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THE CENTER FOR EFFECTIVE PHILANTHROPY
Grantee Survey Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Fielded</th>
<th>Number of Grantees Surveyed</th>
<th>Responses Received</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August and September 2020</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subgroup Analysis

- Reviewed ratings by program area, number of grants and number of grants within specific program areas
# Grantee Comparative Dataset

*More than 300 funders*

*More than 40,000 grantee responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. M. Kirby Foundation, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Graham Brown Foundation, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite Casey Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdeck Family Foundation, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Kiewit Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The George Gund Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The John A. Hartford Foundation, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The John R. Oishei Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ralph M. Parsons Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia G. Piper Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT AND UNDERSTANDING
“Overall, how would you rate the Trust’s impact on your field?”

1 = No impact, 7 = Significant positive impact

- MSSCT 2020: 6.43 (98th percentile)
“Overall, how would you rate the Trust’s impact on your organization?”

1 = No impact, 7 = Significant positive impact
“The Trust has maintained a low profile publicly, but has maintained significant influence in behind the scenes ways. Our program officer understands those who are the experts are those with lived experience and those working in the field every day...”

“The Trust has had a profound impact on [our organization]. It's one of our largest institutional donors and has created a solid funding foundation on which we've been able to build. [Our organization] is stronger now thanks to the Trust, and better positioned to receive other grants, based on the prestige of the Trust's support.”
## Grantmaking Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Grant Length</th>
<th>Average Grant Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 yrs at MSSCT</td>
<td>120K at MSSCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 yrs at the custom cohort</td>
<td>150K at the custom cohort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grantmaking Characteristics

46% of MSSCT grantees report receiving unrestricted support

vs.

22% of grantees at the typical funder report receiving unrestricted support

“The Trust is having enormous impact on our organization—particularly in their unrestricted support which has provided essential support for our patient families, particularly during this time as they face the disproportionate impacts of the pandemic.”
Patterns of Non-Monetary Support

- **Intensive Assistance Patterns**
  - **Comprehensive Assistance**: Grantees receiving at least 7 forms of assistance
  - **Field-Focused Assistance**: Grantees receiving at least 3 forms of field-related assistance but less than 7 forms of assistance overall

- **Other Patterns**
  - **Little Assistance**: Grantees receiving at least one form of assistance but not falling into the above categories
  - **No Assistance**: Grantees not receiving non-monetary support
Opportunities to Provide Non-monetary Assistance

8% of MSSCT grantees report receiving intensive non-monetary support

vs.

19% of grantees at the median cohort funder report receiving intensive non-monetary support

MSSCT grantees who receive even just a few forms of support rate significantly higher than grantees who receive none for the Trust’s impact on their fields and organizations, understanding of their beneficiaries’ needs, and aspects of relationships.
RELATIONSHIPS WITH GRANTEES
Funder-Grantee Relationships

**INTERACTIONS**

- **Fairness** of treatment by foundation
- **Comfort** approaching foundation if a problem arises
- **Responsiveness** of foundation staff

**COMMUNICATIONS**

- **Clarity of communication** of foundation’s goals and strategy
- **Consistency of information** provided by different communications
Funder-Grantee Relationships
Summary Measure

1 = Very negative, 7 = Very positive

MSSCT 2020

Custom Cohort

6.51
94th
**Understanding and Transparency**

**Understanding Summary Measure**
1 = Very negative
7 = Very positive

"Overall, how transparent is the Trust with your organization?"
1 = Not at all transparent
7 = Extremely transparent
“How well does the Trust embody its stated values and beliefs?”

1 = Not at all, 7 = To a great extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>MSSCT 2020</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in individuals' dignity &amp; potential</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in interdependence</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“The May & Stanley Smith Charitable Trust has been an incredible partner to our organization and each step of the process has encouraged growth for us as an organization and has helped equip us to better perform our mission.”

“The relationship goes beyond funding and we value the regular exchange we have with our program officer who always keeps his finger on the pulse of our activities. We use the word "partnership" because we learn as much from the Trust as we believe they learn from us. Together, we make each other sharper and more effective.”
TRUST PROCESSES
Trust Processes

“How helpful was participating in the Trust's selection process in strengthening the organization/program funded by the grant?”

1 = Not at all helpful
7 = Extremely helpful

“To what extent was the Trust's reporting process a helpful opportunity for you to reflect and learn?”

1 = Not at all
7 = To a great extent
Median hours spent by on funder requirements

"...The numbers and types of attachments required are far and away more extensive and onerous than any other public or private funder to which we apply...”
“To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the Trust's grant application process:”

1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree

- The Trust’s application process was, or could be, useful in applying to other foundations
  - MSSCT 2020: 6.09

- The Trust’s application process helped us clearly articulate and frame our work
  - MSSCT 2020: 6.09

- The Trust’s website was helpful in preparing our request
  - MSSCT 2020: 5.78

- The Trust’s application process was not overly burdensome
  - MSSCT 2020: 5.65

- The Trust’s application process was easier than other foundations' applications
  - MSSCT 2020: 4.56
"I would suggest limiting the number of follow-up questions after a grant application is submitted to maybe one round of questions. I would also suggest not requiring the past month's financial statements and instead asking for the most recent that an agency has available."

“Compared to other funders May and Stanley digs deep, requiring extensive research, data point reporting, and many follow-up questions - in short, a lot of work. Of course its their prerogative to ask a lot of questions about how their grant award is being used, but we don't look forward to the application and reporting process. It feels like they are holding our feet to the flames.”
DECLINED APPLICANT PERCEPTIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Fielded</th>
<th>Number of Applicants Surveyed</th>
<th>Responses Received</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August and September 2020</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subgroup Analysis**

- Reviewed ratings by program area.
“Overall, how would you rate the Trust’s impact on your field?”

1 = No impact, 7 = Significant positive impact
“Overall, how responsive was Trust staff?”

1 = Not at all responsive, 7 = Extremely responsive

"If the Trust is going to continue to allow unsolicited proposals I believe it would be beneficial for staff to require interested applicants to have a conversation with them prior to submitting any formal LOI or application..."
“Why did you apply to the Trust for funding?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>MSSCT 2020</th>
<th>Median Funder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read Guidelines</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Local Funder</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged By Others</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Field Funder</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged By Trust Staff</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“After your request was declined did you request/receive any feedback or advice from the Trust?”

Received Feedback
- MSSCT 2020: 16%
- Median Funder: 43%

Requested Feedback
- MSSCT 2020: 25%
- Median Funder: 53%
Selection Process and Declination Findings

- On selection process, declined applicants:
  - Spend less time than is typical
  - Rate typical for its helpfulness

- After declination:
  - Out of the quarter of applicants who requested feedback, 40% of those applicants report not receiving any
  - Ratings for helpfulness of feedback for strengthening future proposals are higher than typical
  - Those who receive feedback rate the Trust higher for its fairness, understanding, of communications, honesty in declination, and overall transparency
“Would you consider applying for funding from the Trust in the future?”

Proportion that responded ‘Yes’
CEP Recommendations

• Celebrate the Trust’s exceptionally strong perceptions and continue to reinforce the values and beliefs that have led to this success.

• Build on the benefits that grantees receive from non-monetary support and where resources allow, consider increasing the facilitation of collaboration and connection amongst grantees.

• Streamline and simplify the Trust’s administrative processes and the information required from grantees, particularly for long-time partners or organizations with limited resources.

• Consider providing a larger proportion of applicants with more detailed feedback on how their proposal can be improved, so that the Trust receives the most relevant and strongest proposals in the future.
Thank You.