

Center for Effective Philanthropy 2018 Resource and Assessment Survey

Analysis Summary

May 2018

Prepared For

Center for Effective Philanthropy

Prepared By

Learning for Action (LFA)

Table of Contents

I. Survey Response Rates.....	1
II. All Responses Analysis 2016 & 2018 Summary	2
General Impressions of CEP	2
General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement	4
About Your Most Recent Report and Services	5
Creating Change with Results	6
Background and the Overall Experience	8
III. Client vs. Stakeholder Analysis Summary	9
General Impressions of CEP	9
IV. Tool/Service Analysis Summary	12
General Impressions of CEP	12
General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement	15
About Your Most Recent Report and Services	16
Creating Change with Results	19
Background and the Overall Experience	22
V. All Tool Users 2016 vs. 2018 Analysis Summary.....	24
General Impressions of CEP	24
General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement	25
About Your Most Recent Report and Services	26
Creating Change with Results	28
Background and the Overall Experience	29
VI. Stakeholders 2016 vs. 2018 Analysis Summary.....	31
General Impressions of CEP	31

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 companion report, Statistical Significance and Trend Data for Select Analysis Cuts.*
- *Percentages may sum to greater or less than 100% due to rounding.*

I. Survey Response Rates

Type of Survey	Response Rate	Percent
GPR	56/88	64%
DPR	12/16	75%
SPR	6/12	50%
Advisory Services	11/17	65%
Stakeholders	219/1,374	16%
Total	304/1,507	20%

II. All Responses Analysis 2016 & 2018 Summary

Dashes within the tables indicate questions that were not asked in the 2016 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% (n=5)	12% (n=32)	38% (n=104)	49% (n=136)	277
2018	0.3% (n=1)	8% (n=24)	45% (n=138)	46% (n=141)	304

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

	CEP has a poor reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a somewhat negative reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a somewhat positive reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has an excellent reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	Don't know	Mean ¹	n
2016	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	32% (n=76)	58% (n=137)	10% (n=24)	3.6 (n=214)	238
2018	0% (n=0)	1% (n=2)	24% (n=66)	61% (n=165)	14% (n=39)	3.7 (n=233)	272

¹The 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.*)?

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

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
2016	0% (n=0)	1% (n=2)	49% (n=99)	42% (n=85)	8% (n=15)	3.6	201
2018	0% (n=0)	3% (n=7)	43% (n=95)	46% (n=102)	8% (n=17)	3.6	221

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
2016	0% (n=0)	8% (n=16)	62% (n=125)	24% (n=49)	6% (n=12)	3.3	202
2018	1% (n=1)	8% (n=17)	57% (n=125)	29% (n=64)	6% (n=12)	3.3	219

Exhibit 6. 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?

	Yes	No	Don’t know/ Not applicable	n
2016	31% (n=72)	60% (n=138)	9% (n=20)	230
2018	34% (n=75)	58% (n=128)	9% (n=19)	222

Exhibit 7. 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 ¹	Total n
Engaged in rigorous work	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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
An expert in the field of philanthropy	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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
Focused on the most important issues in philanthropy	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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

Table continues on next page.

		Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)	Don't Know	Mean ¹	Total n
Trusted	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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
Influential on foundation practice and effectiveness	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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
Innovative	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	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

¹The 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 8. 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% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=2)	11% (n=5)	30% (n=14)	54% (n=25)	6.4	46
2018	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	2% (n=2)	1% (n=1)	7% (n=6)	35% (n=29)	53% (n=44)	6.3	83

Exhibit 9. 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

About Your Most Recent Report and Services

Exhibit 10. 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	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
	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=11)	(n=27)	(n=31)			

Exhibit 11. 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	Not applicable/ Did not use	Mean ¹	Total n
Memorandum of Key Findings and Recommendations/ Executive Summary	2016	0%	2%	2%	5%	14%	21%	52%	2%		6.1	42
		(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=6)	(n=9)	(n=22)	(n=1)		(n=41)	
	2018	0%	1%	0%	7%	12%	24%	53%	3%		6.2	74
		(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=9)	(n=18)	(n=39)	(n=2)		(n=72)	
Interactive online report	2016	0%	0%	7%	0%	12%	31%	50%	0%		6.2	42
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=13)	(n=21)	(n=0)		(n=42)	
	2018	0%	0%	1%	3%	16%	24%	39%	16%		6.2	74
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=1)	(n=2)	(n=12)	(n=18)	(n=29)	(n=12)		(n=62)	
Segmentation of the data by subgroup (e.g., program area, department)	2016	0%	0%	7%	5%	10%	26%	48%	5%		6.1	42
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=2)	(n=4)	(n=11)	(n=20)	(n=2)		(n=40)	
	2018	0%	0%	0%	4%	16%	23%	49%	8%		6.3	74
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=3)	(n=12)	(n=17)	(n=36)	(n=6)		(n=68)	
Open-ended respondent comments and suggestions ²	2016	0%	0%	0%	5%	7%	24%	62%	2%		6.5	42
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=2)	(n=3)	(n=10)	(n=26)	(n=1)		(n=41)	
	2018	0%	0%	0%	7%	14%	31%	46%	3%		6.2	74
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=5)	(n=10)	(n=23)	(n=34)	(n=2)		(n=72)	
An initial call with CEP staff to discuss your draft report	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=6)	(n=8)	(n=19)	(n=37)	(n=4)		(n=70)	
Additional analyses after receiving your draft report	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=7)	(n=18)	(n=29)	(n=20)		(n=54)	
CEP research publications relevant to your results	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-
		(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=9)	(n=11)	(n=9)	(n=8)	(n=37)		(n=37)	

