

Key Findings and Recommendations from the Trump Foundation 2016 Grantee Perception Report

Prepared by The Center for Effective Philanthropy

In May and June of 2016, The Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP) conducted a survey of the Trump Foundation’s grantees and non-grantee partners¹, achieving a 66 percent response rate overall².

This memo of key findings and recommendations accompanies the comprehensive survey results found in the Foundation’s interactive online reports at <https://cep.surveymresults.org> and in the downloadable online materials. The Foundation’s full report also contains more information about survey analysis and methodology.



Introduction

We are pleased to provide you with your 2016 Grantee Perception Report (GPR) for the Trump Foundation. We look forward to discussing the results of this survey of your grantees and non-grantee partners (partners).

Assessing funder performance is challenging, and a range of data sources is required. The GPR provides one set of perspectives that can be useful in understanding philanthropic funder performance and should be interpreted in light of the Foundation’s particular goals, strategy and context. The survey covers many areas in which grantees’ and non-grantee partners’ perceptions might be useful to your Foundation. The Trump Foundation should place emphasis on the areas covered according to your specific priorities. Low ratings in an area that is not core to your strategy may not be concerning.

Context matters – both in terms of interpreting your results and planning for future action based on these results. It is our hope that this GPR will inform planning and learning efforts underway by providing data and insight, from the perspective of grantees and non-grantee partners, about the Foundation’s relative strengths and opportunities for improvement.

¹ Throughout this memo, data refers to grantee and non-grantee partners, unless otherwise noted.

² Please refer to Appendix A: Methodology for more detail.

Overview

Overall, grantee and non-grantee partner perceptions in 2016 are similar to 2014³. Across key GPR measures, the Foundation receives mixed feedback, summarized below.

- **Field Impact:** Grantee and partner perceptions of the Foundation's impact on their fields in 2016 are similar to 2014, though slightly trending up. Additionally, ratings have significantly improved for the Foundation's effects on public policy and are trending up for advancing the state of knowledge. In a new custom question, respondents report that the Foundation is having a very positive impact on the teaching of mathematics and science in Israeli high schools.
- **Impact on Organizations:** Ratings for Trump's impact on organizations are similar to 2014, lower than typical, and remain in the bottom 5 percent of CEP's comparative dataset.
- **The Funder-Grantee Relationship⁴:** As in 2014, grantees and partners report strong relationships with the Foundation, with continued exceptionally positive ratings for how clearly the Foundation has communicated its goals and strategies. In fact, the Trump Foundation receives its highest comparative ratings from both grantee and partners for the clarity with which it communicates its goals and strategies. However, ratings for some measures of interactions are trending down.
- **Processes:** With regard to the Foundation's processes, grantee ratings for the helpfulness of the selection process are trending up from 2014, and are now higher than typical. Ratings for the helpfulness of the reporting and evaluation process, however, are typical and trending down from 2014.
- When asked to describe the Foundation in one word, respondents most commonly used the words "professionalism" and "partnership" to describe the Trump Foundation.

Respondents have similar perceptions of and experiences with the Foundation. There are no consistent significant differences when segmenting results by grantees and non-grantee partners.

When analyzing grantee responses by segmentation, there are no consistent differences by grantee strategy (Implementation; Opportunity; Expertise; Amplifying Activities: Knowledge, Media & Networks). However, when segmenting results by grant size, ratings are significantly more positive from grantees receiving grants of 450,000 NIS or more.

With regard to non-grantee partner segmentations, there are no consistent differences when segmenting results by field (Policy & Stakeholders, Research, Practice). However, practice partners rate Trump significantly more positively than policy & stakeholder partners on measures of field and organizational impact.

³ For more detail, please refer to Appendix B: Statistically Significant Changes over Time.

⁴ Please refer to Appendix C for more information regarding CEP's research on funder-grantee relationships.

The Foundation's Approach to and Impact on Grantees' & Partners' Fields

Respondent feedback indicates improvements from 2014 regarding Trump's impact on grantee fields, though ratings continue to be lower than typical. Respondents, as in 2014, provide mixed feedback about the Foundation's strategic approach.

