

# Grantee Perception Report<sup>®</sup>

prepared for

**The SC Ministry Foundation**

**Fall 2007**

*Excerpt of Full Report*

VERSION 3/17/2008



THE CENTER FOR  
EFFECTIVE PHILANTHROPY

675 Massachusetts Avenue ♦ Seventh Floor ♦ Cambridge, MA 02139  
Tel: 617-492-0800 ♦ Fax: 617-492-0888 ♦ [www.effectivephilanthropy.org](http://www.effectivephilanthropy.org)

# Review of Findings (1)

Chart shows SC Ministry 2007's (◆), SC Ministry 2003's (◇), and the median comparative cohort foundation's (◇) percentile rank among all foundations in the comparative set.

Indicator	Percentile					Description
	0th	25th	50th	75th	100th	
Overall Effectiveness in Creating Social Impact						Grantees were asked to rate the foundation's overall effectiveness in creating social impact.
Impact on the Field						Grantees were asked to rate the foundation's impact on their fields.
Impact on the Community						Grantees were asked to rate the foundation's impact on their local communities.
Impact on the Grantee Organization						Grantees were asked to rate the foundation's impact on their organizations.
Satisfaction						Grantees were asked to rate their satisfaction with their funder.
Quality of Interactions						This summary includes grantee ratings of foundation fairness, responsiveness, and grantee comfort approaching the foundation if a problem arises.
Clarity of Communication of Goals and Strategy						Grantees were asked to rate the clarity of the foundation's communication of its goals and strategy.
Non-Monetary Assistance						This summary includes the frequency of provision and ratings of helpfulness of 14 individual activities, including management and field-related assistance.
Assistance Securing Funding from Other Sources						This summary includes the frequency of provision of foundation assistance in obtaining funding from other sources, and ratings of the impact of those efforts.
Selection Process						Grantees were asked to rate the helpfulness of the foundation's selection process for their organizations.
Reporting and Evaluation Processes						Grantees were asked to rate the helpfulness of the foundation's reporting and evaluation processes for their organizations.
Dollar Return on Grantee Administrative Hours						This summary is calculated by dividing the dollar value of individual grants by the time required of grantees to fulfill the foundation's administrative requirements.

SC Ministry 2007 overlaps SC Ministry 2003

# Review of Findings (2)

Chart shows SC Ministry's Ohio grantees' (▲), and non-Ohio grantees' (△) percentile rank among all foundations in the comparative set.

Indicator	Percentile					Description
	0th	25th	50th	75th	100th	
Overall Effectiveness in Creating Social Impact						Grantees were asked to rate the foundation's overall effectiveness in creating social impact.
Impact on the Field						Grantees were asked to rate the foundation's impact on their fields.
Impact on the Community						Grantees were asked to rate the foundation's impact on their local communities.
Impact on the Grantee Organization						Grantees were asked to rate the foundation's impact on their organizations.
Satisfaction						Grantees were asked to rate their satisfaction with their funder.
Quality of Interactions						This summary includes grantee ratings of foundation fairness, responsiveness, and grantee comfort approaching the foundation if a problem arises.
Clarity of Communication of Goals and Strategy						Grantees were asked to rate the clarity of the foundation's communication of its goals and strategy.
Non-Monetary Assistance						This summary includes the frequency of provision and ratings of helpfulness of 14 individual activities, including management and field-related assistance.
Assistance Securing Funding from Other Sources						This summary includes the frequency of provision of foundation assistance in obtaining funding from other sources, and ratings of the impact of those efforts.
Selection Process						Grantees were asked to rate the helpfulness of the foundation's selection process for their organizations.
Reporting and Evaluation Processes						Grantees were asked to rate the helpfulness of the foundation's reporting and evaluation processes for their organizations.
Dollar Return on Grantee Administrative Hours						This summary is calculated by dividing the dollar value of individual grants by the time required of grantees to fulfill the foundation's administrative requirements.

# Analysis and Discussion (1)

- ◆ High Grantee Ratings of SC Ministry Interactions, Communications, and Processes
  - SC Ministry is rated more positively than 90% of foundations on the quality of its interactions with grantees. Grantees comment that Foundation staff are “very friendly” and “very helpful.”
  - SC Ministry is rated more highly by its grantees than any other foundation surveyed by CEP in the last three years on the clarity of its communication of its goals and strategy. Grantees comment that the Foundation’s communication is “very consistent” and “direct, honest, and practical.”
  - SC Ministry is rated more highly than 90% of foundations on the quality of both its selection and its evaluation processes. SC Ministry’s administrative processes are described as demanding but grantees comment that these processes are “invaluable” and helpful for “strategic planning and measurement.”
    - *How can the Foundation staff and board specifically identify those practices and attributes of the Foundation that they believe lead to these successes so that effective interactions, communications, and processes can be sustained and strengthened?*

## Analysis and Discussion (2)

- ◆ Impact on the Grantee Organization and the Sustainability of Funded Work
  - SC Ministry is rated similarly to the median foundation on its impact on grantee organizations. SC Ministry is rated below the median foundation on its impact on the sustainability of funded work.
  - Grantees that report receiving one year grants rate the Foundation's impact on their organization and the sustainability of the funded work lower than grantees that receive longer grants. A larger than typical proportion of SC Ministry grantees report receiving one year grants.
  - Only a quarter of grantees are first-time grantees – a typical proportion.
  - Few SC Ministry grantees report receiving active assistance securing funding from other sources. The average grantee rating of the impact of this support is lower than typical. Grantees receiving grants larger than \$15K that rate the impact of this support highly also rate the Foundation highly on its impact on the sustainability of the work funded by the grant.
    - *Can the Foundation award longer grants to organizations that have received several years of support?*
    - *How can the Foundation more directly assist its grantees in securing funding from other sources?*

## Analysis and Discussion (3)

- ◆ Discussion of Completed Reports/Evaluations with Grantees
  - Forty-five percent of SC Ministry grantees that completed reports or evaluations for the Foundation report discussing their report with Foundation staff.
  - The average rating of the helpfulness of the evaluation process of grantees that discussed completed reports with Foundation is 5.6 (99<sup>th</sup> percentile). The average rating of the helpfulness of the evaluation process of grantees that *did not* discuss completed reports with Foundation is 5.6 (50<sup>th</sup> percentile).
    - *How can the Foundation discuss completed grant reports with more grantees?*
    - *Is the Foundation staffed in such a way that would enable it to undertake these additional interactions?*
  
- ◆ Dollar Return on Grantee Administrative Time
  - At the median, the number of dollars awarded per hour of administrative time spent by SC Ministry grantees is smaller than that of the median foundation
  - This is a result of a combination of the Foundation's typically time-consuming selection process, its relatively small grant size, and the relatively small proportion of multi-year grants it provides.
  - SC Ministry's selection process is rated very highly by its grantees, and those grantees who rate the selection process highly also rate the Foundation's impact on their organization highly.
    - *Can the Foundation award longer or larger grants to organizations that have received several years of support?*
    - *Can the Foundation streamline their selection process without sacrificing the helpfulness of the process?*