















































































































































































Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort					
Length of Grant Awarded					
	0 - 1.99 years	2 - 2.99 years	3 - 3.99 years	4 - 4.99 years	5 - 50 years
NHCF 2022	41%	7%	50%	0%	2%
NHCF 2018	82%	8%	5%	2%	4%
NHCF 2014	77%	11%	5%	0%	6%
NHCF 2008	74%	15%	7%	0%	3%
NHCF 2004	82%	8%	6%	1%	3%
Average Funder	48%	22%	19%	3%	8%
Custom Cohort	62%	16%	17%	1%	5%

Selected Cohort: None		
Proportion of Unrestricted Funding	NHCF 2022	Average Funder
No, this funding was not restricted to a specific use (i.e. general operating, core support)	52%	26%
Yes, this funding was restricted to a specific use (e.g. supported a specific program, project, capital need, etc.)	48%	74%

## Grantmaking Characteristics - By Subgroup

Selected Subgroup: Program Type	
Length of Grant Awarded (By Subgroup)	
Average grant length	
Community Grants - Express	1.2 years
Invited Grants	2.3 years
Large Community Grants	2.9 years
NH Library Technology Program	1 years
Tillotson Local Fund	1.3 years
Tillotson Large and Other Funds	1.7 years
Wellborn Ecology Fund	1 years
Multiple Grant Programs	2.6 years

Selected Subgroup: Program Type					
Length of Grant Awarded (By Subgroup)					
	0 - 1.99 years	2 - 2.99 years	3 - 3.99 years	4 - 4.99 years	5 - 50 years
Community Grants - Express	95%	0%	3%	0%	3%
Invited Grants	61%	13%	18%	0%	8%
Large Community Grants	4%	4%	91%	0%	0%
NH Library Technology Program	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tillotson Local Fund	82%	9%	9%	0%	0%
Tillotson Large and Other Funds	55%	18%	27%	0%	0%
Wellborn Ecology Fund	91%	9%	0%	0%	0%
Multiple Grant Programs	40%	13%	40%	0%	7%



Selected Subgroup: Program Type		
Proportion of Unrestricted Funding (By Subgroup)		
	No, this funding was not restricted to a specific use (i.e. general operating, core support)	Yes, this funding was restricted to a specific use (e.g. supported a specific program, project, capital need, etc.)
Community Grants - Express	11%	89%
Invited Grants	32%	68%
Large Community Grants	92%	8%
NH Library Technology Program	0%	100%
Tillotson Local Fund	5%	95%
Tillotson Large and Other Funds	27%	73%
Wellborn Ecology Fund	0%	100%
Multiple Grant Programs	40%	60%

## Grant Size

Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort	
Grant Amount Awarded	
Median grant size	
NHCF 2022	\$30K
NHCF 2018	\$14.7K
NHCF 2014	\$15K
NHCF 2008	\$15K
NHCF 2004	\$5K
Median Funder	\$100K
Custom Cohort	\$30K

Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort									
Grant Amount Awarded									
	Less than \$10K	\$10K - \$24K	\$25K - \$49K	\$50K - \$99K	\$100K - \$149K	\$150K - \$299K	\$300K - \$499K	\$500K - \$999K	\$1MM and above
NHCF 2022	15%	18%	20%	38%	2%	4%	1%	0%	1%
NHCF 2018	40%	34%	10%	8%	3%	3%	0%	1%	0%
NHCF 2014	38%	30%	12%	11%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%
NHCF 2008	35%	35%	13%	11%	1%	2%	0%	0%	2%
NHCF 2004	63%	22%	9%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Average Funder	8%	11%	12%	15%	10%	17%	9%	8%	9%
Custom Cohort	10%	23%	24%	21%	8%	8%	3%	2%	2%

Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort	
Median Percent of Budget Funded by Grant (Annualized)	
Size of grant relative to size of grantee budget	
NHCF 2022	2%
NHCF 2018	3%
NHCF 2014	3%
NHCF 2008	2%
NHCF 2004	2%
Median Funder	4%
Custom Cohort	2%