- Grantees and partners rate Trump's impact on their field similarly to 2014 and in the bottom 10 percent of CEP's comparative dataset, though ratings are trending up slightly.
- Ratings have improved on other field-related measures. Ratings have significantly improved since 2014 for the extent to which the Foundation has affected public policy; Trump is now rated in the top 10 percent of funders on this measure.
 - In open-ended comments, respondents describe the Foundation as having strong policy influence. They describe impact on Ministry of Education, praise the Foundation's influence among policymakers, and credit Trump for increasing broad public awareness of the importance of math and science education.
 - Additionally, ratings are trending up since 2014 for the extent to which the Foundation has advanced the state of knowledge in grantees' and partners' fields.
- CEP's broad field-wide research shows that grantee perceptions of a funder's understanding of their fields is the strongest predictor of perceptions of its impact on their fields.
 - Ratings for the Foundation's field understanding are typical, though trending down slightly from 2014. Respondents who rate the Foundation a 6 or 7 for the extent to which Trump understands their fields rate the Foundation significantly more positively on field impact.
- Ratings for measures of field impact differ somewhat by subgroup:
 - Grantees that report receiving grants of at least 450,000 NIS – including strategic grantees – rate the Foundation significantly more positively on a number of measures, including its impact on and understanding of their fields and effect on public policy.
 - Practice partners rate the Foundation's impact on their fields significantly more positively than policy & stakeholder partners.

The Trump Foundation's Approach

- Particularly as a relatively new foundation, the Trump Foundation's work within high schools is viewed positively, with optimism about future improvements.
 - In a custom question, respondents report that the Foundation is having a very positive impact on the teaching of mathematics and science in Israeli high schools.
 - Similarly, nearly 90 percent of respondents believe that the Foundation's goal to see a 20 percent increase in the number of high school students studying advanced Physics and a 15 percent rise in students studying advanced mathematics in ten years is feasible, similar to 2014.
 - Additionally, grantees believe that Trump has a strong understanding of the needs of beneficiaries, and ratings for the extent to which the Foundation's funding priorities reflect a deep understanding of their intended beneficiaries' needs are similar to the typical funder.

- However, Trump is rated lower than typical for the extent to which it is open to ideas about its strategy and for its understanding of the context that affects the work of grantees and non-grantee partners.
- In fact, the number one suggestion relates to the Foundation’s broad approach and strategy.
 - As in 2014, respondents recognize the Foundation’s specific and narrow focus and encourage the Foundation to “broaden its objectives,” suggesting an expansion of “its framework to fields of education in general....not only math and science in high school,” that it consider a “strategic expansion of the target audience, down to elementary school age,” and greater focus on “outstanding teachers, and not necessary in sciences and math.”
 - Others suggest that the Foundation invest more in the “research related to teaching and learning math” and support more “unconventional” and “innovative” efforts in the math and science space.

“The Foundation’s field is narrow relative to our field of endeavor. We would like to expand the scope of collaboration, but we are limited by the goals of the Foundation.”

“The Foundation significantly raised public awareness about the importance of learning math.”

“The Foundation has a big impact on strengthening science education in Israel in general and math in particular – on the public level and on the professional level.”

“The Foundation’s impact on the professional field in which it chooses to operate – science studies in secondary education – is enormous. It is nearly unprecedented in Israeli concepts. But we as an organization operate in the Foundation’s central field of activity only in one project, and it is because of this project that we connected with the Foundation. Thus, we have a broad community for which the Trump Foundation is not relevant.”

“The activity at the national level had an impact on changing policy at the Ministry.”

Impact on and Understanding of Grantees’ & Partners’ Organizations

Overall, ratings on measures of impact on and understanding of respondent organizations are similar to 2014, and remain typical or lower than typical.

- Ratings for Trump’s impact on organizations remain lower than typical, in the bottom five percent of funders overall.⁵
- CEP’s broad field-wide research shows that grantee perceptions of a funder’s understanding of their organizations’ goals and strategies is the strongest predictor of perceptions of its impact on their organizations. As in 2014, respondents rate the Foundation similarly to the typical funder for its understanding of their goals and strategies⁶.

⁵ This question was asked only of grantees in 2014 and of both grantees and non-grantee partners in 2016.

⁶ This question was asked only of grantees in 2014 and of both grantees and non-grantee partners in 2016.

