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Preface

The Assessment Report is a public version of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s biennial Scorecard, a self-assessment that highlights key indicators of organizational performance based on perceptions of external stakeholders, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) staff, and administrative data. RWJF is one of the few philanthropies that shares this kind of information publicly—as of 2009, only 13 percent of foundations publish annual reports.¹

The first Scorecard was produced in 1993 and has evolved significantly since then. In its early years, the report focused on broad Foundation goals (such as improving access to care), and answered the question of how the Foundation was doing through case studies of specific programs. Since RWJF did not have specific, measurable strategies to achieve its goals, it had to rely on qualitative assessments of individual programs as the basis of the Scorecard with limited quantitative data to complement them.

In 1996 the Foundation developed a Scorecard debuting quantitative data on all aspects of programming. The new Scorecard provided information on the three interventions—demonstrations, research, and training—that accounted for 95 percent of the Foundation’s grantmaking. Specifically examining these areas of significant investment helped the Foundation plan future programming during a time of significant asset expansion. The following year, the Scorecard incorporated three-year trend data to illustrate results.

In 1999 RWJF began reporting results of its self-assessment in a balanced Scorecard, which blended financial and nonfinancial measures to provide a complete picture of the organization’s total health. Two years later, the balanced Scorecard reported measures of the Foundation’s performance on three distinct areas of its work—Program Development, Impact, and Customer Service.

The current Scorecard focuses on these areas, as well as on Financial Resources, Communication, Web, and Social Media. It also includes: (1) performance indicators to measure RWJF’s performance in meeting long-term strategic goals relative to the targets that the Foundation sets for itself, and (2) external stakeholder survey data collected by outside organizations that provide comparative data from “peer” organizations. Biennially, Foundation staff revisits the type of data included in the Scorecard, balancing the need for consistent measures over time with the Foundation’s changing needs for accountability.

Although the Scorecard has evolved significantly over its 20-year history, its role as a continuous quality improvement tool endures. At times, the scores reported and the perceptions shared through the Scorecard indicated the Foundation had fallen short of its goals. Sometimes further exploration of the problem was needed before improvements could be implemented, but most of the time problems identified in the Scorecard become top priorities for the Foundation. Responses to problems identified in the Scorecard have often resulted in significant improvement in the Foundation’s philanthropic practices.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Taking Stock of RWJF’s Performance

In keeping with RWJF policy to produce an in-depth review of organizational performance every other year, the 2013 Assessment Report presents information gathered from multiple sources—external stakeholders, grantees, and internal administrative data—in this assessment. In examining these data, the Foundation focuses on the 14 most critical indicators of its performance. As shown in the 2013 Assessment Report, the Foundation has maintained or improved its performance on nearly all (12 out of 14) indicators related to Program Impact, Program Development, and Grantee Relations. However, grantees’ perceptions of RWJF as a source for objective information, as well as the quality of its communication with grantees, have declined since 2011. As in the past, RWJF looks toward these metrics to guide its efforts to improve the organization.

Assessment Report Summary
The 2013 Assessment Report focuses only on priority measures, those that senior management views as highest priority in assessing organizational performance. Senior management sets targets (indicated in charts as ○) for each of these priority measures within the most critical dimensions of the Foundation’s work—Program Development, Program Impact, and Grantee Relations. Targets are meant to be achieved over a three- to five-year period. These 14 metrics and their targets are presented in the Assessment Report Summary diagram on page 9.

So, how did RWJF do? Overall, the Foundation achieved its target for 3 of the 14 measures and reached 75 to 99 percent of target for 11 measures. Across the three dimensions of RWJF’s work—Program Impact, Program Development, and Grantee Relations—its performance is strong. Highlights from each of these areas are outlined below, with more details following in their respective sections.

Program Development
The first dimension of the Assessment Report, Program Development, focuses on the strength of the strategies underlying RWJF’s grantmaking. Health policy experts’ and grantees’ perceptions of how the Foundation’s priorities match the needs of the country and how well its approach works are reported. As in previous years, experts express familiarity with RWJF’s work in health and health care. State legislators continue to be least familiar with the Foundation compared to thought leaders, representatives from media, and nonelected officials. More than three-quarters of health policy experts also believe that RWJF is working on the right set of issues. Although cost and access continue to be top of mind for experts, they have given increased prominence to issues related to the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, universal health insurance, and obesity. Both experts and grantees also believe that RWJF has demonstrated a commitment to addressing these issues over time.

