

Key Findings and Recommendations from the Eddie and Jules Trump Family Foundation 2022 Grantee Perception Report

Prepared by the Center for Effective Philanthropy

Introduction

We are pleased to provide you with your 2022 Grantee Perception Report (“GPR”) for the Eddie and Jules Trump Family Foundation (referred to as “the Foundation” and “Trump”). 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. This GPR provides one set of perspectives useful in understanding philanthropic funder performance. The comparative benchmarking available for the GPR – from grantees of more than 350 funders – can help illuminate Trump’s unique strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to grantees of other funders CEP has surveyed.

The results of these assessments should be interpreted in light of the Foundation’s particular context, goals, and strategy – alongside other evidence it collects about the efficacy and impact of its work. Context matters – in terms of interpreting results and planning for future action based on this set of feedback. While the surveys cover many areas in which grantees’ and non-grantee partners’ perceptions might be useful to the Foundation, low ratings in an area not important to the Foundation’s strategy may not be concerning. Similarly, high ratings in an area not important to the Foundation’s strategy may not be cause for celebration. We hope that this set of feedback will inform efforts by providing perspectives of some of your crucial stakeholders about the Foundation’s opportunities for improvement and relative strengths.

Unless otherwise noted, this memo compares the Foundation’s grantee and non-grantee partner ratings to *grantee* ratings of all funders in CEP’s datasets based on percentile rank. Trump ratings are described as “higher than typical” when they fall above the 65th percentile and “lower than typical” when they fall below the 35th percentile. Selected respondent comments are shown throughout this memo and highlight key themes.

Overview

- ▶ Respondents’ perceptions of Trump in 2022 are largely unchanged or trending down from the Foundation’s 2020 results. Non-grantee partners and grantees continue to provide ratings that are lower than those of many other funders in CEP’s comparative dataset across key survey themes, including on questions related to perceptions of Trump’s impact, its understanding of them and their fields, as well as the quality of Trump’s funder-partner interactions.
- ▶ Though partners continue to believe that Trump’s goal is important, their ratings and comments suggest that they feel the Foundation could expand both its approach and strategy to the greatest advancement in their fields. As in 2020 and 2018, the largest proportion of partners’ qualitative suggestions relates to the Foundation’s impact on and understanding of education in Israel. Most frequently, 2022 partners request that the Foundation listen better to the context of those working on the ground and reflect that deeper understanding in changes to the Foundation’s strategy and approach.
- ▶ Grantee partners’ ratings of Trump’s understanding have declined since 2020, and several of those ratings are now in the bottom 10 percent of CEP’s comparative dataset.
- ▶ Grantee partners in 2022 experience the Foundation’s selection process as significantly more helpful and slightly more streamlined than in the past.

Opportunity to Enhance Impact on and Understanding of Partners' Fields

- ▶ The Foundation receives one of its higher comparative ratings – in the top 40 percent of CEP's comparative dataset - for the extent to which it has affected public policy within partners' fields.
- ▶ Yet, as in all of Trump's past GPR results, when rating the Foundation's impact on the field in which they work, grantees and non-grantee partners provide less positive ratings than grantees of other funders whom CEP has surveyed. Since 2020, grantees' ratings have further declined on this and related measures.
- ▶ Across both their ratings and open-ended feedback, partners indicate a need for Trump to better understand them and their fields. Ratings on all questions related to Trump's understanding continue to be lower than typical, with most trending lower than 2020.
 - Grantee partners' ratings also indicate an opportunity for Trump to understand better the needs of the people and communities they serve – and then better reflect those needs in its funding approaches.
- ▶ Relatedly, the most common theme in partners' written suggestions relates to ways the Foundation could increase its impact on the field of education in Israel, including by placing more emphasis on listening to the needs and context of those on the ground and then reflecting that listening in changes to its approach.

Partners ask the Foundation to “listen... to the needs that arise from the field,” “map the real needs of the field together with...various partners,” and “[be] more considerate of the researchers' opinions.”

