CEP research publication (e.g., *Sharing What Matters: Foundation Transparency*; *Benchmarking Foundation Governance*; *Investing and Social Impact*; *Assessing to Achieve High Performance*, etc.)?

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
GPR	90% (n=27)	7% (n=2)	3% (n=1)	30
DPR	100% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6
SPR	100% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6
Advisory	100% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4
General	82% (n=159)	5% (n=9)	13% (n=26)	194

**Exhibit 21.** In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's research publication(s) for reflecting on your or your foundation's work?

	Not at all useful (1)	Not very useful (2)	Somewhat useful (3)	Very useful (4)	Extremely useful (5)	Mean	n
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	37% (n=10)	44% (n=12)	19% (n=5)	3.8	27
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=3)	50% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	3.5	6
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	83% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	3.8	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=2)	25% (n=1)	25% (n=1)	3.8	4
General	0% (n=0)	1% (n=2)	53% (n=83)	41% (n=64)	6% (n=9)	3.5	158

**Exhibit 22.** In the past year, how useful have you found CEP's research publication(s) for improving your or your foundation's work?

	Not at all useful (1)	Not very useful (2)	Somewhat useful (3)	Very useful (4)	Extremely useful (5)	Mean	n
GPR	0% (n=0)	11% (n=3)	48% (n=13)	22% (n=6)	19% (n=5)	3.5	27
DPR	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	67% (n=4)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	3.0	6
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=4)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	3.3	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	75% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	25% (n=1)	3.5	4
General	0% (n=0)	8% (n=12)	64% (n=101)	25% (n=40)	4% (n=6)	3.3	159

**Exhibit 23.** In the past year, have you or your colleagues used any of CEP’s writings (research publications, blog posts, other communications or publications) as a basis of discussion with board members?

	Yes	No	Don't know/ Not applicable	n
GPR	50% (n=15)	43% (n=13)	7% (n=2)	30
DPR	50% (n=3)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	6
SPR	0% (n=0)	100% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	6
Advisory	50% (n=2)	50% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	4
General	28% (n=52)	63% (n=115)	9% (n=17)	184

## General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement

**Exhibit 24.** 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% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=2)	3% (n=1)	37% (n=11)	53% (n=16)	6.4	30
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	50% (n=3)	6.3	6
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	5.8	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	100% (n=4)	7.0	4
General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Exhibit 25.** 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
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=5)	83% (n=25)	6.8	30
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=3)	50% (n=3)	6.5	6
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	83% (n=5)	6.8	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	100% (n=4)	7.0	4
General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## About Your Most Recent Report and Services

**Exhibit 26.** How satisfied are you with the extent to which the CEP staff's interpretation of the results of your recent GPR, DPR, or SPR was meaningful for guiding reflection on your foundation's performance overall?

	Not at all satisfied (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very satisfied (7)	Mean	n
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=2)	20% (n=6)	47% (n=14)	27% (n=8)	5.9	30
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	67% (n=4)	17% (n=1)	6.0	6
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	50% (n=3)	6.3	6
Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Exhibit 27.** 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.

CEP Service		Not at all helpful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very helpful (7)	Not applicable/ Did not use	Mean*	Total n
Memorandum of Key Findings and Recommendations/ Executive Summary	GPR	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=2)	10% (n=3)	20% (n=6)	60% (n=18)	0% (n=0)	6.2 (n=30)	30
	DPR	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
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	5.6 (n=5)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interactive online Report	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=2)	33% (n=10)	53% (n=16)	0% (n=0)	6.3 (n=30)	30
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	5.5 (n=6)	6
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	6.3 (n=6)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Segmentation of the data by subgroup (e.g., program area, department)	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=3)	3% (n=1)	10% (n=3)	23% (n=7)	50% (n=15)	3% (n=1)	6.0 (n=29)	30
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	50% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	6.3 (n=6)	6
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	6.0 (n=5)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Downloadable PDF of all respondent comments and suggestions for the foundation	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	10% (n=3)	27% (n=8)	60% (n=18)	0% (n=0)	6.4 (n=30)	30
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	67% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	6.3 (n=6)	6
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	67% (n=4)	17% (n=1)	6.8 (n=5)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

\*The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.

**Exhibit 28.** How well did CEP’s work reflect a clear understanding of the specific organizational context of your foundation?

	Not at all well (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Extremely well (7)	Mean	n
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	7% (n=2)	30% (n=9)	30% (n=9)	30% (n=9)	5.8	30
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	5.7	6
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=4)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	5.5	6
Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Exhibit 29.** In general, how would you rate the quality of CEP’s in-person presentation?