- Grantees and partners that rate the Foundation a 6 or 7 for the extent to which Trump understands their organization's goals and strategies rate the Foundation significantly more positively on most measures in the survey, including its impact on their organizations.
- Grantees rate the Foundation significantly more positively than 2014 for their ability to sustain the grant-funded work in the future, though ratings for this measure remain lower than typical.
- As in 2014, grantees rate the Foundation similarly to the typical funder for its awareness of the challenges grantees are facing. However, ratings remain lower than typical for the extent to which the Foundation takes advantage of its various resources to help grantees address their challenges.

Grantmaking Characteristics

Compared to the typical funder, and as in 2014, Trump's grantmaking characteristics are distinct.

- Trump grantees report receiving longer and larger grants than the typical funder, and the Foundation provides more program/project support grants than the typical funder.
 - Grantees receiving grants of 2.5 years or longer rate Trump more positively on a number of measures, including their ability to sustain the funded work, Trump's helpfulness in helping grantees address grantee their challenges, impact on public policy, and Trump's field understanding than grantees receiving shorter grants.
- Perhaps a reflection of the foundation's specific approach, a larger than typical proportion of grantees report using the grant to add new program work, rather than to maintain or expand existing program work.
- The Foundation has a higher than typical proportion of first-time grantees, though fewer than in 2014.
- Trump funds larger organizations than typical and, given its large grant size, also funds a larger than typical proportion of grantees' organizational budgets.
 - Grantees with organizational budgets of less than \$1M USD rate Trump's impact on their organizations significantly more positively than grantees whose organizational budgets equal or exceed \$1M USD.

Continued Valuable Non-monetary Assistance⁷:

The Trump Foundation continues to provide a larger than typical proportion of its grantees with intensive forms of non-monetary assistance. These supports are highly valued; grantees continue to find Foundation-organized events helpful and express some interest in more Foundation-organized convenings of grantees and partners.

- Forty percent of grantees, a higher than typical proportion, report receiving intensive patterns (field focused or comprehensive⁸) of non-monetary assistance. Grantees that received these intensive patterns of non-monetary assistance rate the Foundation significantly more positively on almost every measure in the survey, compared to grantees that received a few or no types of non-monetary assistance.

⁷ Please refer to Appendix D: Non-Monetary Assistance for more detail

⁸ Please refer to Appendix D: Non-Monetary Assistance for more detail

- Grantees most frequently report receiving forms of field-focused assistance, specifically the encouragement or facilitation of collaboration (56 percent), introductions to field leaders (54 percent), and seminars/forums/convenings (46 percent).
- Eighty-five percent of grantees and partners, a larger proportion than in the past, report participating in at least one event (e.g. workshops, group meetings, conferences) bringing together grantees and partners, organized by the Foundation.
- As in 2014, participants find events to be very helpful, and 61 percent of respondents would like to see more efforts from the Trump Foundation to convene grantees and partners.
 - In particular, respondents express interest in small group meetings focused on particular topics, enrichment events with experts, and general knowledge-sharing events.

Continued Strong Relationships & Particularly Positive Communications

CEP's research finds that strong funder-grantee relationships – defined by high quality interactions and clear and consistent foundation communications – are critical to high-performing funders. Grantees who have strong relationships with their funders perceive those funders to have significantly greater impact on their organizations, communities, and fields.⁹ More tangibly, grantees that can approach funders with challenges, get answers to important questions in a timely fashion, and clearly understand what a funder is trying to achieve are more likely to efficiently execute work on shared goals *and* draw on funder resources beyond the grant funding – amplifying the impact of money invested in providers and programs.

Overall, and as in 2014, Trump grantees and non-grantee partners have stronger than typical relationships with the Foundation, and the strength of relationships is most positive among grantees with whom the Foundation has the most active relationships. However, ratings for some measures of interactions are trending down from 2014.

Interactions

Overall, while they remain typical or higher than typical, ratings for some measures related to quality of interactions are trending down from 2014.

- While ratings for staff responsiveness are typical and similar to 2014, ratings for comfort approaching the Foundation if a problem arises are trending down from 2014 and are now typical.
 - Grantee ratings have declined significantly since 2014 on both of these measures.
- Although ratings of the fairness of the Foundation's treatment remain higher than typical, ratings have significantly declined since 2014.
- In a custom question about interactions with Trump, as in 2014, respondents rate most positively for the extent to which the Foundation trusts them to carry out the work specified in the partnership and respects their expertise in their areas of focus.
- Ratings for the *quality* of interactions are related to the *quantity* of interactions between the Foundation and its grantees and partners. Interaction patterns are similar to those in 2014, with 65 percent of respondents having contact with the Foundation monthly or more often. These

⁹ Please refer to Appendix C for more information regarding CEP's research on funder-grantee relationships.

respondents rate Trump significantly more positively on measures relating to the quality of interactions.