- Although most feedback is about the Foundation's strategy, several partners also suggest changes to its goals. They describe an opportunity to widen the Foundation's target populations (whom some believe to be overlooked) in service of achieving Trump's specific field goals. For example, they request the Foundation “Increase activity in elementary school” and “invest mainly in disadvantaged areas.”
- ▶ Perhaps related to some partners' sense that their contexts are not reflected in the Foundation's approach of how best to improve education in Israel, grantee partners continue to report experiencing an unusually high (and, over time, increasing) level of pressure to modify their own organizational priorities to receive Foundation funding. Grantees that report experiencing these high levels of pressure (rating a five or higher on a seven-point scale) provide significantly lower ratings for Trump's impact on their fields and organizations, aspects of its contextual understanding, and most interaction measures.



“Be more attentive to the field: To the needs of the target audience, to the recommendations of the professional developing bodies. If a widespread problem arises - which is not of a specific program/organization but of most organizations and programs - take into account that there may be a problem with their work assumptions and think about how they can be improved.... The problems that the organizations raise are both at the operational level and reflect the needs of the target audience.” – Grantee partner



“The Foundation's activity is very professional. The problem is...it forces organizations to run programs that they think, from knowing the field, are not good or needed enough because they have a very clear and closed agenda and workplan and it doesn't matter to them...if the organizations...think differently.... The many organizations they fund are part of the big plan puzzle they have for change. And the organizations are...tools that don't think enough and lack independence. Such a centralized approach may be good to drive large programs with clear goals, but...an organization that does not know the problems and challenges in the field completely misses all this knowledge....” – Grantee partner

Partners Believe in The Importance of the Foundation’s Overall Goal. They Hold More Mixed Perceptions of Whether Its Success Indicator Can Be Achieved

- ▶ As in 2020, nearly all partners agree – rating a five or higher on a seven-point scale - that the Foundation’s goal of raising the bar in secondary schools and readying every student for the challenge of studying mathematics and the sciences at a level of excellence is important.
- ▶ When asked if they *identify* with the goal and/or success indicator, more than 90 percent of partners agree with the Foundation’s goal.
- ▶ Though, as mentioned above, they have many suggestions about how the Foundation could better achieve that goal. And so, perhaps relatedly, respondents agree less strongly that success indicator can be achieved. And, as in 2020, a smaller proportion agree with the success indicator than agree with the goal. About 40 percent of grantee partners and 15 percent of non-grantee partners do not agree with the success indicator; they agree with the goal only.



“The Foundation had a great impact in raising awareness of excellence in mathematics, especially in high school. It now concentrates on middle school and I hope the impact will be just as great...” – Grantee partner

Extremely Clear Communications, with Opportunity to Strengthen Interactions

- ▶ CEP’s research finds that strong funder-grantee relationships – defined by high-quality interactions and clear, consistent communications – are a key predictor of grantees’ perceptions of a funder’s impact on their fields, organizations, and local communities.
- ▶ Ratings suggest the Foundation provides incredibly clear communications of its goals and strategy, with grantees and non-grantee partners rating Trump in the top 5 percent of all funders for this measure.
- ▶ However, partners continue to highlight interactions with Foundation staff as an important area for improvement. Undoubtedly, some partners have positive interactions with the Foundation. They describe staff as “professional’ and “excellent.” But more often than at most other funders, some partners describe difficult, one-sided interactions. Themes in those less positive comments often touch on aspects of understanding and pressure. For example, echoing other comments, partners write:
 - “Sometimes there is an intervention in the contents of the program that is not always in line with our professional knowledge and tries to impose the ideas of the staff members and the Foundation, even though they are not always suitable for us or...for the program.” (Grantee)
 - “The Foundation works alone, ignoring the professional elements in the [organization] and often ‘over their heads,’ does not consult and does not adapt itself to the policies of the [organization].” (Non-grantee)
- ▶ Relatedly, the Foundation receives ratings in the bottom 10 percent of CEP’s benchmarking for nearly all survey items related to the quality of grantees’ and non-grantee partners’ interactions with staff. Notably, grantees’ ratings for Foundation staff responsiveness have significantly declined since 2020 and now trend lower than those of non-grantee partners.
- ▶ These perceptions appear to be primarily related to the *quality* of interactions with Trump staff rather than the *quantity* of interactions. Ratings are similar for partners who have more or less frequent interactions and between partners who have had a recent change in their primary contact at the Foundation and those that have not.