Program Impact
The Program Impact section of the Assessment Report—using data from a sample of health policy experts and RWJF grantees, along with internal program benchmarks—examines whether RWJF is perceived as making a difference in the fields of health and health care. Of the 16 team performance indicators due this year, 15 were completed on time. One indicator (in the Human Capital portfolio) was not completed as a result of a shift in team strategy. As in past years, the majority of health policy experts perceives RWJF as having a notable impact on the health field and believes that it is good at providing objective information and avoiding political partisanship. The Foundation’s grantees also give it strong scores for making a difference on the problems it addresses and advancing knowledge in the field. Although the majority of grantees (77%) still see RWJF as a source for objective information, there was a decline from 2011 (85%).
Grantee Relations

The Grantee Relations section of the Assessment Report relies exclusively on a survey by the Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP) of RWJF’s active grantees and grantees whose grants ended less than one year prior. As in the past, RWJF values the comparison information, which uses other large national foundations as its peer group.2 During the last few years, the Foundation has implemented quality improvement efforts for working with grantees. While the previous two Assessment Reports (2009 and 2011) have found progress in these areas, data this year suggest that that progress has slowed. In fact, although grantees’ responses remain nearly the highest they have been since 2006 and are on par with responses from grantees of the Foundation’s peers, they were significantly lower than in 2011 for RWJF staff’s communication of goals and strategies (63% versus 75%). This indicator in particular, received the lowest ratings from grantees among all grantee-related indicators in the Assessment Report. In 2013 the Foundation began an intensive strategic planning process to inform its future direction. As a result, it is possible that these internal activities may have hindered RWJF staff’s ability to effectively communicate with grantees in this area.

Summary

Overall, the findings this year suggest that the Foundation’s performance was strong. In general, reports—particularly those from external stakeholders—were positive. Surveys with health policy experts and RWJF grantees show that the Foundation has a strong reputation for making a long-term commitment to and a difference in health and health care issues of importance to the country. Although the Foundation worked effectively with its grantees in most areas, communication about its goals and strategies presents a target for future improvement.

---

2 Peer organizations are identified on page 8.
The Sources of Assessment Report Data

**Health Policy Experts:** Key stakeholders for the Foundation include health policy experts, who are comprised of a diverse set of leaders:

- Thought leaders (academics, association heads, heads of advocacy organizations);
- Media;
- Nonelected government officials (state and local public health officials, state and local Medicaid officials, and federal health officials); and
- State legislators

RWJF is particularly interested in the attitudes and behaviors of state legislators because they are an important constituency for the Foundation’s work and have always differed from the other types of health policy experts. As such, throughout the Assessment Report, key differences between state legislators and the other three sectors are highlighted.

This report also highlights comparisons between health policy experts’ perceptions of RWJF and other organizations that focus on health issues.

Between February and April of 2013, 590 experts (an 18% response rate) responded to a phone or web-based survey conducted by the Princeton Survey Research Associates International (PSRAI). These experts reported their perceptions of the Foundation’s programs and their effectiveness. State legislators (123 respondents) constituted about 21 percent of the surveyed experts.

**Grantee Survey:** Since 2004, the Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP) has conducted a grantee survey for RWJF to track its performance in serving grantees over time. A valuable feature of the survey is the opportunity to compare its scores with those of 14 large national funders.

Some 541 RWJF grantees participated in the 2013 CEP grantee survey (a 62% response rate), which was administered online from February through March 2013.

**Internal and Administrative Data:** RWJF regularly tracks impact internally through its performance indicator system and web data metrics. The Assessment Report also includes data from the Foundation’s Program Information Management System.

**NOTE:** Targets for RWJF’s 2013 internal measures are indicated in each chart.

---

3 Only legislators who served on committees in areas relevant to RWJF work were asked to participate. Committees included Allied Health, Appropriations, Budget, Emergency Preparedness, Family Medicine/Primary Care, Finance, Food and Drugs, Health, Health Care, Health Care Facilities, Health Insurance, Insurance, Medicaid, Medicare, Medicine, Minority Affairs, Nursing, Nutrition, Patient Protection/Affordable Health Care Act, Public Health.


5 When reporting data from the Grantee Survey in the Scorecard, RWJF uses the percentage of grantees who responded positively to each question (a “6” or a “7” on a 7-point scale).
## 2013 ASSESSMENT REPORT SUMMARY

### Reviewing Key Indicators of RWJF’s Performance

Percentages reported for indicators represent ratings relative to the Foundation’s targets.