- A larger than typical proportion of respondents, representing a significant increase from 2014, report experiencing a recent contact change at the Foundation. Those who did rate the Foundation significantly less positively on almost every measure of the survey.
- Improving interactions are the second and third most common suggestion from respondents, respectively. Grantees and non-grantee partners suggest more frequent interaction with the Foundation, smoother management of contact changes, and more site visits.

Communications

- As in 2014, the Foundation is rated exceptionally positively - higher than 97 percent of funders in CEP’s comparative dataset - for how clearly Trump has communicated its goals and strategies to grantees and non-grantee partners.
- Ratings remain typical, and similar to 2014, for the consistency of information provided by different communications resources, both personal and written, that they used to learn about the Foundation.
 - With regard to specific communications resources, respondents most frequently use individual communication with the Foundation, which they find to be the most valuable.
 - While respondent find Trump’s online resources to be moderately helpful, overall, they are most useful for learning about the Foundation’s goals and strategies.
- Ratings for the Foundation’s overall transparency are trending up from 2014 and are now similar to the typical funder¹⁰.
 - While still typical or below typical, ratings on aspects of transparency (e.g., the Foundation’s processes for selecting grantees; best practices the Foundation has learned - through its work or through others’ work - about the issue areas it funds) have significantly improved since 2014.

“The relations with the Foundation’s staff were excellent. On the one hand, we received full attention to all of our requests, and our program was carefully examined. On the other hand, we were given the freedom to act as we thought best – the Foundation did not try to force us to do things their way.”

“The Foundation defined clear objectives, which were continually monitored in cooperation with us, while making adjustments to best achieve the objectives. The relationship is excellent, the Foundation provides strong and supportive backing, and knows how to encourage and empower toward achieving the goals.”

“Quality discourse and relationship, honest and direct, between colleagues working together toward a common objective.”

“The communication was available, to-the-point, and patient.”

¹⁰ CEP’s recent research, using responses to the GPR, indicates that the strongest predictor of the strength of the funder-grantee relationship is grantee responses to the question “Overall how transparent is the Foundation with your organization?” For more detail on CEP’s research on transparency and predictors of the funder-grantee relationship please refer to CEP’s research report: [Sharing What Matters – Foundation Transparency \(2016\)](#).

Foundation Processes and Monetary Return¹¹

Grantee ratings for the helpfulness of the selection process are trending up from 2014, and are now higher than typical. Ratings for the helpfulness of the reporting and evaluation process, however, are typical and trending down from 2014. Additionally, grantee feedback paints a picture of time consuming and intensive grant processes, that, in light of larger than typical grant size, yield a monetary return that is similar to the typical funder.

Selection Process

- Grantees view the selection process as more helpful than typical – and more helpful than in 2014 – in strengthening their organizations or grant-funded programs.
- The selection process is an intensive experience for grantees. Staff are very involved in the proposal development process and grantees feel a higher than typical amount of pressure to modify their organization’s priorities in order to create a grant proposal that is likely to receive funding, a significant increase from 2014.

Reporting & Evaluation Process

- Grantees view the reporting/evaluation process as typically helpful – though less helpful than in 2014 – in strengthening their organizations or grant-funded programs. More specifically, they provide ratings in the bottom five percent of CEP’s comparative dataset for how helpful Trump has been to their organization’s ability to assess progress towards their own goals.
- Grantees report greater than typical engagement with the Foundation during the evaluation/reporting process. A higher than typical proportion, similar to 2014, discuss their report/evaluation with the Foundation, and 70 percent, a typical proportion and similar to 2014, report exchanging ideas with the Foundation regarding how their organization would assess the results of the work funded by this grant.
- The Foundation’s processes, particularly its evaluation processes, are the second most commonly mentioned suggestion from grantees. Grantees request greater clarity and ongoing communication during the evaluation process, as well as feedback on submitted reports.

Time Spent on Processes and Monetary Return

With larger than typical grant size, even in light of time-intensive processes, the Foundation has a typical financial return per hour invested in Foundation processes. In other words, for every process hour, grantees receive \$2,500 on average, similar to the return of \$2,200 at the typical foundation.