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

²The 2016 survey question language is comparable to the 2018 language. 2016 language reads as: “Downloadable PDF of all respondent comments and suggestions”

Exhibit 12. 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
2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	7% (n=3)	33% (n=14)	31% (n=13)	26% (n=11)	5.7	42
2018	0% (n=0)	3% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=5)	19% (n=14)	35% (n=25)	36% (n=26)	5.9	72

Exhibit 13. 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 ¹	Total n
2016	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
2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=2)	7% (n=5)	14% (n=10)	56% (n=40)	21% (n=15)	6.5 (n=57)	72

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

Creating Change with Results

Exhibit 14. 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 ¹	Total n
Communications with grantees, donors, and/or staff (e.g., clarity, methods of communication)	2016	33% (n=14)	7% (n=3)	29% (n=12)	26% (n=11)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	2.3 (n=26)	42
	2018	15% (n=11)	7% (n=5)	50% (n=36)	25% (n=18)	3% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	2.2 (n=59)	72
Grantmaking processes (e.g., selection, reporting and evaluation processes)	2016	43% (n=18)	14% (n=6)	21% (n=9)	10% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	12% (n=5)	1.9 (n=19)	42
	2018	25% (n=18)	14% (n=10)	42% (n=30)	6% (n=4)	1% (n=1)	13% (n=9)	1.9 (n=44)	72
Grantmaking patterns (e.g., size and length of grants)	2016	31% (n=13)	41% (n=17)	7% (n=3)	7% (n=3)	2% (n=1)	12% (n=5)	1.4 (n=23)	42
	2018	25% (n=18)	38% (n=27)	19% (n=14)	3% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	15% (n=11)	1.4 (n=43)	72
Foundation strategy (e.g., what it is you’re trying to do, focus)	2016	31% (n=12)	44% (n=17)	10% (n=4)	5% (n=2)	5% (n=2)	5% (n=2)	1.4 (n=23)	39
	2018	22% (n=16)	42% (n=30)	22% (n=16)	4% (n=3)	3% (n=2)	7% (n=5)	1.5 (n=49)	72

Table continues on next page.

Foundation Functions		Too Soon to Tell	No Change (1)	Some Change (2)	Significant Change (3)	Evaluation of Previous Change	Not applicable	Mean ¹	Total n
Provision of assistance to grantees beyond “the check” (e.g., management assistance, field-related assistance, assistance securing funding from other sources)	2016	33% (n=14)	26% (n=11)	21% (n=9)	12% (n=5)	2% (n=1)	5% (n=2)	1.8 (n=25)	42
	2018	19% (n=14)	17% (n=12)	43% (n=31)	6% (n=4)	4% (n=3)	11% (n=8)	1.8 (n=47)	72
Staffing levels	2016	29% (n=12)	57% (n=24)	7% (n=3)	2% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	1.2 (n=28)	42
	2018	13% (n=9)	60% (n=43)	19% (n=14)	3% (n=2)	3% (n=2)	3% (n=2)	1.3 (n=59)	72
Attitudes toward work with grantees	2016	35% (n=14)	18% (n=7)	33% (n=13)	10% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	1.9 (n=24)	40
	2018	23% (n=16)	16% (n=11)	41% (n=29)	6% (n=4)	1% (n=1)	14% (n=10)	1.8 (n=44)	71
Attitudes toward work with donors	2016	31% (n=13)	17% (n=7)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	45% (n=19)	1.3 (n=9)	42
	2018	10% (n=7)	19% (n=14)	13% (n=9)	6% (n=4)	1% (n=1)	51% (n=37)	1.6 (n=27)	72
Allocation of resources for a particular program area or department	2016	29% (n=12)	50% (n=21)	7% (n=3)	5% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=4)	1.3 (n=26)	42
	2018	21% (n=15)	43% (n=31)	19% (n=14)	1% (n=1)	1% (n=1)	14% (n=10)	1.4 (n=46)	72
Addressing performance of a particular program officer/other staff member	2016	31% (n=13)	31% (n=13)	17% (n=7)	7% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	14% (n=6)	1.6 (n=23)	42
	2018	22% (n=16)	22% (n=16)	18% (n=13)	6% (n=4)	1% (n=1)	31% (n=22)	1.6 (n=33)	72
Addressing performance of or approach to a particular program area or department	2016	33% (n=14)	29% (n=12)	21% (n=9)	10% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=3)	1.7 (n=25)	42
	2018	21% (n=15)	26% (n=19)	29% (n=21)	8% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	15% (n=11)	1.7 (n=46)	72
Other	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2018	12% (n=3)	4% (n=1)	36% (n=9)	16% (n=4)	8% (n=2)	24% (n=6)	2.2 (n=14)	25

