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The **mission of the Center for Effective Philanthropy** is to provide data, feedback, programs, and insights to help individual and institutional donors improve their effectiveness. We do this work because we believe effective donors, working collaboratively and thoughtfully, can profoundly contribute to creating a better and more just world.
Why Benchmarked Feedback?

- Grantees and applicants have insightful feedback to share.
- Power dynamics inhibit candor, so third-party confidentiality is key.
- Receiving a grant is inherently positive, so grantee feedback is skewed.
- Comparative benchmarking allows for meaningful interpretation of results.
Grantee Comparative Dataset

More than 350 foundations
More than 40,000 grantee responses

Applicant Comparative Dataset

More than 50 foundations
More than 4,000 applicant responses

The Greenwall Foundation GPR Custom Cohort

Archstone Foundation
F.M. Kirby Foundation
Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation
Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation
Kenneth Rainin Foundation
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
The Jacob and Valeria Langeloth Foundation
The John A. Hartford Foundation
The Teagle Foundation
## Survey Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Grant Period/ Application Period</th>
<th>Surveys Fielded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2020 – March 2021</td>
<td>May – June 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Survey Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Surveyed</th>
<th>Responded</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined Applicants</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Response Breakdowns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantees</th>
<th>Declined Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making a Difference (n=25)</td>
<td>First application to the Foundation (n=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Scholars (n=11)</td>
<td>Previously applied for funding (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (n=6, not shown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT ON GRANTEEES’ FIELDS
### Grantee Responses

**“Overall, how would you rate the Foundation’s impact on your field?”**

1 = No impact, 7 = Significant positive impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenwall 2022</th>
<th>0th (4.50)</th>
<th>25th (5.58)</th>
<th>50th (5.84)</th>
<th>75th (6.05)</th>
<th>100th (6.70)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custom Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a Difference</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Scholars Program</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“To what extent has the Foundation advanced state of knowledge in your field?”**

1 = Not at all, 7 = Leads the field to new thinking and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenwall 2022</th>
<th>0th (3.58)</th>
<th>25th (4.76)</th>
<th>50th (5.13)</th>
<th>75th (5.49)</th>
<th>100th (6.44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custom Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a Difference</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Scholars Program</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“The Greenwall Foundation supports groundbreaking research and practice in bioethics and related disciplines. I especially appreciate the Foundation’s commitment to funding research projects that will have real-world implications in improving the lives of patients and building healthy communities.”

“In the world of bioethics, Greenwall funding is significant (for both individuals and organizations). This is especially true for disciplines that are less likely to get NSF/NIH funding.”
“How confident are you that if this work had not been funded by the Foundation, it would have otherwise been funded?”

1 = Not at all confident, 7 = Extremely confident

We rely upon the Foundation as one if not the only sources of bioethics funding - to that extent, we cannot overstate just how much influence Greenwall has when setting priorities. Importantly also, a real virtue of the Foundation is the willingness to take risks in projects that would be not funded in other ways.”

“The Foundation’s investment has been critical to advancing research that may not be funded by others.”
## Grantmaking Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Characteristic</th>
<th>Greenwall 2022</th>
<th>Custom Cohort</th>
<th>Average Funder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Grant Size</td>
<td>$226K</td>
<td>$235K</td>
<td>$100K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Year Grants</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Receiving non-monetary support</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grantees who report receiving non-monetary support rate significantly more positively on several measures throughout the report.
RELATIONSHIPS WITH GRANTEES AND DECLINED APPLICANTS
### Grantee Responses

“**To what extent did the Foundation exhibit respectful interaction during this grant?**

1 = Not at all, 4 = Somewhat, 7 = To a great extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>0th (SD)</th>
<th>25th (SD)</th>
<th>50th (SD)</th>
<th>75th (SD)</th>
<th>100th (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenwall 2022</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Scholars Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applicant Responses

“**Overall, how fairly did the Foundation treat you?**

1 = Not at all fairly, 7 = Extremely fairly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>0th (SD)</th>
<th>25th (SD)</th>
<th>50th (SD)</th>
<th>75th (SD)</th>
<th>100th (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenwall 2022</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First funding application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously applied for funding</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Overall, how responsive was Foundation staff?”

1 = Not at all responsive, 7 = Extremely responsive

**Grantee Responses**

- **Greenwall 2022**: 6.74
- **Custom Cohort**: 6.76
- **Making a Difference**: 6.76
- **Faculty Scholars Program**: 6.91

**Applicant Responses**

- **Greenwall 2022**: 4.00
- **First funding application**: 4.07
- **Previously applied for funding**: 3.75
“How clearly has the Foundation communicated its goals and strategy to you?”