- More specifically, at the median, grantees report spending 80 hours on the Foundation’s administrative requirements over the lifetime of their grant, relative to 32 at the typical funder. This is an increase from 50 hours in 2014, driven largely by an increase in time spent on monitoring, reporting and evaluation.
- Grantees receiving grants of less than 450,000 NIS receive a lower than typical monetary return.

¹¹ This section references questions asked of grantees only.

“The processes were very orderly and clear, and the personal connection and guidance helped a lot in the process.”

“There was no feedback from the Foundation. We’d be happy to know what the Foundation thinks about what we did.”

CEP Recommendations

- As a strategy to increase field impact, consider where the Foundation might be able to **deepen, clarify, and demonstrate its understanding of the fields in which grantees and partners work**. In doing so, reflect on ways to articulate the rationale behind the Foundation’s strategic approach, and seek opportunities to be increasingly open to ideas from grantees and partners about Trump’s strategy.
- If improving the strength and sustainability of grantee and partner organizations is a goal of the Foundation, **review the ways in which Trump and its staff build and communicate strong understanding of their goals, strategies and challenges**. Additionally, create opportunities to better communicate the Foundation’s interest in and understanding of grantees’ and partners’ organizational goals, strategies and challenges.
- Building on the valuable provision of **non-monetary assistance**, consider the role of and possibilities for expanding the Foundation’s facilitation of convenings for grantees and partners.
- To further strengthen the funder-grantee relationship, in service of impact, reflect on ways to provide increasingly **consistent communications** and **high-quality interactions to grantees and partners**. In doing so, seek a more transparent articulation of Trump’s approach and grantees’ and partners’ contributions to that approach.
- Consider how the **selection and reporting/evaluation processes**, in addition to providing information needed for Trump decision-making, **can be a tool for strengthening grantee programs**. Consider opportunities for clearer expectations and greater engagement during the reporting/evaluation process.

Contact Information

Naomi Orensten, Manager – Assessment & Advisory Services

naomio@effectivephilanthropy.org

Della Menhaj, Analyst – Assessment & Advisory Services

dellam@effectivephilanthropy.org

Appendix A: Methodology

CEP surveyed grantees and non-grantee partners of the Trump Foundation in May and June of 2016. CEP received 86 responses for an overall 66 percent response rate. CEP received 50 responses from grantees for an overall 86 percent response rate from grantees, and 35 responses from non-grantee partners for an overall 50 percent response rate from non-grantee partners. These response rates are higher than typical.

This is the second GPR for the Foundation. CEP previously surveyed the Foundation's grantees and non-grantee partners in 2014.

Throughout this report, Trump Foundation's survey results are compared to CEP's broader dataset of more than 50,000 grantees built up over more than a decade of grantee surveys of approximately 300 funders. Funder results are displayed relative to other funders who have used the GPR, and, with this comparative data, results are frequently compared to the "median" or "typical" funder rated at the 50th percentile. Grantee ratings for the Foundation are described as "higher than typical" when they fall above the 65th percentile, and "lower than typical" when they fall below the 35th percentile. As the Foundation considers its comparative results, it is important to note that, across foundations, grantee ratings do not differ by foundation size, grant size, grant type, or program area. In other words, these factors are not predictive of grantee ratings.

CEP compares past ratings to current ratings, testing for statistically significant differences. The use of the term "significant" in this memo denotes a statistically significant change. CEP uses a 90 percent confidence interval for significance testing. CEP uses the word "trending" when the data shows a pattern over time (from one GPR to the next) towards a given direction, but when that pattern is not statistically significant.

Appendix B: Statistically Significant Changes over Time

Significant Differences Between 2014 & 2016 – Overall

- Grantees and non-grantee partners rate Trump significantly more positively than in 2014 for the following measures:
 - The Foundation’s effect on public policy
 - The extent to which the Foundation improved grantees’ ability to sustain the work funded by this grant in the future.
 - Transparency measures, including:
 - Transparency regarding the Foundation's processes for selecting grantees
 - Transparency regarding best practices the Foundation has learned - through its work or through others' work - about the issue areas it funds
 - Transparency regarding the Foundation's experience with what it has tried but has not worked in its past grantmaking
- Grantees report significantly more pressure than in 2014 to modify their priorities to create a request that is more likely to receive funding.
- Ratings for fairness and the overall relationship summary measure have decreased significantly since 2014.
- In 2016, a significantly larger proportion of grantees and non-grantee partners report having had a change in primary contact than in 2014.