¹The 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 15. 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 ¹	Total n
2016	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
2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=2)	3% (n=2)	17% (n=12)	27% (n=19)	19% (n=13)	0% (n=0)	31% (n=22)	5.8 (n=48)	70

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

Exhibit 16. Does your foundation intend to commission the GPR, DPR, or SPR again in the future?

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

Exhibit 17. Would you recommend the GPR, DPR, SPR, or CEP's Advisory Services to a colleague foundation?

	Yes	No	n
2016	100% (n=46)	0% (n=0)	46
2018	98% (n=79)	3% (n=2)	81

Exhibit 18. 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% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	4% (n=2)	35% (n=16)	35% (n=16)	22% (n=10)	5.6	46
2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=2)	15% (n=12)	17% (n=14)	36% (n=29)	30% (n=24)	5.8	81

III. Client vs. Stakeholder Analysis Summary

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

General Impressions of CEP

Exhibit 19. 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
Client	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	37% (n=31)	64% (n=54)	85
Stakeholder	1% (n=1)	11% (n=24)	49% (n=107)	40% (n=87)	219

Exhibit 20. Which statement best describes how you perceive CEP's reputation among colleagues in your professional network?

	CEP has a poor reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a somewhat negative reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a somewhat positive reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has an excellent reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	Don't know	Mean ¹	n
Client	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=14)	74% (n=62)	10% (n=8)	3.8** (n=76)	84
Stakeholder	0% (n=0)	1% (n=2)	28% (n=52)	55% (n=103)	17% (n=31)	3.6 (n=157)	188

¹The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 4.

** Statistically significant difference $p < 0.01$

Exhibit 21. 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.*)?

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
Client	88% (n=74)	7% (n=6)	5% (n=4)	84
Stakeholder	79% (n=149)	9% (n=16)	12% (n=23)	188

Exhibit 22. 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
Client	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	37% (n=27)	50% (n=37)	14% (n=10)	3.8**	74
Stakeholder	0% (n=0)	5% (n=7)	46% (n=68)	44% (n=65)	5% (n=7)	3.5	147

** Statistically significant difference $p < 0.01$

Exhibit 23. 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
Client	1% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	52% (n=38)	36% (n=26)	11% (n=8)	3.6***	73
Stakeholder	1% (n=1)	11% (n=16)	60% (n=87)	26% (n=38)	3% (n=4)	3.2	146

*** Statistically significant difference $p < 0.001$

Exhibit 24. 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?

	Yes	No	Don’t know/ Not applicable	n
Client	38% (n=28)	53% (n=39)	10% (n=7)	74
Stakeholder	32% (n=47)	60% (n=89)	8% (n=12)	148

Exhibit 25. 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 ¹	Total n
Engaged in rigorous work	Client	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
	Stakeholder	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
An expert in the field of philanthropy	Client	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
	Stakeholder	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
Focused on the most important issues in philanthropy	Client	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
	Stakeholder	0% (n=0)	4% (n=7)	3% (n=5)	9% (n=17)	25% (n=46)	30% (n=56)	15% (n=28)	15% (n=29)	5.4 (n=159)	188
Trusted	Client	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
	Stakeholder	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
Influential on foundation practice and effectiveness	Client	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
	Stakeholder	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
Innovative	Client	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
	Stakeholder	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

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

[†] Approaches statistical significance $p < 0.10$

* Statistically significant difference $p < 0.05$

** Statistically significant difference $p < 0.01$

*** 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 26. 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)	38% (n=21)	63% (n=35)	56
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	42% (n=5)	58% (n=7)	12
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	67% (n=4)	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	27% (n=3)	73% (n=8)	11

Exhibit 27. Which statement best describes how you perceive CEP's reputation among colleagues in your professional network?

	CEP has a poor reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a somewhat negative reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a somewhat positive reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has an excellent reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	Don't know	Mean ¹	n
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	18% (n=10)	68% (n=38)	14% (n=8)	3.8 (n=48)	56
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	100% (n=12)	0% (n=0)	4.0 ^{***†} (n=12)	12
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	83% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	3.8 (n=6)	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	30% (n=3)	70% (n=7)	0% (n=0)	3.7 (n=10)	10

¹The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 4.