## Grant Size - By Subgroup

Selected Subgroup: Program Type	
Grant Amount Awarded (By Subgroup)	
Median grant size	
Community Grants - Express	\$10K
Invited Grants	\$64K
Large Community Grants	\$60K
NH Library Technology Program	\$6.4K
Tillotson Local Fund	\$20K
Tillotson Large and Other Funds	\$50K
Wellborn Ecology Fund	\$5K
Multiple Grant Programs	\$60K

Selected Subgroup: Program Type									
Grant Amount Awarded (By Subgroup)									
	Less than \$10K	\$10K - \$24K	\$25K - \$49K	\$50K - \$99K	\$100K - \$149K	\$150K - \$299K	\$300K - \$499K	\$500K - \$999K	\$1MM and above
Community Grants - Express	45%	50%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Invited Grants	8%	3%	18%	34%	5%	21%	3%	3%	5%
Large Community Grants	1%	6%	33%	61%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
NH Library Technology Program	91%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tillotson Local Fund	23%	73%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tillotson Large and Other Funds	0%	27%	18%	27%	18%	9%	0%	0%	0%
Wellborn Ecology Fund	82%	9%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Multiple Grant Programs	3%	14%	21%	41%	10%	0%	10%	0%	0%

Selected Subgroup: Program Type	
Median Percent of Budget Funded by Grant (Annualized) (By Subgroup)	
Size of grant relative to size of grantee budget	
Community Grants - Express	5%
Invited Grants	2%
Large Community Grants	2%
NH Library Technology Program	5%
Tillotson Local Fund	5%
Tillotson Large and Other Funds	6%
Wellborn Ecology Fund	0%
Multiple Grant Programs	2%

## Grantee Characteristics

Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort	
Operating Budget of Grantee Organization	
Median Budget	
NHCF 2022	\$0.7M
NHCF 2018	\$0.4M
NHCF 2014	\$0.5M
NHCF 2008	\$0.6M
NHCF 2004	\$0.3M
Median Funder	\$1.6M
Custom Cohort	\$1.2M

Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort						
Operating Budget of Grantee Organization						
	<\$100K	\$100K - \$499K	\$500K - \$999K	\$1MM - \$4.9MM	\$5MM - \$24MM	>=\$25MM
NHCF 2022	14%	28%	15%	24%	11%	8%
NHCF 2018	19%	34%	14%	19%	7%	6%
NHCF 2014	19%	31%	16%	23%	8%	4%
NHCF 2008	19%	28%	15%	23%	11%	4%
NHCF 2004	24%	35%	11%	16%	11%	3%
Average Funder	8%	18%	13%	30%	18%	12%
Custom Cohort	9%	23%	14%	30%	16%	8%

## Grantee Characteristics - By Subgroup

Selected Subgroup: Program Type	
Operating Budget of Grantee Organization (By Subgroup)	
Median Budget	
Community Grants - Express	\$0.2M
Invited Grants	\$2M
Large Community Grants	\$0.8M
NH Library Technology Program	\$0.2M
Tillotson Local Fund	\$0.3M
Tillotson Large and Other Funds	\$0.7M
Wellborn Ecology Fund	\$1M
Multiple Grant Programs	\$1.2M

Selected Subgroup: Program Type		Operating Budget of Grantee Organization (By Subgroup)					
	<\$100K	\$100K - \$499K	\$500K - \$999K	\$1MM - \$4.9MM	\$5MM - \$24MM	>=\$25MM	
Community Grants - Express	41%	35%	5%	11%	3%	5%	
Invited Grants	0%	14%	17%	26%	26%	17%	
Large Community Grants	7%	30%	19%	31%	8%	4%	
NH Library Technology Program	42%	50%	8%	0%	0%	0%	
Tillotson Local Fund	24%	43%	14%	5%	10%	5%	
Tillotson Large and Other Funds	27%	18%	9%	18%	18%	9%	
Wellborn Ecology Fund	22%	0%	22%	11%	22%	22%	
Multiple Grant Programs	4%	26%	7%	44%	11%	7%	

## Funding Relationship

Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort	
Funding Status	
Percent of grantees currently receiving funding from NHCF	
NHCF 2022	79%
NHCF 2018	67%
NHCF 2014	61%
NHCF 2008	60%
NHCF 2004	63%
Median Funder	82%
Custom Cohort	80%

Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort					
Pattern of Grantees' Funding Relationship with NHCF	NHCF 2022	NHCF 2018	NHCF 2014	Average Funder	Custom Cohort
First grant received from NHCF	16%	21%	16%	29%	19%
Consistent funding in the past	57%	55%	49%	53%	52%
Inconsistent funding in the past	28%	24%	35%	18%	29%

## Funding Relationship - by Subgroup

Selected Subgroup: Program Type	
Funding Status (By Subgroup)	
Percent of grantees currently receiving funding from NHCF	
Community Grants - Express	57%
Invited Grants	84%
Large Community Grants	88%
NH Library Technology Program	45%
Tillotson Local Fund	55%
Tillotson Large and Other Funds	55%
Wellborn Ecology Fund	82%
Multiple Grant Programs	90%

Selected Subgroup: Program Type			
Pattern of Grantees' Funding Relationship with NHCF (By Subgroup)			
	First grant received from NHCF	Consistent funding in the past	Inconsistent funding in the past
Community Grants - Express	32%	30%	38%
Invited Grants	3%	79%	18%
Large Community Grants	10%	59%	31%
NH Library Technology Program	80%	0%	20%
Tillotson Local Fund	27%	55%	18%
Tillotson Large and Other Funds	27%	45%	27%
Wellborn Ecology Fund	20%	30%	50%
Multiple Grant Programs	0%	80%	20%



## Funder Characteristics

Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort		
Financial Information		
	Total assets	Total giving
NHCF 2022	\$946.9M	\$53M
NHCF 2018	\$755.5M	\$46M
NHCF 2014	\$602M	\$32.3M
NHCF 2008	\$446M	\$32M
NHCF 2004	\$263.2M	N/A
Median Funder	\$264M	\$18.7M
Custom Cohort	\$917M	\$50M


Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort		
Funder Staffing		
	Total staff (FTEs)	Percent of staff who are program staff
NHCF 2022	50	28%
NHCF 2018	52	22%
NHCF 2014	42	24%
NHCF 2008	38	29%
NHCF 2004	13	N/A
Median Funder	17	43%
Custom Cohort	50	16%

Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort						
Grantmaking Processes	NHCF 2022	NHCF 2018	NHCF 2014	NHCF 2008	Median Funder	Custom Cohort
Proportion of grants that are invitation-only	53%	40%	N/A	N/A	50%	21%
Proportion of grantmaking dollars that are invitation-only	59%	42%	0%	10%	64%	25%

## Respondents and Communities Served

### Are the efforts funded by this grant primarily meant to benefit historically disadvantaged groups?


Yes No Don't know



Cohort: Family Foundations Past results: on

### Are the efforts funded by this grant primarily meant to benefit historically disadvantaged groups? - By Subgroup

Yes No Don't know




Subgroup: Program Type

The following question is asked only of U.S.-based grantees who answered "yes" to the question "Are the efforts funded by this grant primarily meant to benefit historically disadvantaged groups?"


**Specifically, are any of the following populations the primary intended people and/or communities served by the efforts funded by this grant?**

NHCF 2022




Cohort: None Past results: on

**Specifically, are any of the following populations the primary intended people and/or communities served by the efforts funded by this grant? - By Subgroup**



Subgroup: Program Type

**Specifically, are any of the following populations the primary intended people and/or communities served by the efforts funded by this grant? - By Subgroup (cont.)**



Subgroup: Program Type

## Respondent Demographics

Note: Survey questions about respondents' demographics were recently modified or added to match best practices, and depict comparative data from over 50 funders in the dataset. Demographic questions related to grantees' POC and racial/ethnic identity are only asked of respondents in the United States.

Survey language and response options for questions about race and ethnicity are guided by best practices shared by [National Institutes of Health](#), [Pew Research Center](#), [Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research](#), and the [US Census Bureau](#).

Survey language and response options for questions about gender and LGBTQ+ identity are guided by best practices shared by [Fundors For LGBTQ Issues](#), [HRC Foundation's Welcoming Schools](#), and the [Williams Institute of the University of California – Los Angeles School of Law](#).

Survey respondents are asked to share their gender identities in a check-all-that-apply question. Each chart has the option of showing the average ratings of respondents who selected only "man," only "woman," multiple gender identities, "gender non-conforming or non-binary," "prefer to self-identify," and "prefer not to say" - as long as that response option had at least 10 respondents.