- ▶ CEP's research suggests that a funder's understanding of an organization's goals and challenges is a leading predictor of the strength of a funder's interactions and communications. As in 2020, Trump grantee partners provide ratings that are much lower than typical for these items, and their ratings for the Foundation's understanding of their organization's goals and strategies significantly declined.



"I was impressed that the Foundation is very professional, its information always seems reliable." – Non-grantee partner



"The people working at the Foundation are pleasant and professional, but there is a feeling that they do not understand or are aware of what is happening on the ground..." – Grantee partner

Helpful and Increasingly Efficient Selection & Reporting Processes

- ▶ In 2022, grantees find Trump's selection process to be clear and extremely helpful in strengthening them or the funded work, and they report spending less time on this process than in the past. Ratings of this process' helpfulness have significantly improved and now place Trump in the top 10 percent of funders.
- ▶ Grantees highlight similar strengths for the Foundation's reporting process, continuing to rate Trump higher than typical for both the relevance and straightforwardness of its reporting process.
- ▶ Notably, grantees experience the Foundation's processes as more streamlined than previous years. The typical grantee now spends 65 hours on Trump's selection and reporting/evaluation requirements over their grant lifetime, compared to 81 hours in 2020. Although this time spent is higher than that of other funders, Trump continues to provide much larger than typical grants. Accordingly, grantees continue to receive a comparatively positive financial return for each hour spent on Trump processes.



"This is a third program...for which I am involved in one way or another in the submission of the grant or reports on the execution.... There is a great improvement in terms of the convenience of submitting the grant, the required processes, attention to difficulties and the simplification of the required forms and documents, and this is for the better...." – Grantee partner

CEP Recommendations

- ▶ Focus on the low ratings of Trump's understanding.
 - Is the Trump Foundation potentially missing opportunities related to its approach, which partners are recognizing? Consider creating opportunities to work with partners – perhaps across groups of partners – to listen authentically to their thinking about their fields and the needs of their beneficiaries, to deepen Trump's own expertise, and reflect back to future partners the way its approaches are informed by partners' feedback.
 - Has Trump Foundation simply not done a good enough job communicating to partners why and how its approaches *are* rooted in a strong understanding of the field and the needs of the people partners' organizations are serving, and how the Foundation continuously adjusts its approach based on partners' feedback? If so, it could focus on selling its ideas more effectively to partners – to inspire them to align more closely with Trump's thinking and approach. In so doing, it could focus on dialogue that continually enhances both Trump's and partners' understanding.
- ▶ Work with staff to identify what barriers currently hinder their interactions with partners and how these challenges might be addressed. In particular, find ways to prioritize staff responsiveness.
- ▶ Continue to streamline processes, seeking to investigate where bottlenecks may exist that result in the collection of information not truly vital for the Foundation's decision-making or learning.

Appendix A: Methodology

CEP surveyed grantees and non-grantee partners of the Eddie and Jules Trump Family Foundation in May and June of 2022. In total, CEP received 84 responses for an overall 56 percent response rate. CEP received 52 responses from grantees for a 65 percent grantee response rate and 32 responses from non-grantee partners for a 46 percent non-grantee partner response rate. As in the past, Grantee response rates are in line with typical response rates, and non-grantee partner response rates are higher than typical.

This is the fifth GPR for the Foundation. CEP previously surveyed the Foundation's grantees and non-grantee partners in 2020, 2018, 2016, and 2014.

Throughout this report, Trump Foundation's survey results are compared to CEP's broader dataset of more than 40,000 grantee responses built up over more than a decade of grantee surveys of more than 350 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 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) with a mean difference of at least .30 in a given direction, but when that pattern is not statistically significant.

Appendix B: Statistically Significant Changes Over Time

Significant differences between 2022 & 2020 – overall

- ▶ 2022 grantees and non-grantee partners rate the Foundation significantly less positively than in 2020 for the Foundation's impact on their local communities.
- ▶ At the median, 2022 grantees and non-grantee partners are significantly more likely to have experienced a recent primary contact change compared to grantees and non-grantee partners in 2020.