#### Program Development

| Percentage of health policy experts who say RWJF works on issues important to the United States | 98% | 80% | 78% | 77% |
| Percentage of health policy experts who say RWJF makes long-term commitments to the issues it addresses | 91% | 80% | 73% | 73% |
| Percentage of RWJF grantees who say RWJF makes long-term commitments to the issues it addresses | 99% | 80% | 79% | 80% |

#### Program Impact

| Percentage of current objectives completed | 100% | 85% | 94% | 73% |
| Percentage of health policy experts rating RWJF’s impact as big/moderate | 92% | 85% | 78% | 77% |
| Percentage of health policy experts who agree RWJF avoids political partisanship/ideology | 92% | 85% | 78% | 77% |
| Percentage of grantees who say RWJF is advancing knowledge in the field | 90% | 80% | 72% | 75% |
| Percentage of grantees who say RWJF provides unbiased and objective information | 100% | 65% | 69% | 65% |
| Percentage of grantees who say RWJF makes a difference on problems on which it focuses | 96% | 80% | 77% | 85% |

#### Grantee Relations

| Grantee satisfaction | 96% | 90% | 86% | 88% |
| Fairness in treating grantees | 92% | 95% | 87% | 89% |
| Responsiveness of Foundation staff | 96% | 85% | 82% | 85% |
| Clarity of goals and strategies | 84% | 75% | 63% | 75% |

**Percentage of Target Achieved = Present Score ÷ Target**
The Program Development section of the Assessment Report examines the Foundation’s ability to create programs that support RWJF’s guiding principles and help fulfill its mission. In this section, the Assessment Report highlights the perceptions of health policy experts and grantees, to help assess the underlying strength of RWJF’s programming strategies, and the degree to which programs are timely and relevant.

**TABLE 1: VIEWS OF RWJF’S PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT WORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES</th>
<th>Present Score</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Percentage of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of health policy experts who say RWJF works on issues important to the United States</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of health policy experts who say RWJF makes long-term commitments to the issues it addresses</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of RWJF grantees who say RWJF makes long-term commitments to the issues it addresses</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health policy experts (thought leaders, representatives from media, nonelected government officials, and state legislators) are aware of RWJF and its work. Nearly 6 in 10 (58%) reported having the highest level of familiarity (“very familiar”) with the Foundation’s activities in the health and health care arena. In fact, when experts were asked about their familiarity with other nonprofit health organizations, they reported significantly higher familiarity with RWJF.

Compared to other health policy experts, however, state legislators were generally the least likely to be familiar with the Foundation and peer-comparison nonprofit health organizations. Further, compared to other experts, state legislators who are familiar with RWJF were also less familiar with nine out of RWJF’s 11 interest areas. Nursing and violence prevention were the only areas in which all health policy experts were equally familiar with RWJF’s programming.

To help assess the importance of the issues RWJF is working on, health policy experts also identified, from their perspective, the most pressing health policy concerns facing the country today and how the Foundation’s priorities address those concerns.

**CHART 1: Health Policy Experts Who Say RWJF Works on Issues Important to the United States**

- The majority of health policy experts (78%) felt that RWJF works on issues that are particularly important to the United States, just missing the target of 80 percent.
- State legislators, however, are least likely to think that RWJF works on the most important health and health care issues (50%) compared to 83 percent of other health policy experts.
- Health policy experts reported that cost continues to dominate top-of-mind concerns (43%), followed by issues around Affordable Care Act implementation (25%), access to care (13%), obesity (13%), Medicaid (10%), and universal health insurance (10%).

The target refers only to responses of “very” and “somewhat” well. The proportion of health policy experts who responded “very” or “somewhat” well in 2013 did not significantly differ (p<0.05) from 2008 or 2011. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.
Health policy experts were also asked about their perception of RWJF’s long-term commitment to the issues it takes on and how it compares with the perceived commitment of peer organizations.

**Chart 2: Health Policy Experts’ Views on RWJF and Peers’ Long-Term Commitments to the Issues They Address**

- About 73 percent of all health policy experts surveyed thought the Foundation did “very well” or “somewhat well” at making a commitment to the issues it addressed, falling short of the 80 percent target. However, more health policy experts perceived RWJF as having a long-term commitment to its issues than its peer organizations (62%).

- When the comparison is limited to respondents who are familiar with the organization about which they are responding, RWJF performed similarly to its peers. Some 83 percent of health policy experts who were familiar with the Foundation believed it did “somewhat well” or “very well.”