Significant Differences over Time – Grantees

- Grantees rate the extent to which Trump improved their ability to sustain the work funded by the grant in the future significantly more positively than grantees in 2014.
- Grantees rate Trump more positively on the following aspects of transparency:
 - Transparency regarding Foundation's processes for selecting grantees
 - Transparency regarding best practices the Foundation has learned - through its work or through others' work - about the issue areas it funds
 - Transparency regarding Foundation's experience with what it has tried but has not worked in its past grantmaking
- Grantee ratings have declined significantly on measures of the funder-grantee relationship, including the relationship summary measure, perceptions of being treated fairly, comfort approaching the Foundation if a problem arises and staff responsiveness. Compared to 2014, a larger proportion of grantees in 2016 report having had a change in their primary contact.
- Grantees report feeling significantly more pressure in 2016 than 2014 to modify their organization’s priorities in order to create a grant proposal that was likely to receive funding.

Significant Differences over Time – Non-grantee Partners

- Non-grantee partners rate the Foundation’s impact on public policy significantly more positively in 2016 than 2014.
- A significantly larger proportion of non-grantee partners in 2016 report having had a change in primary contact than grantees in 2014.

Appendix C: Funder-Grantee Relationships

Funder-Grantee Relationships Factor

Through our broader research, CEP has identified five statistically related survey items that illustrate a larger construct of relationships (visualized below). This relationships construct is one of the strongest predictors of the extent to which grantees perceive their funder’s impact on their organizations, and is highly related to a number of other grantee perceptions about their funders, described on page 6 of this report.

For more information about CEP’s research and recommendations regarding funder-grantee relationships, please refer to CEP’s research report [Working Well with Grantees: A Guide for Program Staff](#).



Appendix D: Non-Monetary Assistance

The grantee survey asks grantees to indicate what types of non-monetary assistance (listed below) they received from the Trump Foundation in association with the funding from their grant. CEP then categorized grantees' responses into one of four categories outlined below and described in more detail in CEP's research report, [More Than Money: Making a Difference with Assistance Beyond the Grant](#).

<u>Management Assistance</u>	<u>Field-Related Assistance</u>	<u>Other Assistance</u>
General management advice	Encouraged/facilitated collaboration	Board development/governance assistance
Strategic planning advice	Insight and advice on your field	Information technology assistance
Financial planning/accounting	Introductions to leaders in field	Communications/marketing/publicity assistance
Development of performance measures	Provided research or best practices	Use of Foundation facilities
	Provided seminars/forums/convenings	Staff/management training



Appendix E: Top & Bottom 5 Comparative Ratings

Top 5 Comparative Ratings			
Rank	Measure	Percentile Ranking	Average Rating
1	“How clearly has the Foundation communicated its goals and strategy to you?” (1 = Not at all clearly, 7 = Extremely clearly)	97	6.34
2	“How involved was Foundation staff in the development of your grant proposal?” (1 = No involvement, 7 = Substantial involvement)	95	5.08
3	Proportion of grantees that received field-focused or comprehensive assistance	93	40%
4	“To what extent has the Foundation affected public policy in your field?” (1 = Not at all, 7 = Major influence on shaping public policy)”	91	5.42
5	“Overall, how fairly did the Foundation treat you?” (1 = Not at all fairly, 7 = Extremely fairly)	82	6.71
Bottom 5 Comparative Ratings			
Rank	Measure	Percentile Ranking	Average Rating
1	“Overall, how would you rate the Foundation’s impact on your organization?” (1 = No impact, 7 = Significant positive impact)	2	5.04
2	“How helpful has the Foundation been to your organization’s ability to assess progress towards your organization’s goals?” (Not at all helpful, 7 = Extremely helpful)	3	4.35
3	“Overall, how would you rate the Foundation’s impact on your field?” (1 = No impact, 7 = Significant positive impact)	7	5.07
4	“Transparency: The Foundation’s experiences with what it has tried but has not worked in its past grantmaking.” (1 = Not at all transparent, 7 = extremely transparent)	10	4.02
5	“How much, if at all, did the Foundation improve your ability to sustain the work funded by this grant in the future?” (1 = Did not improve ability at all, 7 = Substantially improved ability)	11	4.95