



GRANTEE PERCEPTION REPORT

GPR Results and Response Overview

In 2017, The Clowes Fund commissioned the Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP) to conduct an anonymous survey of our grantees and evaluate their perception of the foundation. Thank you to those who participated!

CEP presented the results of the Grantee Perception Report (GPR) to Fund leadership in December, and then through spring 2018, the Fund's board and staff took a deeper dive into the results and recommendations, which we are happy to share in the spirit of transparency.

In short, CEP reports that overall The Clowes Fund continues to receive ratings from its grantees that are more positive than typical. However, some measures trend lower from when the Fund last conducted the GPR in 2010, and most notable to us, unlike prior GPRs, the variances are not consistent regionally.

CEP included four recommendations, and the Fund's responses follow in bold:

- Continue to reinforce aspects of the selection and reporting processes that strengthen grantees. **The Clowes Fund is committed to continuing the aspects of its selection and reporting processes that strengthen grantees, and we always welcome grantee feedback on these processes.**
- Explore factors that might have led to a decline in the Fund's clarity and consistency of communications. **We believe we have identified the factors that led to a decline in clear and consistent communications, especially the variation by region, and we will strive to improve. Notably, Indiana's ranking lagged the most with regard to clear, consistent communications. The Fund recognizes that it has indeed sent mixed messages as board sentiment changed in regard to its decision made in 2013 to eventually discontinue grantmaking in Indiana. At its recent annual meeting, the board decided that The Clowes Fund will continue its current grantmaking activities in Indianapolis in support of immigrants, refugees and asylees as well as workforce (including youth) development and certain legacy grantees for at least five years.**
- Consider capacity to provide closely aligned grantees with larger, general operating, multi-year grants. **Operating and multi-year grant requests generally are driven by program officer recommendations, and we recognize that staff turnover in our New England region led to a decline in these types of grants. We believe a course-correction is in process, and we are committed to maintaining that positive trajectory by retaining qualified program staff who can develop mutually beneficial relationships with grantees.**



- Discuss what may have contributed to more typical perceptions of understanding of and impact on grantees' communities.
When segmented by region, we recognized a lag in New England where the Fund's priorities, both in terms of geography and fields of interest, are more widespread compared to our other two regions. Though we do not foresee shrinking the scope of our geographic or fields of interest in New England, or expanding our regional staff in the near future, we will continue to monitor and strive for local impact. Meanwhile, our New England Program Officer will continue to actively engage with grantees and seek other learning opportunities throughout the region.