SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE CONTEXT

CEP surveyed PHF’s grantees from February through March of 2013. CEP has also previously surveyed PHF’s grantees in 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>SURVEY PERIOD</th>
<th>CALENDAR YEAR OF SURVEYED GRANTEES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONSES RECEIVED</th>
<th>SURVEY RESPONSE RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHF 2013</td>
<td>February and March 2013</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF 2009</td>
<td>September and October 2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout this report, Paul Hamlyn Foundation's survey results are compared to CEP's broader dataset of more than 40,000 grantees built up over more than decade of grantee surveys of nearly 300 funders. The full list of participating funders can be found at [http://www.effectivephilanthropy.org/index.php?page=gpr-subscribers](http://www.effectivephilanthropy.org/index.php?page=gpr-subscribers).

COHORT FUNDERS

PHF chose a set of 12 other funders to create a smaller comparison group that more closely resembles PHF in terms of scale and scope, including five European funders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COHORT FUNDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arcus Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beldon Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Foundation of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.B. Heron Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Provident Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: The median response rate for individual funders over the last ten years of surveys is 69 percent.
FOUNDATION AND GRANTEE CHARACTERISTICS

Foundations make different choices about the ways they organise themselves, structure their grants, and the types of grantees they support. The following tables show some of these important characteristics. The information is based on self-reported data from funders and grantees, and further detail is available in the appendix. Compared to grantees of the typical funder, PHF grantees are smaller organisations that are more likely to be first-time grant recipients of the Foundation. PHF also awards larger, longer grants than the typical funder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY ITEM</th>
<th>PHF 2013</th>
<th>PHF 2009</th>
<th>COHORT MEDIAN</th>
<th>FULL DATASET MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANT SIZE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median grant size</td>
<td>£105K</td>
<td>£64K</td>
<td>£66K</td>
<td>£39K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANT LENGTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average grant length</td>
<td>2.6 years</td>
<td>2.3 years</td>
<td>2.1 years</td>
<td>2.1 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of grantees receiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating support</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of grantees receiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme/project support</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of grantees receiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other types of support</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANTEE ORGANISATION BUDGET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical organisational budget</td>
<td>£459K</td>
<td>£262K</td>
<td>£918K</td>
<td>£918K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANT HISTORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of first-time grants</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%(^1)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Due to changes in the survey instrument, PHF 2009 data is not directly comparable to PHF 2013 and Full Dataset data on this measure.
READING AND INTERPRETING YOUR RESULTS

THE CURRENT DATASET AND YOUR FOUNDATION’S CURRENT RESULTS

PERCENTILE SCALE
Much of the data in this report is displayed on the percentile scale below. Every participating funder’s average rating is ranked along this scale. The 0th percentile represents the lowest rated foundation, while the 100th represents the highest rated.

50TH PERCENTILE
The 50th percentile represents the median, or “typical,” funder in the dataset (the point at which half of funders are rated higher and half are rated lower).

NUMERICAL RATING
The actual numerical rating (on a 1-7 scale) that corresponds to each quartile is also displayed.

YOUR RESULTS
Your results are shown in the white box, which displays your average rating and the corresponding percentile of that rating.

PAST RESULTS
The charts include results from your past surveys and a segmentation of your current results by Programme Area. Average ratings are shown in the callout boxes.

COMPARATIVE COHORT OF SIMILAR FUNDERS
Results for your comparative cohort of peer funders are displayed along the same percentile scale. The triangles represent the lowest, highest, and median funder in the cohort.

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF CHANGES OVER TIME
CEP compares your past ratings to your current ratings, testing for statistically significant differences. Dark background in your previous results denotes a statistically significant difference between that previous rating and your current rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Rating</th>
<th>Current Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHF 2009</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference between this rating and your current rating is not statistically significant.

Difference between this rating and your current rating is statistically significant (p≤0.1).
KEY GRANTEE PERCEPTION REPORT THEMES

Impact on Fields and Organisations

Funder-Grantee Relationships

Grant Processes

Assistance Beyond the Grant
IMPACT ON GRANTEES’ FIELDS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Grantees’ perceptions about a funder’s impact on grantees’ fields and local communities reflect a foundation’s decisions about its focus, goals, and strategies. For example, while some funders focus on and are able to achieve high ratings of impact on both grantees’ fields and local communities, many funders focus on one or the other and therefore may place more value on feedback in one area. As with all sections of this report, we encourage interpretation of these results in light of a foundation’s goals and strategies. Lower ratings in an area that is not core to a funder’s work may not be concerning.