Significant differences between 2022 & 2020 – grantees only

- ▶ Grantees rate the Foundation significantly more positively than grantees in 2020 for the helpfulness of the selection process in strengthening the grant-funded efforts. At the median, they report spending significantly fewer hours on the Foundation's selection process requirements.
- ▶ Grantees rate the Foundation significantly less positively than grantees in 2020 for the following measures:
 - The Foundation's effect on public policy within their fields of work.
 - The Foundation's impact on their local communities.
 - The Foundation's understanding of their organizational goals and strategy.
 - The responsiveness of Foundation staff.
- ▶ At the median, 2022 grantees are significantly more likely to have experienced a recent primary contact change.

Significant differences between 2022 & 2020 – non-grantee partners only

- ▶ Non-grantee partners rate the Foundation significantly less positively than non-grantee partners in 2020 for the Foundation's impact on their local communities.

Significant differences between 2022 & 2018 - overall

- ▶ 2022 grantees and non-grantee partners rate the Foundation significantly less positively than in 2018 for the following measures:
 - The Foundation's impact on their local communities.
 - The responsiveness of Foundation staff.
- ▶ At the median, 2022 grantees and non-grantee partners are significantly more likely to have experienced a recent primary contact change compared to grantees and non-grantee partners in 2018.

Significant differences between 2022 & 2018 – grantees only

- ▶ Grantees rate the Foundation significantly more positively than grantees in 2018 for the helpfulness of the selection process in strengthening the grant-funded efforts.
- ▶ Grantees report experiencing a significantly higher level of pressure to create a proposal that was likely to receive Foundation funding than did grantees in 2018.
- ▶ Grantees rate the Foundation significantly less positively than grantees in 2018 for the following measures:
 - The Foundation's impact on their fields of work.
 - The Foundation's effect on public policy within their fields of work.
 - Their comfort approaching the Foundation if a problem arises.
 - The responsiveness of Foundation staff.
 - The consistency of information provided by the Foundation's communication resources.
 - The Foundation's overall transparency.
- ▶ At the median, grantees receive significantly larger grants compared to 2018. Though, a significantly smaller proportion of grantees receive multi-year grants compared to 2018.
- ▶ At the median, grantees are significantly more likely than grantees in 2018 to report having:
 - A prospective discussion with the Foundation about assessing the results of the funded work.
 - Experienced a recent primary contact change.

Significant differences between 2022 & 2018 – non-grantee partners only

- ▶ Non-grantee partners rate the Foundation significantly more positively than non-grantee partners in 2018 for the following measures:
 - The Foundation's understanding of their fields of work.
 - The Foundation's understanding of their socio-cultural contexts.
 - The Foundation's openness to their ideas.

Significant differences between 2022 & 2016 - overall

- ▶ 2022 grantees and non-grantee partners rate the Foundation significantly less positively than grantees and non-grantee partners in 2016 for the following measures:
 - The Foundation's impact on their fields of work.

- The Foundation's effect on public policy in their fields of work.
- The Foundation's impact on their organizations.
- The Foundation's impact on their local communities.
- The responsiveness of Foundation staff.
- The consistency of information provided by the Foundation's communication resources.

Significant differences between 2022 & 2016 – grantees only

- ▶ Grantees rate the Foundation significantly more positively than grantees in 2016 for the helpfulness of the selection process in strengthening the grant-funded efforts.
- ▶ Grantees report experiencing a significantly higher level of pressure to create a proposal that was likely to receive Foundation funding than did grantees in 2016.
- ▶ Grantees rate the Foundation significantly less positively than grantees in 2016 for the following measures:
 - The Foundation's understanding of the needs of the people and communities they serve.
 - The extent to which the Foundation's programmatic priorities reflect an understanding of the needs of the people and communities they serve.
 - The Foundation's understanding of their organizational goals and strategies.
 - The Foundation's awareness of their organizational challenges.
 - The responsiveness of Foundation staff.
 - The consistency of information provided by the Foundation's communication resources.
- ▶ At the median, grantees receive larger grants compared to 2016. They also report receiving a significantly larger financial return per hour invested in the Foundation's processes than grantees in 2016.
- ▶ At the median, grantees are significantly more likely to report having:
 - A prospective discussion with the Foundation about assessing the results of the funded work.
 - Experienced a recent primary contact change.

