

METHODOLOGY USED FOR *CAN FEEDBACK FUEL CHANGE AT FOUNDATIONS?* AN ANALYSIS OF THE GRANTEE PERCEPTION REPORT

THE DATA DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT WERE

gathered through confidential surveys administered between spring 2003 and fall 2010.

Sample

For this research, analyses were conducted on two samples of foundations. The first sample was composed of the 196 funders that subscribed to the Grantee Perception Report (GPR) for the first time between spring 2003 and fall 2010. For this sample, 43,304 grantees were invited to participate in CEP's grantee survey and 29,561 responded, resulting in a 68 percent response rate. On average, the proportion of a foundation's grantees responding to the survey was 72 percent. Analyses were run on this sample of funders to understand whether or not, in the experiences of grantees, the field of funders coming to CEP for their first GPR was changing over time.

The second sample in this paper was composed of a subset of 59 funders that subscribed to the GPR two times between spring 2003 and fall 2009. The sample includes data for each of these funders at two points in time. For the first GPRs, these 59 foundations' 12,561 grantees were invited to participate in the grantee survey and 8,612 responded, resulting in a 69 percent response rate. The second time, 16,325 grantees were invited to participate in the survey and 11,271 responded, resulting in a 69 percent response rate.

Method

Data from grantees were collected through a standard survey CEP created in 2003. When a foundation commissions a GPR, this standard survey is sent to that funder's grantees. While individual items in the survey have been added, changed, or deleted over the years, the survey has consistently included more than 50 items exploring grantees' perceptions of working with a particular funder. Those items include a funder's responsiveness, fairness, and approachability, as well as its impact on the grantee's organization, local community, and field. Many of the survey items are rated on a seven-point Likert scale; other items offer a few response options from which respondents

choose. Grantees may respond to the survey by mail or online and are given the option to respond anonymously.

Analyses

To determine whether or not ratings of funders commissioning a GPR for the first time were trending in a positive direction between 2003 and 2010, the average of funder averages on each survey item in each year were compared using analysis of variance (ANOVA). Similar analyses were also conducted at the grantee level. An alpha level of 0.05 was used to determine statistical significance. Effect sizes were examined for all analyses.¹

The main question that this study addressed was whether or not the ratings of the 59 funders that have repeated the GPR process have changed between the first and second time that they subscribed to the GPR. To account for the fact that the number of grantees responding varied greatly across funders, and the number of grantees responding about each funder changed from time one to time two, hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) was used to analyze change over time in the ratings funders received. This type of analysis was conducted for each of the items that had been asked of grantees at both time points for at least 30 funders.

After learning on which items funders, on average, were changing at a statistically significant level over time ($p < .05$), an analysis of the magnitude of change was conducted. To do this, a z-score was created to compare the magnitude of change across items. The z-score for an item was created by dividing the level-two slope, which represents the average amount of change between time one and time two, by the standard deviation of the time one average. Creating z-scores allowed for a comparison of the magnitude of change across items, while taking into account the number of grantee responses for each foundation and the variation in those responses.

To understand whether or not the ratings of individual funders were changing in a statistically significant way between the first and second use of the GPR, t-tests were conducted for each funder.

¹ Cohen, J. "A Power Primer," *Psychology Bulletin*, 1 (112), 1992: 155-159.