In addition to perceptions of impact, this section contains grantees’ perceptions of understanding of fields and local communities, a key predictor of higher ratings on these impact measures.

FIELD-RELATED MEASURES

“Overall, how would you rate the Foundation’s impact on your field?”

1 = No impact
7 = Significant positive impact

“How well does the Foundation understand the field in which you work?”

1 = Limited understanding
7 = Thorough understanding
IMPACT ON GRANTEES’ ORGANISATIONS

Many funders consider grantees’ perceptions of impact on the grantee organisation to be a crucial measure of success, and grantees are well positioned to comment on the impact of funding and assistance on their organisations, work, and sustainability. Each of these topics are covered in this section of the report.

GRANTEE ORGANISATION-RELATED MEASURES

“Overall, how would you rate the Foundation's impact on your organisation?”

1 = No impact
7 = Significant positive impact

“How well does the Foundation understand your organisation's strategy and goals?”

1 = Limited understanding
7 = Thorough understanding
KEY GRANTEE PERCEPTION REPORT THEMES

Impact on Fields and Organisations

Funder-Grantee Relationships

Grant Processes

Assistance Beyond the Grant
FUNDER-GRANTEE RELATIONSHIPS

Funder-grantee interactions and communications are crucial to grantees. The quality of interactions and the clarity and consistency of communications together create the larger construct that CEP refers to as “relationships.”

In addition to feedback about quality of relationships, this section of the report includes information about the patterns of funder interactions with grantees and grantees’ use of communications resources, such as funders’ websites and social media.

FUNDER-GRANTEE RELATIONSHIPS SUMMARY MEASURE

The relationships measure is an average of grantee ratings on:
1. Fairness of treatment by the foundation
2. Comfort approaching the foundation if a problem arises
3. Responsiveness of foundation staff
4. Clarity of communication of the foundation’s goals and strategy
5. Consistency of information provided by different communications

1 = Very negative
7 = Very positive
INTERACTIONS MEASURES

**“Overall, how fairly did the Foundation treat you?”**

1 = Not at all fairly  
7 = Extremely fairly

**“How comfortable do you feel approaching the Foundation if a problem arises?”**

1 = Not at all comfortable  
7 = Extremely comfortable

**“Overall, how responsive was the Foundation staff?”**

1 = Not at all responsive  
7 = Extremely responsive
CONTACT CHANGE AND SITE VISITS

“Has your main contact at the Foundation changed in the past six months?”

Chart shows proportion of respondents who indicated “Yes”

BEHIND THE NUMBERS
Grantees that indicate that their main contact at the Foundation has changed in the past six months rate the Foundation significantly lower on most measures in the report.

“Did the Foundation conduct a site visit during the course of this grant?”

Chart shows proportion of respondents who indicated “Yes”

BEHIND THE NUMBERS
Grantees that indicate that the Foundation conducted a site visit during the course of the grant rate the Foundation significantly higher on most measures in the report.
COMMUNICATION MEASURES

“How clearly has the Foundation communicated its goals and strategy to you?”

1 = Not at all clearly
7 = Extremely clearly

“How consistent was the information provided by different communications resources, both personal and written, that you used to learn about the Foundation?”

1 = Not at all consistent
7 = Completely consistent
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GRANT PROCESSES

Selection and reporting/evaluation processes provide opportunities for funders not only to receive information from grantees, but also to set expectations, forge relationships, provide feedback, and, for some funders, to help strengthen grantees’ organisations or programmes.

The following section shows grantee feedback related to application/selection and reporting/evaluation processes as well as the time spent by grantees fulfilling foundation process requirements.

MEASURES RELATED TO SELECTION PROCESS

“How helpful was participating in the Foundation’s selection process in strengthening the organisation/programme funded by the grant?”

1 = Not at all helpful
7 = Extremely helpful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0th</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>50th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>100th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohort

PHF 2009

82nd

5.24
MEASURES RELATED TO REPORTING/EVALUATION PROCESS

“How helpful was participating in the Foundation’s reporting/evaluation process in strengthening the organisation/programme funded by the grant?”

