

DGMT Applicant/Grantee Survey 2012:

Summary of most important survey data and findings

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Purpose | To get feedback from organisations of their experience of applying to us for funding and as an implementing partner of the Trust. | |
| Sample | 1 037 organisations out of a possible 1 222 who applied for funding from DGMT during 2010 and 2011. | |
| Response Rate | 288 organisations responded = 28% response rate | |
| Descriptive information on the organisations that responded | | |
| Implementation field | Most organisations implemented programmes which tended to include outcomes areas covered by our Inclusion and ECD portfolios. | |
| Geographical area | These programmes are mostly being implemented in the Western Cape, Gauteng, KwaZulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape. | |
| Grantee status | Most have been previously funded by DGMT although about 55% said they are not currently grantees. | |
| Grant Size | Those that received grants from DGMT before tended to reported grants sizes of below R500 000. | |
| Recent funding history | Recent grantees were most likely to hold grants activated in 2011 and 2012 and if an organisation's last application was declined, it was most likely declined in 2011 during the step 1 application stage. | |
| Most important findings | | |
| Overall | Overall feedback from applicants and grantees alike was generally positive and very encouraging. | 69% of grantees and applicants said they were satisfied with their experience dealing with DGMT. |
| Areas of strength | Responsiveness in terms of enquiries and requests from applicants and grantees. Grantees also rated DGMT very highly in terms of being accessible and responsive to grantees' needs. | >50% said that DGMT is very responsive; 50% of grantees strongly agreed that DGMT was accessible and responsive. |
| | Overall applicants and grantees viewed DGMT as an organisation that is fair in its decision making and has influence that could contribute to shaping public policy. | >70% of organisations agreed that DGMT is fair in its decision making and has influence to impact public policy. |
| | Large majority rated DGMT very positively on reporting indicators. Learning briefs are seen as useful and informative. | >70% of organisations rated DGMT positively on reporting requirement statements. |
| Areas for improvement | Applicants and/or grantees were uncertain about our funding strategy (i.e. funding of organisations/proposals with catalytic potential). | 23% remained neutral on the statement regarding catalytic potential and 17% disagreed. |
| | Applicants and grantees would like DGMT to simplify its application process. | Half of organisations said the application process was only reasonably easy and straightforward and it was the area most mentioned for improvement in the qualitative data. |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>Organisations feel that DGMT should work harder on cultivating an improved understanding of the organisations that they work with and who are applying for funding. There were repeated appeals by both applicants and grantees for more site visits and face-to-face meetings to facilitate the development of this understanding.</p> | <p>Lowest scores on all scale items in comparison to scores on other variables. Second most often mentioned area for improvement in qualitative data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — 54% of organisations that went through Step 2 said the review included a site visit; — 61% of grantees said they have never been visited since their grant has been approved (read discussion section for a balanced view on site visits) — 62% said they communicated with DGMT every few months – 23% said yearly or less often; — 67% of grantees said they would like more engagement with DGMT on the implementation of their programmes or grants |
| | <p>Although still viewing us very positively, organisations were slightly less convinced of DGMT’s leadership ability in terms of leading and enhancing the knowledge the field in which they are working and being a thought partner for the organisation.</p> | <p>Grantees were more likely to disagree on the statement that they see DGMT as a thought partner; Although still positive, ratings were lower on sector leadership statements by applicants and grantees.</p> |
| | <p>Many organisations requested that DGMT provide detailed feedback on why their application has been declined. Several organisations have commented that they were suddenly declined after the change in DGMT’s strategy in 2011 and in the context of the past relationship that they had with DGMT, they were shocked and confused by this outcome.</p> | |