## Differences in Ratings by Respondent Demographics

It is CEP's standard practice to analyze responses for differences by the following demographics characteristics:

### Person of Color Identity

Ratings from grantees who identify as a person of color are significantly higher than grantees who do not identify as a person of color for the following measures:

- Impact on grantees' local communities
- Understanding of grantees' local communities
- Understanding of the needs of the people and communities served
- Extent to which programmatic priorities reflect understanding of needs of people and communities served
- Awareness of challenges facing grantee organizations
- Responsiveness of funder staff
- Clarity of the funder's communication of its goals and strategy
- Funder's transparency
- The extent to which the funder is open to ideas from grantees
- Candor about the foundation's perspectives on grantees' work

Additionally, grantees who identify as a person of color are significantly less likely to receive multi-year general operating support than grantees who do not identify as a person of color. Analyses show that ratings from grantees who identify as a person of color do not otherwise differ from ratings from grantees who do not identify as a person of color in terms of grant size, annual operating budget, funding history, and patterns of interactions.

### Respondent Gender

Ratings from respondents who identify exclusively as "woman" are significantly higher than respondents who identify exclusively as "man" for the following measures:

- Understanding of grantees' fields
- Extent to which programmatic priorities reflect understanding of needs of people and communities served
- Responsiveness of funder staff
- Clarity and transparency of the selection process requirements and timelines
- Extent to which the reporting process is relevant, with questions and measures pertinent to the work funded by this grant
- Extent to which the evaluation process resulted in your organization making changes to the work that was evaluated
- Agreement that the Foundation has clearly communicated what diversity, equity, and inclusion means for its work
- Agreement that the Foundation demonstrates an explicit commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in its work
- Agreement that the Foundation advances equity, racial justice, and economic inclusion in its grantmaking and civil leadership and advocacy
- Benefit of the Foundation's provision of organizational and capacity building opportunities
- Benefit of the Foundation's work to actively bring more federal and private foundation dollars into New Hampshire
- Agreement that the Foundation's New Hampshire Tomorrow initiative is making noticeable progress towards achieving its goal

Analyses show that ratings from women do not differ from ratings from men in terms of grantmaking characteristics, organizational characteristics, receipt of non-monetary support, funding history, and patterns of interactions.

### Transgender Identity

There are too few respondents to analyze results by transgender identity.

### LGBTQ+ Identity


There are no consistent, significant differences in grantee ratings according to their LGBTQ+ identity.

### Disability Identity

There are no consistent, significant differences in grantee ratings according to their disability identity.


**Please select the option that represents how you describe yourself:**

■ NHCF 2022
 ■ Family Foundations
 ■ Median Funder



Cohort: Family Foundations Past results: on

## How would you describe your race and/or ethnicity?



Cohort: Family Foundations Past results: on



Selected Cohort: None		
Do you identify as a person of color?	NHCF 2022	Average Funder
Yes	4%	22%
No	92%	72%
Prefer not to say	4%	5%

Selected Cohort: None		
Are you transgender?	NHCF 2022	Average Funder
Yes	0%	1%
No	97%	96%
Prefer not to say	3%	3%

Selected Cohort: None		
Do you identify as a member of the LGBTQ+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer) community?	NHCF 2022	Average Funder
Yes	6%	11%
No	90%	84%
Prefer not to say	4%	5%

Selected Cohort: None		
Do you have a disability?	NHCF 2022	Average Funder
Yes	8%	5%
No	87%	90%
Prefer not to say	6%	5%

## Respondent Job Title

Selected Cohort: Custom Cohort						
Job Title of Respondents						
	Executive Director/CEO	Other Senior Team (i.e., reporting to Executive Director/CEO)	Project Director	Development Staff	Volunteer	Other
NHCF 2022	55%	14%	4%	15%	4%	9%
NHCF 2018	59%	9%	12%	6%	7%	0%
NHCF 2014	54%	7%	6%	12%	5%	10%
NHCF 2008	57%	9%	6%	11%	0%	12%
NHCF 2004	56%	6%	7%	10%	0%	17%
Average Funder	47%	18%	12%	9%	1%	5%
Custom Cohort	60%	11%	5%	11%	2%	5%

## Additional Survey Information

On many questions in the grantee survey, grantees are allowed to select “don’t know” or “not applicable” if they are not able to provide an alternative answer. In addition, some questions in the survey are only displayed to a select group of grantees for which that question is relevant based on a previous response.