1 = Not at all helpful
7 = Extremely helpful

“After submission of your report/evaluation, did the Foundation or the evaluator discuss it with you?”

Chart shows proportion of respondents who indicated “Yes”

BEHIND THE NUMBERS
Grantees that indicate that they discussed their completed report/evaluation rate the Foundation significantly higher on most measures in the report.
POUNDS PER HOUR SPENT ON PROCESS REQUIREMENTS

Median pounds awarded per process hour required

(Includes total grant pounds awarded and total time necessary to fulfill the administrative requirements over the lifetime of the grant)

Median Grant Size

Median hours spent by grantees on funder process requirements over grant lifetime
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NON-MONETARY ASSISTANCE

PHF grantees were asked to indicate whether they had received any of the following types of assistance provided directly or paid for by the Foundation:

**MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE**
- General management advice
- Strategic planning advice
- Financial planning/accounting
- Development of performance measures

**FIELD-RELATED ASSISTANCE**
- Encouraged/facilitated collaboration
- Insight and advice on your field
- Introductions to leaders in field
- Provided research or best practices
- Provided seminars/forums/convenings

**OTHER ASSISTANCE**
- Board development/governance assistance
- Information technology assistance
- Communications/marketing/publicity assistance
- Use of Foundation facilities
- Staff/management training

Based on their responses, CEP categorised grantees by the pattern of assistance they received. CEP’s analysis shows that providing three or fewer assistance activities is often ineffective; it is only when grantees receive one of the two intensive patterns of assistance described below that they have a substantially more positive experience compared to grantees receiving no assistance.

**Intensive Assistance Patterns**
- **COMPREHENSIVE ASSISTANCE**
- **FIELD-FOCUSED ASSISTANCE**
- **LITTLE ASSISTANCE**
- **NO ASSISTANCE**

Grantees receiving at least 7 forms of assistance
Grantees receiving at least 3 forms of field-related assistance but less than 7 forms of assistance overall
Grantees receiving at least one form of assistance but not falling into the above categories
Grantees not receiving non-monetary support

**NON-MONETARY ASSISTANCE PATTERNS – OVERALL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PHF 2013</th>
<th>PHF 2009</th>
<th>Cohort Average</th>
<th>Average of all Funders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of grantees receiving field or comprehensive assistance</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE CONTEXT

CEP surveyed PHF’s declined applicants in February and March of 2013. The median response rate for individual funders is 43 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY</th>
<th>SURVEY PERIOD</th>
<th>CALENDAR YEAR OF SURVEYED DECLINED APPLICANTS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONSES RECEIVED</th>
<th>SURVEY RESPONSE RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHF 2013</td>
<td>February and March 2013</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout this report, Paul Hamlyn Foundation’s survey results are compared to CEP’s broader dataset of more than 4,000 declined applicants built up over nearly a decade of applicant surveys of 42 funders. The full list of participating funders can be found at http://www.effectivephilanthropy.org/index.php?page=apr-subscribers.

FOUNDATION SEGMENTATION

BEHIND THE NUMBERS

Applicants that were declined at the second stage rate significantly higher than those declined at the first stage for virtually all measures in the report.
This table is intended to provide context to the Foundation in thinking about characteristics of declined applicants. The information is based on self-reported data from declined applicants about the size and types of grants that they requested. Further detail is available in the appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY ITEM</th>
<th>PHF 2013</th>
<th>FULL DATASET MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANT REQUEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median size of grant request</td>
<td>£60K</td>
<td>£33K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of declined applicants requesting operating support</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of declined applicants requesting programme/project support</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of declined applicants requesting other types of support</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REAPPLICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of declined applicants that reports considering reapplying</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DECLINED APPLICANTS

This table is intended to provide context to the Foundation in thinking about its APR results relative to the structural characteristics of its declined applicants. The information is based on self-reported data from declined applicants about the characteristics of their organisations.

Compared to the typical funder, PHF declined applicants are smaller organisations that have been established for a shorter amount of time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY ITEM</th>
<th>PHF 2013</th>
<th>FULL DATASET MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET OF DECLINED APPLICANT ORGANISATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical organisational budget</td>
<td>£0.2M</td>
<td>£0.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURATION OF REQUESTED PROGRAMME AND DECLINED APPLICANT ORGANISATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median length of establishment of declined applicant organisations</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>22 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIFFERENCES IN GRANTEE AND DECLINED APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS

This table is intended to provide context to the Foundation in thinking about differences in characteristics between declined applicants and grantees. The information is based on self-reported data from declined applicants and grantees about their application and organisation characteristics.