Significant differences between 2022 & 2016 – non-grantee partners only

- ▶ Non-grantee partners rate the Foundation significantly less positively than non-grantee partners in 2016 for the following measures:
 - The Foundation's impact on their fields of work.
 - The Foundation's impact on their local communities.
 - The Foundation's impact on their organizations.
 - The Foundation's overall transparency.

Significant differences between 2022 & 2014 - overall

- ▶ 2022 grantees and non-grantee partners rate the Foundation significantly less positively than grantees and non-grantee partners in 2014 for the following measures:
 - The Foundation's impact on their local communities.
 - Their comfort approaching the Foundation if a problem arises.

- The responsiveness of Foundation staff.
 - The consistency of information provided by the Foundation’s communication resources.
- ▶ At the median, 2022 grantees and non-grantee partners are significantly more likely to have experienced a recent primary contact change.

Significant Differences Between 2022 & 2014 – grantees only

- ▶ Grantees rate the Foundation significantly more positively than grantees in 2014 for the helpfulness of the Foundation’s selection process in strengthening the grant-funded efforts.
- ▶ Grantees report experiencing a significantly higher level of pressure to create a proposal that was likely to receive Foundation funding than did grantees in 2014.
- ▶ Grantees rate the Foundation significantly less positively than grantees in 2014 for the following measures:
- The Foundation’s understanding of their local communities.
 - The Foundation’s understanding of their socio-cultural contexts.
 - The Foundation’s understanding of their organizational goals and strategies.
 - The Foundation’s awareness of their organizational challenges.
 - Their comfort approaching the Foundation if a problem arises.
 - The responsiveness of Foundation staff.
 - The consistency of information provided by the Foundation’s communication resources.
- ▶ At the median, 2022 grantees are significantly more likely to report having experienced a recent primary contact change.
- ▶ At the median, grantees report significantly larger organizational budgets compared to grantees in 2014.
- ▶ At the median, they also report significantly larger grants compared to 2014 and receive a larger financial return per hour invested in the Foundation’s processes. A significantly larger proportion of 2022 grantees receive multi-year grants compared to 2014.

Significant Differences Between 2020 & 2014 – non-grantee partners only

- ▶ Non-grantee partners rate the Foundation significantly less positively than non-grantee partners in 2014 for the Foundation’s impact on their local communities.
- ▶ At the median, non-grantee partners are significantly more likely to report having experienced a recent primary contact change.

Appendix C: Top & Bottom 5 Comparative Ratings¹

Top 5 Comparative Ratings	
Rank	Measure
1	“As you developed your grant proposal, how much pressure did you feel to modify your organization's priorities in order to create a grant proposal that was likely to receive funding? (1 = No pressure, 7 = Significant pressure)*
2	“How well do you understand the way in which the work funded by this grant fits into the Foundation's broader efforts?” (1 = Limited understanding, 7 = Thorough understanding)*
3	“How clearly has the Foundation communicated its goals and strategy to you?” (1 = Not at all clearly, 7 = Extremely clearly)
4	“To what extent was the Foundation’s reporting process straightforward?” (1 = Not at all, 7 = To a great extent)*
5	“To what extent was the Foundation’s selection process a helpful opportunity to strengthen the efforts funded by the grant?” (1 = Not at all, 7 = To a great extent)*
Bottom 5 Comparative Ratings	
Rank	Measure
1	“Overall, how would you rate the Foundation’s impact on your organization?” (1 = No impact, 7 = Significant positive impact)
2	“Overall, most staff I have interacted with at the Foundation embody a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion” (1 = Strongly disagree, 4 = Neither agree nor disagree, 7 = Strongly agree)*
3	“Overall, how would you rate the Foundation’s impact on your field?” (1 = No impact, 7 = Significant positive impact)
4	“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)*
5	“To what extent do the Foundation's funding priorities reflect a deep understanding of the people and communities that you serve?” (1 = Not at all, 7 = To a great extent) *

¹ An asterisk (*) indicates that this question was only asked of the Foundation’s grantees.