^{***} DPR statistically significantly higher than GPR $p < 0.001$

[†] DPR approaches statistical significant over Advisory $p < 0.10$

Exhibit 28. 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.*)?

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
GPR	89% (n=50)	5% (n=3)	5% (n=3)	56
DPR	75% (n=9)	17% (n=2)	8% (n=1)	12
SPR	100% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6
Advisory	90% (n=9)	10% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	10

Exhibit 29. 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)	44% (n=22)	44% (n=22)	12% (n=6)	3.7	50
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	22% (n=2)	78% (n=7)	0% (n=0)	3.8	9
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	3.8	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	11% (n=1)	56% (n=5)	33% (n=3)	4.2 [†]	9

[†]Indicates notable trend. Statistical significance testing was not conducted due to insufficient response rates.

Exhibit 30. 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)	2% (n=1)	59% (n=29)	29% (n=14)	10% (n=5)	3.5	49
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=3)	67% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	3.7	9
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=3)	50% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	3.5	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=3)	33% (n=3)	33% (n=3)	4.0	9

Exhibit 31. 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?

	Yes	No	Don't know/ Not applicable	n
GPR	40% (n=20)	54% (n=27)	6% (n=3)	50
DPR	44% (n=4)	44% (n=4)	11% (n=1)	9
SPR	17% (n=1)	83% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	6
Advisory	33% (n=3)	33% (n=3)	33% (n=3)	9

Exhibit 32. 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 ¹	Total n
Engaged in rigorous work	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=2)	18% (n=10)	36% (n=20)	39% (n=22)	4% (n=2)	6.2 (n=54)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	42% (n=5)	42% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	6.0 (n=12)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	83% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	6.5 (n=6)	6
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=1)	20% (n=2)	60% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	6.2 (n=10)	10
An expert in the field of philanthropy	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	9% (n=5)	43% (n=24)	43% (n=24)	4% (n=2)	6.3 (n=54)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	83% (n=10)	0% (n=0)	6.5 (n=12)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	83% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	6.8 (n=6)	6
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=1)	20% (n=2)	70% (n=7)	0% (n=0)	6.6 (n=10)	10
Focused on the most important issues in philanthropy	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	16% (n=9)	50% (n=28)	21% (n=12)	9% (n=5)	6.0 (n=51)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	58% (n=7)	25% (n=3)	8% (n=1)	5.9 (n=11)	12
	SPR	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
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	20% (n=2)	40% (n=4)	40% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	6.2 (n=10)	10

		Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)	Don't Know	Mean ¹	Total n
Trusted	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6% (n=3)	46% (n=25)	46% (n=25)	4% (n=2)	6.4 (n=53)	55
	DPR	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=4)	58% (n=7)	0% (n=0)	6.3 (n=12)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	83% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	6.7 (n=6)	6
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	30% (n=3)	60% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	6.3 (n=10)	10
Influential on foundation practice and effectiveness	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=4)	20% (n=11)	36% (n=20)	29% (n=16)	9% (n=5)	5.9 (n=51)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=2)	33% (n=4)	42% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	6.0 (n=12)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	6.2 (n=6)	6
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	20% (n=2)	20% (n=2)	60% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	6.4 (n=10)	10
Innovative	GPR	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=4)	30% (n=17)	39% (n=22)	9% (n=5)	13% (n=7)	5.5 (n=49)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=4)	25% (n=3)	25% (n=3)	8% (n=1)	5.6 (n=11)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	5.3 (n=6)	6
	Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	20% (n=2)	20% (n=2)	30% (n=3)	20% (n=2)	10% (n=1)	5.6 (n=9)	10

¹The 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 33. 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)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	7% (n=4)	36% (n=20)	53% (n=29)	6.4	55
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	25% (n=3)	67% (n=8)	6.6	12
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	50% (n=3)	6.0	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	10% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=1)	40% (n=4)	40% (n=4)	5.9	10

Exhibit 34. 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)	2% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	11% (n=6)	87% (n=47)	6.8	54
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	92% (n=11)	6.8	12
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	67% (n=4)	6.5	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=1)	10% (n=1)	80% (n=8)	6.7	10