PHF declined applicants request smaller grants, and are smaller organisations than grantees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY ITEM</th>
<th>PHF AWARDED</th>
<th>PHF DECLINED</th>
<th>FULL AWARDED DATASET</th>
<th>FULL DECLINED DATASET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Grant Size/Request</td>
<td>£105K</td>
<td>£60K</td>
<td>£39K</td>
<td>£33K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Budget of Organisations</td>
<td>£0.5M</td>
<td>£0.2M</td>
<td>£0.9M</td>
<td>£0.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Hours Spent by Grantees/Declined Applicants during the Selection Process</td>
<td>40 hours</td>
<td>25 hours</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Length of Establishment</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>24 years</td>
<td>22 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding of Declined Applicants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interactions and Communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application Process</strong></td>
<td><strong>Feedback and Future Implications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UNDERSTANDING OF DECLINED APPLICANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>PHF 2013 AVERAGE</th>
<th>MEDIAN FUNDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Declined Applicants’ Fields</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1 = Limited understanding of the field, 7 = Regarded as an expert in the field)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Applicants’ Local Communities</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1 = Limited understanding of the community, 7 = Regarded as an expert in the community)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the Social, Cultural, or Socioeconomic Factors That Affect Applicants’ Work</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1 = Limited understanding, 7 = Thorough understanding)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Comparative data limited due to changes to the survey instrument.
KEY APPLICANT PERCEPTION REPORT THEMES

Understanding of Declined Applicants

Interactions and Communications

Application Process

Feedback and Future Implications
“Overall, how responsive was the Foundation staff?”

1 = Not at all responsive
7 = Extremely responsive

“How accessible do you believe the Foundation is to applicants?”

1 = Some organisations are favored over others
7 = Everyone has equal access

“Overall, how fairly did the Foundation treat you?”

1 = Not at all fairly
7 = Extremely fairly
COMMUNICATION MEASURES

“How clearly has the Foundation communicated its goals and strategy with you?”
1 = Not at all clearly
7 = Extremely clearly

“How consistent was the information provided by different communications resources, both personal and written, that you used to learn about the Foundation?”
1 = Not at all consistent
7 = Completely consistent
KEY APPLICANT PERCEPTION REPORT THEMES

Understanding of Declined Applicants

Applications and Communications

Application Process

Feedback and Future Implications
APPLICATION PROCESSES

The application process provides an opportunity for funders not only to receive information from applicants, but also to set expectations, forge relationships, provide feedback, and, for some funders, to help strengthen applicants’ organisations or programmes.

The following section shows applicant feedback related to the application/selection process as well as the time spent by applicants fulfilling application requirements.

UNDERSTANDING OF APPLICANTS’ GOALS AND STRATEGIES

“How well does the Foundation understand your organisation’s strategy and goals?”

1 = Limited understanding
7 = Thorough understanding

MEASURES RELATED TO SELECTION PROCESS

“How helpful was participating in the Foundation’s selection process in strengthening the organisation/programme to which the grant funding would have been directed?”

1 = Not at all helpful
7 = Extremely helpful
KEY APPLICANT PERCEPTION REPORT THEMES

Understanding of Declined Applicants

Interactions and Communications

Application Process

Feedback and Future Implications
FEEDBACK ON DECLINED APPLICATIONS

“After your request was declined did you request/receive any feedback or advice from the Foundation?”

Total proportion of PHF declined applicants that did not receive feedback: 72% compared to 51% at the average funder.

“Please rate the feedback and advice you received in terms of its helpfulness in strengthening future proposals to this funder.”

1 = Not at all helpful
7 = Extremely helpful
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE APPLICATIONS - OVERALL

“Would you consider applying for funding from the Foundation in the future?”

HISTORY WITH THE FOUNDATION OF RESPONDENTS THAT WOULD CONSIDER REAPPLYING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0th (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th (94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100th (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2013

87%
44th

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

PHF 2013

Average of all Funders

Previously declined
Previously received funding
First-time applicant