	Poor (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Excellent (7)	Not applicable	Mean*	Total n
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=2)	3% (n=1)	17% (n=5)	47% (n=14)	27% (n=8)	6.4 (n=22)	30
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	40% (n=2)	40% (n=2)	20% (n=1)	6.5 (n=4)	5
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=3)	33% (n=2)	6.5 (n=4)	6
Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

\*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 30.** Considering the aspects of your work identified in the table below, please indicate the degree to which use of GPR, DPR, or SPR 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)	Significant Change (3)	Evaluation of Previous Change	Not applicable	Mean*	Total n
Communications with grantees, donors, and/or staff (e.g., clarity, methods of communication)	GPR	33% (n=10)	7% (n=2)	27% (n=8)	33% (n=10)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2.4 (n=20)	30
	DPR	50% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2.3 (n=3)	6
	SPR	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	1.7 (n=3)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grantmaking processes (e.g., selection, reporting and evaluation processes)	GPR	47% (n=14)	13% (n=4)	27% (n=8)	10% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	1.9 (n=15)	30
	DPR	50% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	3.0 (n=1)	6
	SPR	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	1.3 (n=3)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grantmaking patterns (e.g., size and length of grants)	GPR	30% (n=9)	47% (n=14)	10% (n=3)	7% (n=2)	3% (n=1)	3% (n=1)	1.4 (n=19)	30
	DPR	50% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	3.0 (n=1)	6
	SPR	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	1.0 (n=3)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Foundation strategy (e.g., what it is you’re trying to do, focus)	GPR	26% (n=7)	56% (n=15)	11% (n=3)	4% (n=1)	4% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	1.3 (n=19)	27
	DPR	67% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2.5 (n=2)	6
	SPR	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	1.0 (n=2)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table continues on the next page.

Foundation Functions		Too Soon to Tell	No Change (1)	Some Change (2)	Significant Change (3)	Evaluation of Previous Change	Not applicable	Mean*	Total n
Provision of assistance to grantees beyond “the check” (e.g., management assistance, field-related assistance, assistance securing funding from other sources)	GPR	37% (n=11)	27% (n=8)	20% (n=6)	13% (n=4)	3% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	1.8 (n=18)	30
	DPR	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	2.5 (n=2)	6
	SPR	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1.4 (n=5)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Staffing levels	GPR	23% (n=7)	67% (n=20)	3% (n=1)	3% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	1.1 (n=22)	30
	DPR	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	1.5 (n=2)	6
	SPR	33% (n=2)	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1.3 (n=4)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Attitudes toward work with grantees	GPR	31% (n=9)	17% (n=5)	41% (n=12)	10% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1.9 (n=20)	29
	DPR	50% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	3.0 (n=1)	6
	SPR	40% (n=2)	40% (n=2)	20% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1.3 (n=3)	5
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Attitudes toward work with donors	GPR	23% (n=7)	17% (n=5)	3% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	53% (n=16)	1.2 (n=6)	30
	DPR	67% (n=4)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2.0 (n=2)	6
	SPR	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=3)	1.0 (n=1)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Allocation of resources for a particular program area or department	GPR	27% (n=8)	57% (n=17)	3% (n=1)	7% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=2)	1.3 (n=20)	30
	DPR	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	1.5 (n=2)	6
	SPR	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	1.3 (n=4)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table continues on the next page.

Foundation Functions		Too Soon to Tell	No Change (1)	Some Change (2)	Significant Change (3)	Evaluation of Previous Change	Not applicable	Mean*	Total n
Addressing performance of a particular program officer/other staff member	GPR	27% (n=8)	40% (n=12)	10% (n=3)	10% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	13% (n=4)	1.5 (n=18)	30
	DPR	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	2.0 (n=2)	6
	SPR	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1.7 (n=3)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Addressing performance of or approach to a particular program area or department	GPR	30% (n=9)	37% (n=11)	20% (n=6)	10% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	1.6 (n=20)	30
	DPR	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	2.0 (n=2)	6
	SPR	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2.0 (n=3)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

\*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 31.** 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)	I don't know	Not applicable (no other assessment processes undertaken)	Mean*	Total n
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	17% (n=5)	30% (n=9)	37% (n=11)	0% (n=0)	13% (n=4)	6.2 (n=26)	30
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	5.6 (n=5)	6
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	20% (n=1)	20% (n=1)	60% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4.4 (n=5)	5
Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

\*The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 7.



**Exhibit 32.** Does your foundation intend to commission the GPR, DPR, or SPR again in the future?

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
GPR	73% (n=22)	0% (n=0)	27% (n=8)	30
DPR	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=4)	6
SPR	83% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	6
Advisory	-	-	-	-
General	-	-	-	-

**Exhibit 33.** Would you recommend the GPR, DPR, SPR, or CEP's customized engagements to a colleague foundation?

	Yes	No	n
GPR	100% (n=30)	0% (n=0)	30
DPR	100% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	6
SPR	100% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	6
Advisory	100% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	4
General	-	-	-

**Exhibit 34.** How valuable was your recent GPR, DPR, SPR, or customized engagement relative to its cost?

	Very poor value for the cost (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Excellent value for the cost (7)	Mean	n
GPR	0% (n=0)	3% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=2)	20% (n=6)	40% (n=12)	30% (n=9)	5.8	30
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=3)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	5.0	6
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=4)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	5.5	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	75% (n=3)	25% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	5.3	4
General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-