About Your Most Recent Report and Services

Exhibit 35. 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)	6% (n=3)	11% (n=6)	43% (n=23)	41% (n=22)	6.2	54
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	25% (n=3)	25% (n=3)	50% (n=6)	6.3	12
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	6.2	6
Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Exhibit 36. 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 ¹	Total n
Memorandum of Key Findings and Recommendations/ Executive Summary	GPR	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	6% (n=3)	13% (n=7)	29% (n=16)	48% (n=27)	4% (n=2)	6.2 (n=54)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	17% (n=2)	75% (n=9)	0% (n=0)	6.7 (n=12)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	5.7 (n=6)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interactive online report	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	4% (n=2)	16% (n=9)	25% (n=14)	39% (n=22)	14% (n=8)	6.1 (n=48)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	25% (n=3)	25% (n=3)	33% (n=4)	17% (n=2)	6.1 (n=10)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	33% (n=2)	6.8 (n=4)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Segmentation of the data by subgroup (e.g., program area, department)	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=2)	16% (n=9)	25% (n=14)	45% (n=25)	11% (n=6)	6.2 (n=50)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	25% (n=3)	17% (n=2)	50% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	6.1 (n=12)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	83% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	6.8 (n=6)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Open-ended respondent comments and suggestions	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=2)	14% (n=8)	30% (n=17)	48% (n=27)	4% (n=2)	6.3 (n=54)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	8% (n=1)	42% (n=5)	42% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	6.2 (n=12)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	5.5 (n=6)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
An initial call with CEP staff to discuss your draft report	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=4)	14% (n=8)	29% (n=16)	46% (n=26)	4% (n=2)	6.2 (n=54)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=2)	67% (n=8)	8% (n=1)	6.6 (n=11)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	6.2 (n=5)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table continues on the next page.

CEP Service		Not at all Helpful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Helpful (7)	Not applicable/ Did not use	Mean ¹	Total n
Additional analyses after receiving your draft report	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=4)	23% (n=13)	39% (n=22)	30% (n=17)	6.5 (n=39)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=2)	25% (n=3)	42% (n=5)	17% (n=2)	6.3 (n=10)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	6.2 (n=5)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEP research publications relevant to your results	GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	11% (n=6)	14% (n=8)	16% (n=9)	9% (n=5)	50% (n=28)	5.5 (n=28)	56
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	17% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=2)	58% (n=7)	5.6 (n=5)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	5.0 (n=4)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Exhibit 37. 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)	4% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=4)	22% (n=12)	33% (n=18)	33% (n=18)	5.8	54
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	50% (n=6)	42% (n=5)	6.3	12
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	6.0	6
Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Exhibit 38. 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 ¹	Total n
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	6% (n=3)	15% (n=8)	59% (n=32)	19% (n=10)	6.6 (n=44)	54
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	58% (n=7)	25% (n=3)	6.6 (n=9)	12
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	5.8 (n=4)	6
Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Creating Change with Results

Exhibit 39. 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 ¹	Total n
Communications with grantees, donors, and/or staff (e.g., clarity, methods of communication)	GPR	15% (n=8)	7% (n=4)	61% (n=33)	15% (n=8)	2% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	2.1 (n=45)	54
	DPR	17% (n=2)	8% (n=1)	25% (n=3)	42% (n=5)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	2.4 (n=9)	12
	SPR	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	83% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3.0 (n=5)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grantmaking processes (e.g., selection, reporting and evaluation processes)	GPR	28% (n=15)	17% (n=9)	46% (n=25)	7% (n=4)	2% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	1.9 (n=38)	54
	DPR	17% (n=2)	8% (n=1)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=8)	1.5 (n=2)	12
	SPR	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	2.0 (n=4)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grantmaking patterns (e.g., size and length of grants)	GPR	32% (n=17)	41% (n=22)	20% (n=11)	4% (n=2)	4% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	1.4 (n=35)	54
	DPR	8% (n=1)	8% (n=1)	17% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=8)	1.7 (n=3)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	67% (n=4)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	1.2 (n=5)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Foundation strategy (e.g., what it is you’re trying to do, focus)	GPR	26% (n=14)	48% (n=26)	13% (n=7)	6% (n=3)	2% (n=1)	6% (n=3)	1.4 (n=36)	54
	DPR	17% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	58% (n=7)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	17% (n=2)	2.0 [‡] (n=7)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	67% (n=4)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1.3 (n=6)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table continues on the next page.

¹The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes responses for no change, some change, and significant change.

[‡]Indicates notable trend. Statistical significance testing was not conducted due to insufficient response rates.