As a result, there are some measures where only a subset of responses is included in the reported results. The table below shows the number of responses included on each of these measures. The total number of respondents to NHCFF’s grantee survey was 310.

Question Text	Number of Responses
Overall, how would you rate the Foundation's impact on your field?	276
How well does the Foundation understand the field in which you work?	265
To what extent has the Foundation advanced the state of knowledge in your field?	207
To what extent has the Foundation affected public policy in your field?	165
Overall, how would you rate the Foundation's impact on your local community?	288
How well does the Foundation understand the local community in which you work?	277
How well does the Foundation understand the social, cultural, or socioeconomic factors that affect your work?	293
How well does the Foundation understand your organization's strategy and goals?	276
How consistent was the information provided by different communication resources, both personal and written, that you used to learn about the Foundation?	275
How well do you understand the way in which the work funded by this grant fits into the Foundation's broader efforts?	293
How often do/did you have contact with your program officer during this grant?	310
Who most frequently initiated the contact you had with your program officer during this grant?	276
Has your main contact at the Foundation changed in the past six months?	289
Did you submit a proposal to the Foundation for this grant?	306
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?	287
To what extent was the Foundation's proposal process a helpful opportunity to strengthen the efforts funded by the grant?	257
To what extent was the Foundation's proposal process an appropriate level of effort given the amount of funding received?	272
To what extent was the Foundation clear and transparent about the proposal process requirements and timelines?	299
To what extent was the Foundation clear and transparent about the criteria the Foundation uses to decide whether an proposal would be funded or declined?	267
At any point during this grant, including the proposal process, did Foundation staff visit your offices or programs?	309
Are you currently receiving funding from the Foundation?	303
Which of the following best describes the pattern of your organization's funding relationship with the Foundation?	301
How well does the Foundation understand the needs of the people and communities that you serve?	269
To what extent do the Foundation's funding priorities reflect a deep understanding of the needs of the people and communities that you serve?	272
Have you participated in a reporting or evaluation process?	288
To what extent was the Foundation's reporting process... Adaptable, if necessary, to fit your circumstances?	195
To what extent was the Foundation's reporting process... A helpful opportunity for you to reflect and learn?	211
To what extent was the Foundation's reporting process... Relevant, with questions and measures pertinent to the work funded by this grant?	210
To what extent was the Foundation's reporting process... Straightforward?	197
To what extent did the evaluation... Result in you making changes to the work that was evaluated?	43
To what extent did the evaluation... Incorporate your input in the design of the evaluation?	41
Did you receive any non-monetary support from the Foundation during this grant period?	285
How would you describe the benefit - to your organization or work - of any non-monetary support that you received?	57