1 = Not at all clearly, 7 = Extremely clearly

**Grantee Responses**
- Greenwall 2022: 5.80 (56th)
- Custom Cohort
- Making a Difference: 5.80
- Faculty Scholars Program: 5.60

**Applicant Responses**
- Greenwall 2022: 4.11 (3rd)
- First funding application: 4.40
- Previously applied for funding: 3.75
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## The Foundation’s New Digital Communications Strategy

*1 = Strongly disagree, 4 = Neither agree nor disagree, 7 = Strongly agree*

### Grantee Responses: Top Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation’s communications about my project have been accurate</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation’s communications efforts reflect the diversity of work it funds</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation’s communications about my work have been readily available and easy to share</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation’s communications have kept me informed about recent developments in bioethics</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applicant Responses: Top Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation’s communications provide helpful information about the research it supports</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation’s communications are readily available and easy to share</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation’s communications provide helpful information about its priorities</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Foundation’s New Digital Communications Strategy

1 = Strongly disagree, 4 = Neither agree nor disagree, 7 = Strongly agree

---

**Grantee Responses**

The Foundation's communications efforts reflect the diversity of work it funds: 6.06

---

**Applicant Responses**

The Foundation's communications efforts reflect the diversity of work it funds: 3.43

---

**Grantee Responses**

The Foundation's communications have kept me informed about recent developments in bioethics: 5.59

---

**Applicant Responses**

The Foundation's communications have kept me informed about recent developments in bioethics: 3.24
“In my experience, Foundation staff are very knowledgeable, engaged, responsive, and helpful.” – Grantee

“I have seen clear improvements in the clarity and organization of the Foundation’s interactions and communications over the last 12 months.” – Grantee

“Once ‘in’ as a grantee, the interactions and communications are actually quite excellent - clear, sincere, and always helpful. However, one can’t help but worry about being ‘out’ of the club the next go round.” – Grantee
APPROACH TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION
“To what extent does the Foundation's work support a broad and inclusive understanding of bioethics topics and scholars?”

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

Grantee Responses: 5.67
Applicant Responses: 3.58

“Be more open to developments in the biological and life sciences that pose novel challenges to bioethics. There is more than traditional biomedical ethics or public health ethics.” – Declined Applicant

“Support efforts to bring the bioethics community together or address what DEI means in bioethics beyond issues of racial discrimination or anti-Black racism.” – Grantee
“Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree the Foundation has clearly communicated what diversity, equity, and inclusion means for its work”

1 = Strongly disagree, 4 = Neither agree nor disagree, 7 = Strongly agree

**Grantee Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0th (4.48)</th>
<th>25th (5.27)</th>
<th>50th (5.62)</th>
<th>75th (5.93)</th>
<th>100th (6.78)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenwall 2022</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a Difference</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Scholars Program</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Applicant Responses**

- Greenwall 2022: 2.85
- Median Funder: 4.86
Applicant Responses

“How accessible do you believe the Foundation is to applicants?”

1 = Some organizations are favored over others,
7 = Everyone has equal access

0th (2.87) 25th (3.80) 50th (4.19) 75th (4.57) 100th (5.48)

3.18 8th Greenwall 2022

3.38 First funding application

2.92 Previously applied for funding

“It feels like [the Foundation] funds in-group members of the bioethics community, and is not open to new members of the bioethics community.” – Declined Applicant

“The Foundation can have a major impact on the field by supporting increased diversity of scholars and of bioethics work focused on issues that other funding bodies (especially governmental) are reluctant to support.” – Grantee
GRANTMAKING PROCESSES
“To what extent was the Foundation's review and selection process a helpful opportunity to strengthen the efforts funded by the grant?”

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0th (3.45)</th>
<th>25th (4.87)</th>
<th>50th (5.19)</th>
<th>75th (5.51)</th>
<th>100th (6.49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenwall 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a Difference</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Scholars Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grantee Responses

Median Hours Spent on Application and Review and Selection Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantees</th>
<th>80 hrs vs. 20 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Greenwall Foundation</td>
<td>Typical funder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>40 hrs vs. 20 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Greenwall Foundation</td>
<td>Typical funder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“To what extent was the Foundation's review and selection process an appropriate level of effort given the amount of funding received/requested?”

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

Grantee Responses

- Faculty Scholars Program: 6.09
- Greenwall 2022: 5.56 (16th)
- Making a Difference: 5.48

Applicant Responses

- 3.62
“To what extent was the Foundation clear and transparent about the criteria the Foundation uses to decide whether an application would be funded or declined?”

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

Grantee Responses

- Greenwall 2022: 5.22 (14th)
- Making a Difference: 5.08
- Faculty Scholars Program: 5.18

Applicant Responses

- 2.48
“Streamlining time burden of grant management and reporting (perhaps through an introductory walk through for those who have not managed grants).” – Grantee

“Share details about the review criteria and process.”
– Grantee

“Simplify the letter of intent process, and recognize (and reduce if possible) the amount of work that goes into that preliminary stage.”
– Declined Applicant
“How would you rate the honesty of the reason(s) the Foundation gave for declining to fund your funding application?”

1 = Not at all honest, 7 = Extremely honest

“Would you consider applying for funding from the Foundation in the future?”

Proportion that responded ‘Yes’
“Clear, detailed guidelines about what type of information is expected in any application section.” – Declined Applicant

“Would appreciate more feedback on my application and reasons why it was not funded or scored high for further review.” – Declined Applicant
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISCUSSION
- **Celebrate** continued outstanding and unique impact on grantees’ fields.

- Continue to offer valued non-monetary benefits such as **networking and mentorship** – and consider expanding these supports to a larger proportion of grantees.

- Consider ways to better communicate the Foundation’s **commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion** in its grantmaking focus, selection process, and relationships with partners.

- Determine approaches that would **simplify the selection process** to increase accessibility and clarity for applicants.

- To ensure the Foundation receives the most relevant and strongest applications in the future, consider **providing a larger proportion of applicants with more detailed feedback** on how their proposal can be improved or with guidance on whether to apply again.