Foundation Functions		Too Soon to Tell	No Change (1)	Some Change (2)	Significant Change (3)	Evaluation of Previous Change	Not applicable	Mean ¹	Total n
Provision of assistance to grantees beyond “the check” (e.g., management assistance, field-related assistance, assistance securing funding from other sources)	GPR	20% (n=11)	19% (n=10)	50% (n=27)	6% (n=3)	6% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	1.8 (n=40)	54
	DPR	25% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	58% (n=7)	2.0 (n=2)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	1.8 (n=5)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Staffing levels	GPR	11% (n=6)	61% (n=33)	19% (n=10)	2% (n=1)	4% (n=2)	4% (n=2)	1.3 (n=44)	54
	DPR	25% (n=3)	58% (n=7)	17% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1.2 (n=9)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	50% (n=3)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1.7 (n=6)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Attitudes toward work with grantees	GPR	23% (n=12)	21% (n=11)	45% (n=24)	8% (n=4)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	1.8 (n=39)	53
	DPR	25% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=8)	2.0 (n=1)	12
	SPR	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	67% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	2.0 (n=4)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Attitudes toward work with donors	GPR	11% (n=6)	22% (n=12)	7% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	59% (n=32)	1.3 (n=16)	54
	DPR	8% (n=1)	17% (n=2)	33% (n=4)	33% (n=4)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	2.2** (n=10)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	83% (n=5)	2.0 (n=1)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Allocation of resources for a particular program area or department	GPR	22% (n=12)	50% (n=27)	15% (n=8)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	11% (n=6)	1.2 (n=35)	54
	DPR	17% (n=2)	25% (n=3)	33% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	25% (n=3)	1.6 (n=7)	12
	SPR	17% (n=1)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	2.0 [‡] (n=4)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table continues on the next page.

¹The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes responses for no change, some change, and significant change.

** DPR statistically significantly higher than GPR $p < 0.01$

[‡]Indicates notable trend. Statistical significance testing was not conducted due to insufficient response rates.

Foundation Functions		Too Soon to Tell	No Change (1)	Some Change (2)	Significant Change (3)	Evaluation of Previous Change	Not applicable	Mean ¹	Total n
Addressing performance of a particular program officer/other staff member	GPR	28% (n=15)	28% (n=15)	19% (n=10)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	26% (n=14)	1.4 (n=25)	54
	DPR	8% (n=1)	8% (n=1)	25% (n=3)	8% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=6)	2.0 [‡] (n=5)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	33% (n=2)	3.0 (n=3)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Addressing performance of or approach to a particular program area or department	GPR	24% (n=13)	33% (n=18)	24% (n=13)	4% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	15% (n=8)	1.5 (n=33)	54
	DPR	17% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	42% (n=5)	25% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=2)	2.4 [‡] (n=8)	12
	SPR	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	2.0 (n=5)	6
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	GPR	14% (n=3)	5% (n=1)	43% (n=9)	14% (n=3)	5% (n=1)	19% (n=4)	2.2 (n=13)	21
	DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	25% (n=1)	25% (n=1)	50% (n=2)	3.0 (n=1)	4
	SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0.0 (n=0)	0
	Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

¹The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes responses for no change, some change, and significant change.

[‡]Indicates notable trend. Statistical significance testing was not conducted due to insufficient response rates.

Exhibit 40. Percent of respondents who reported “Some Change”, “Significant Change”, and “Some Change” or “Significant Change” in **at least one** of the eleven foundation function areas detailed in Exhibit 30.

	Reported “Some Change” in at least one foundation function area	Reported “Significant Change” in at least one foundation function area	Reported “Some Change” or “Significant Change” in at least one foundation function area	Total n
GPR	88% (n=49)	34% (n=19)	89% (n=50)	56
DPR	92% (n=11)	58% (n=7)	92% (n=11)	12
SPR	83% (n=5)	83% (n=5)	83% (n=5)	6
Advisory	-	-	-	-

Background and the Overall Experience

Exhibit 41. 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 ¹	Total n
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=2)	4% (n=2)	19% (n=10)	25% (n=13)	17% (n=9)	0% (n=0)	31% (n=16)	5.7 (n=36)	52
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	25% (n=3)	17% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	50% (n=6)	6.2 (n=6)	12
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	50% (n=3)	33% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6.2 (n=6)	6
Advisory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Exhibit 42. Does your foundation intend to commission the GPR, DPR, or SPR again in the future?

	Yes	No	Don't know	n
GPR	69% (n=37)	0% (n=0)	32% (n=17)	54
DPR	75% (n=9)	8% (n=1)	17% (n=2)	12
SPR	100% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	6
Advisory	-	-	-	-

Exhibit 43. Would you recommend the GPR, DPR, SPR, or CEP's Advisory Services to a colleague foundation?

	Yes	No	n
GPR	98% (n=53)	2% (n=1)	54
DPR	100% (n=12)	0% (n=0)	12
SPR	100% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	6
Advisory	89% (n=8)	11% (n=1)	9

Exhibit 44. 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
GPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=2)	13% (n=7)	20% (n=11)	37% (n=20)	26% (n=14)	5.7	54
DPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	8% (n=1)	25% (n=3)	42% (n=5)	25% (n=3)	5.8	12
SPR	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=2)	50% (n=3)	6.2	6
Advisory	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	33% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	22% (n=2)	44% (n=4)	5.8	9

V. All Tool Users 2016 vs. 2018 Analysis Summary

Statistical analyses revealed no statistically significant differences in the All Tool Users 2016 vs. 2018 comparison

General Impressions of CEP

Exhibit 45. 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	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	11% (n=5)	89% (n=41)	46
2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	37% (n=31)	64% (n=54)	85

Exhibit 46. Which statement best describes how you perceive CEP's reputation among colleagues in your professional network?