Question Text	Number of Responses
To what extent did the Foundation exhibit the following during this grant... Trust in your organization's staff	304
To what extent did the Foundation exhibit the following during this grant... Candor about the Foundation's perspectives on your work	301
To what extent did the Foundation exhibit the following during this grant... Respectful interaction	308
To what extent did the Foundation exhibit the following during this grant... Compassion for those affected by your work	303
Was the funding you received restricted to a specific use?	307
Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about Diversity, Equity and Inclusion:	
The Foundation has clearly communicated what Diversity, Equity and Inclusion means for its work	274
Overall, the Foundation demonstrates an explicit commitment to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in its work	270
Overall, most staff I have interacted with at the Foundation embody a strong commitment to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion	240
I believe that the Foundation is committed to combatting racism	265
Are the efforts funded by this grant primarily meant to benefit historically disadvantaged groups?	299
Primary Intended People and/or Communities	
Are the efforts funded by this grant primarily meant to benefit historically disadvantaged groups?	299
Specifically, are any of the following the primary intended people and/or communities served by the efforts funded by this grant? (Domestic Version)	153
Specifically, are any of the following the primary intended people and/or communities served by the efforts funded by this grant? (International Version)	2
Custom Questions	
Thinking about the roles that NHCF plays beyond grantmaking, please rate the extent to which each is beneficial to your organization in achieving your mission - Advocating for specific approaches to solving New Hampshire's most pressing challenges.	246
Thinking about the roles that NHCF plays beyond grantmaking, please rate the extent to which each is beneficial to your organization in achieving your mission - Amplifying the voices of New Hampshire's non-profit organizations and those that they are seeking to serve.	257
Thinking about the roles that NHCF plays beyond grantmaking, please rate the extent to which each is beneficial to your organization in achieving your mission - Connecting people and organizations doing similar or complementary work.	253
Thinking about the roles that NHCF plays beyond grantmaking, please rate the extent to which each is beneficial to your organization in achieving your mission - Providing organizational learning and capacity building opportunities (e.g., board development training, board diversity training, etc.).	236
Thinking about the roles that NHCF plays beyond grantmaking, please rate the extent to which each is beneficial to your organization in achieving your mission - Working actively to bring more federal and private foundation dollars into New Hampshire to do community work.	223
Thinking about the roles that NHCF plays beyond grantmaking, please rate the extent to which each is beneficial to your organization in achieving your mission - Advocating for federal CARES Act funding to reach the non-profit sector.	214
Thinking about the roles that NHCF plays beyond grantmaking, please rate the extent to which each is beneficial to your organization in achieving your mission - Administering the Non-Profit Emergency Relief Fund (NERF) to New Hampshire organizations.	212
Are you aware of the Foundation's New Hampshire Tomorrow initiative?	290
Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the Foundation's New Hampshire Tomorrow initiative - I have a clear understanding of the New Hampshire Tomorrow initiative.	129
Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the Foundation's New Hampshire Tomorrow initiative - The Foundation's New Hampshire Tomorrow initiative is targeted at one of New Hampshire's most pressing challenges.	125
Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the Foundation's New Hampshire Tomorrow initiative - The Foundation's New Hampshire Tomorrow initiative is beneficial to my organization in achieving its mission.	125
Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the Foundation's New Hampshire Tomorrow initiative - The Foundation's New Hampshire Tomorrow initiative is making noticeable progress towards achieving its goal.	80
In the past 3 years, did your organization receive funding from any of the following entities?	304
Reflecting on your experience with and knowledge of the Foundation, how would you rate its performance to date in meeting the following commitment? In other words, where is the Foundation now, from your perspective? - The Foundation listens to and learns from those who have faced barriers to opportunity and whose voices have been historically excluded.	214
Reflecting on your experience with and knowledge of the Foundation, how would you rate its performance to date in meeting the following commitment? In other words, where is the Foundation now, from your perspective? - The Foundation advances equity, racial justice, and economic inclusion in its grantmaking and civil leadership and advocacy.	223

## About CEP and Contact Information

### Mission:

CEP provides data, feedback, programs, and insights to help individual and institutional donors improve their effectiveness. We do this work because we believe effective donors, working collaboratively and thoughtfully, can profoundly contribute to creating a better and more just world.

### Vision:

We seek a world in which pressing social needs are more effectively addressed.

We believe improved performance of philanthropic funders can have a profoundly positive impact on nonprofit organizations and the people and communities they serve.

Although our work is about measuring results, providing useful data, and improving performance, our ultimate goal is improving lives. We believe this can only be achieved through a powerful combination of dispassionate analysis and passionate commitment to creating a better society.

### About the GPR

Since 2003, the Grantee Perception Report® (GPR) has provided funders with comparative, candid feedback based on grantee perceptions. The GPR is the only grantee survey process that provides comparative data, and is based on extensive research and analysis. Hundreds of funders of all types and sizes have commissioned the GPR, and tens of thousands of grantees have provided their perspectives to help funders improve their work. CEP has surveyed grantees in more than 150 countries and in 8 different languages.

The GPR's quantitative and qualitative data helps foundation leaders evaluate and understand their grantees' perceptions of their effectiveness, and how that compares to their philanthropic peers.

### Contact Information

Kevin Bolduc, Vice President - Assessment and Advisory Services  
[kevinb@cep.org](mailto:kevinb@cep.org)

Joe Lee, Manager - Assessment and Advisory Services  
[josephl@cep.org](mailto:josephl@cep.org)

Emma Relle, Analyst - Assessment and Advisory Services  
[emmar@cep.org](mailto:emmar@cep.org)