	CEP has a poor reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a somewhat negative reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a somewhat positive reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has an excellent reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	Don't know	Mean ¹	n
2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	24% (n=11)	74% (n=34)	2% (n=1)	3.8 (n=45)	46
2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	17% (n=14)	74% (n=62)	10% (n=8)	3.8 (n=76)	84

¹The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 4.

Exhibit 47. 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.)?

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

Exhibit 48. 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
2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	37% (n=16)	49% (n=21)	14% (n=6)	3.8	43
2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	37% (n=27)	50% (n=37)	14% (n=10)	3.8	74

Exhibit 49. 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
2016	0% (n=0)	9% (n=4)	56% (n=24)	21% (n=9)	14% (n=6)	3.4	43
2018	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	52% (n=38)	36% (n=26)	11% (n=8)	3.6	73

Exhibit 50. 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?

	Yes	No	Don’t know/ Not applicable	n
2016	44% (n=20)	50% (n=23)	7% (n=3)	46
2018	38% (n=28)	53% (n=39)	10% (n=7)	74

General Impressions of Your Most Recent CEP Engagement

Exhibit 51. 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% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=2)	11% (n=5)	30% (n=14)	54% (n=25)	6.4	46
2018	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	2% (n=2)	1% (n=1)	7% (n=6)	35% (n=29)	53% (n=44)	6.3	83

Exhibit 52. 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

About Your Most Recent Report and Services

Exhibit 53. 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
2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	19% (n=8)	48% (n=20)	29% (n=12)	6.0	42
2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	4% (n=3)	15% (n=11)	38% (n=27)	43% (n=31)	6.2	72

Exhibit 54. 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 ¹	Total n
Memorandum of Key Findings and Recommendations/ Executive Summary	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
	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
Interactive online report	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
Segmentation of the data by subgroup (e.g., program area, department)	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
	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

Table continues on next page.

CEP Service		Not at all helpful (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very helpful (7)	Not applicable/ Did not use	Mean ¹	Total n
Open-ended respondent comments and suggestions ²	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
	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

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

²The 2016 survey question language is comparable to the 2018 language. 2016 language reads as: "Downloadable PDF of all respondent comments and suggestions"

Exhibit 55. 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
2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	7% (n=3)	33% (n=14)	31% (n=13)	26% (n=11)	5.7	42
2018	0% (n=0)	3% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=5)	19% (n=14)	35% (n=25)	36% (n=26)	5.9	72

Exhibit 56. 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 ¹	Total n
2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	5% (n=2)	17% (n=7)	46% (n=19)	27% (n=11)	6.4 (n=30)	41
2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=2)	7% (n=5)	14% (n=10)	56% (n=40)	21% (n=15)	6.5 (n=57)	72

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

Creating Change with Results

Exhibit 57. 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 ¹	Total n
Communications with grantees, donors, and/or staff (e.g., clarity, methods of communication)	2016	33% (n=14)	7% (n=3)	29% (n=12)	26% (n=11)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	2.3 (n=26)	42
	2018	15% (n=11)	7% (n=5)	50% (n=36)	25% (n=18)	3% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	2.2 (n=59)	72
Grantmaking processes (e.g., selection, reporting and evaluation processes)	2016	43% (n=18)	14% (n=6)	21% (n=9)	10% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	12% (n=5)	1.9 (n=19)	42
	2018	25% (n=18)	14% (n=10)	42% (n=30)	6% (n=4)	1% (n=1)	13% (n=9)	1.9 (n=44)	72
Grantmaking patterns (e.g., size and length of grants)	2016	31% (n=13)	41% (n=17)	7% (n=3)	7% (n=3)	2% (n=1)	12% (n=5)	1.4 (n=23)	42
	2018	25% (n=18)	38% (n=27)	19% (n=14)	3% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	15% (n=11)	1.4 (n=43)	72
Foundation strategy (e.g., what it is you’re trying to do, focus)	2016	31% (n=12)	44% (n=17)	10% (n=4)	5% (n=2)	5% (n=2)	5% (n=2)	1.4 (n=23)	39
	2018	22% (n=16)	42% (n=30)	22% (n=16)	4% (n=3)	3% (n=2)	7% (n=5)	1.5 (n=49)	72
Provision of assistance to grantees beyond “the check” (e.g., management assistance, field-related assistance, assistance securing funding from other sources)	2016	33% (n=14)	26% (n=11)	21% (n=9)	12% (n=5)	2% (n=1)	5% (n=2)	1.8 (n=25)	42
	2018	19% (n=14)	17% (n=12)	43% (n=31)	6% (n=4)	4% (n=3)	11% (n=8)	1.8 (n=47)	72
Staffing levels	2016	29% (n=12)	57% (n=24)	7% (n=3)	2% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	1.2 (n=28)	42
	2018	13% (n=9)	60% (n=43)	19% (n=14)	3% (n=2)	3% (n=2)	3% (n=2)	1.3 (n=59)	72
Attitudes toward work with grantees	2016	35% (n=14)	18% (n=7)	33% (n=13)	10% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	5% (n=2)	1.9 (n=24)	40
	2018	23% (n=16)	16% (n=11)	41% (n=29)	6% (n=4)	1% (n=1)	14% (n=10)	1.8 (n=44)	71
Attitudes toward work with donors	2016	31% (n=13)	17% (n=7)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	45% (n=19)	1.3 (n=9)	42
	2018	10% (n=7)	19% (n=14)	13% (n=9)	6% (n=4)	1% (n=1)	51% (n=37)	1.6 (n=27)	72
Allocation of resources for a particular program area or department	2016	29% (n=12)	50% (n=21)	7% (n=3)	5% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	10% (n=4)	1.3 (n=26)	42
	2018	21% (n=15)	43% (n=31)	19% (n=14)	1% (n=1)	1% (n=1)	14% (n=10)	1.4 (n=46)	72

Foundation Functions		Too Soon to Tell	No Change (1)	Some Change (2)	Significant Change (3)	Evaluation of Previous Change	Not applicable	Mean ¹	Total n
Addressing performance of a particular program officer/other staff member	2016	31% (n=13)	31% (n=13)	17% (n=7)	7% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	14% (n=6)	1.6 (n=23)	42
	2018	22% (n=16)	22% (n=16)	18% (n=13)	6% (n=4)	1% (n=1)	31% (n=22)	1.6 (n=33)	72
Addressing performance of or approach to a particular program area or department	2016	33% (n=14)	29% (n=12)	21% (n=9)	10% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	7% (n=3)	1.7 (n=25)	42
	2018	21% (n=15)	26% (n=19)	29% (n=21)	8% (n=6)	0% (n=0)	15% (n=11)	1.7 (n=46)	72

¹The 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 58. 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 ¹	Total n
2016	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	5% (n=2)	27% (n=11)	24% (n=10)	29% (n=12)	0% (n=0)	12% (n=5)	5.8 (n=36)	41
2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=2)	3% (n=2)	17% (n=12)	27% (n=19)	19% (n=13)	0% (n=0)	31% (n=22)	5.8 (n=48)	70

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

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

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

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

	Yes	No	n
2016	100% (n=46)	0% (n=0)	46
2018	98% (n=79)	3% (n=2)	81

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
2016	0% (n=0)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=1)	4% (n=2)	35% (n=16)	35% (n=16)	22% (n=10)	5.6	46
2018	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	3% (n=2)	15% (n=12)	17% (n=14)	36% (n=29)	30% (n=24)	5.8	81

VI. Stakeholders 2016 vs. 2018 Analysis Summary

Statistical analyses revealed no statistically significant differences in the Stakeholders 2016 vs. 2018 comparison.

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	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% (n=5)	14% (n=32)	43% (n=99)	41% (n=95)	231
2018	1% (n=1)	11% (n=24)	49% (n=107)	40% (n=87)	219

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

	CEP has a poor reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a somewhat negative reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has a somewhat positive reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	CEP has an excellent reputation among leaders of grantmaking organizations	Don't know	Mean ¹	n
2016	0% (n=0)	1% (n=1)	34% (n=65)	54% (n=103)	12% (n=23)	3.6 (n=169)	192
2018	0% (n=0)	1% (n=2)	28% (n=52)	55% (n=103)	17% (n=31)	3.6 (n=157)	188

¹The n displayed represents all responses that are calculated into the mean, which includes answer response options 1 through 4.

Exhibit 64. 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.)?

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

Exhibit 65. 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
2016	0% (n=0)	1% (n=2)	53% (n=83)	41% (n=64)	6% (n=9)	3.5	158
2018	0% (n=0)	5% (n=7)	46% (n=68)	44% (n=65)	5% (n=7)	3.5	147

Exhibit 66. 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
2016	0% (n=0)	8% (n=12)	64% (n=101)	25% (n=40)	4% (n=6)	3.3	159
2018	1% (n=1)	11% (n=16)	60% (n=87)	26% (n=38)	3% (n=4)	3.2	146

Exhibit 67. 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?

	Yes	No	Don’t know/ Not applicable	n
2016	28% (n=52)	63% (n=115)	9% (n=17)	184
2018	32% (n=47)	60% (n=89)	8% (n=12)	148