- State legislators were least likely to believe that the Foundation made the necessary long-term commitment (54%), compared to 77 percent of other health policy experts.
CEP conducts a biennial survey of current and recent RWJF grantees. (CEP collects similar data for other philanthropic organizations, several of which are considered RWJF’s “peer” organizations because of their size and scope of funding.) In 2013 CEP surveyed 541 RWJF grantees (a 62% response rate) about their perception of RWJF’s grantmaking policies and practices.

**Chart 3: Grantees Who Say RWJF Makes Long-Term Commitments to the Issues It Addresses**

- As with health policy experts, grantees continue to perceive RWJF as an organization that makes long-term commitments to the issues it addresses, with 79 percent agreeing.
- Grantees rate the Foundation similar to 2011, and gave it significantly higher ratings than in 2006 and 2007.

Responses in 2013 were significantly higher ($p<.05$) than those in 2006 and 2007.
The Program Impact section assesses the Foundation’s ability to achieve its goals and examines the field’s perceptions of its impact. Is RWJF achieving its desired outcomes? Does the field view RWJF as making a difference in health and health care? Is the Foundation’s reputation for objective information strong? Additionally, are the program teams meeting their benchmarks for performance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM IMPACT PERFORMANCE MEASURES</th>
<th>Present Score</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Percentage of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of current objectives completed</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of health policy experts rating RWJF’s impact as big/moderate</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of health policy experts who agree RWJF provides unbiased and objective information</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of health policy experts who indicate RWJF avoids political partisanship/ideology</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of grantees who say RWJF is advancing knowledge in the field</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of grantees who say RWJF provides unbiased and objective information</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of grantees who say RWJF makes a difference on problems on which it focuses</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Team Performance Measures

During the 2012 calendar year, a total of 16 indicators were used across all of the Foundation’s program areas to measure program performance toward overall goals. Across those areas, the Foundation met 94 percent of its indicators on time, meeting the target set of 85 percent.

Only one 2012 team indicator across the Foundation (in the Human Capital portfolio) was not completed on time due to a change in team strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Number of Indicators</th>
<th>Number of Indicators Completed</th>
<th>Percent of Indicators Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Obesity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality/Equality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pioneer had no team indicators for 2012 due to changes in team strategy.
Approximately 78 percent of experts believe that RWJF has a big or moderate impact in addressing problems related to health and health care. As can be seen, this falls somewhat short of the Foundation’s target of 85 percent, but comfortably exceeds the levels reported for other organizations (63%).

Respondents who are familiar with the Foundation think highly of RWJF and its efforts in health and health care—nearly 9 in 10 say it has a moderate or big impact on addressing health and health care problems—and look to it as a valued source of information.

The target refers only to responses of “big” and “moderate impact.” The proportion of health policy experts who responded that RWJF had a “big” or “moderate” impact was significantly higher (p<.05) than those who responded similarly for peer organizations.
Some 78 percent of all health policy experts surveyed said that RWJF provides unbiased and objective information. Although this is a two percentage point increase from 2011 and is higher than perceptions of peer organizations, it falls short of the 85 percent target for 2013.

As with health policy expert analyses reported earlier, when limiting the respondents to those familiar with the organization they are reporting on, views are more positive, increasing to 90 percent.

State legislators, in particular, are least likely to perceive RWJF as providing unbiased and objective information (52%), compared to 83 percent of other health policy experts.

The target refers only to responses of “very” and “somewhat” well. The proportion of health policy experts who responded that RWJF was described as doing “very” or “somewhat” well at providing unbiased and objective information was significantly higher (p<.05) than those responding similarly for peer organizations.
Overall, about 72 percent of health policy experts agreed that the Foundation avoided partisanship and ideology, a slight decline from the 75 percent who responded this way in 2011. Responses also fall short of RWJF’s 80 percent target, but are higher than those for peer organizations (61%).

Among those familiar with RWJF, the decline is somewhat sharper: 82 percent of respondents agreed the Foundation avoided partisanship and ideology in 2013, compared with 87 percent of respondents who agreed in 2011.

Again, state legislators are least likely to report that RWJF avoids political partisanship and ideology (46%), compared to 77 percent of other health policy experts.

The target refers only to responses of “very” and “somewhat” well. The proportion of health policy experts who responded that RWJF was described “very” or “somewhat” well at avoiding partisanship and ideology was significantly higher (p<.05) than those responding similarly for peer organizations.
In 2013 grantees rated RWJF among the highest in CEP’s dataset for advancing the state of knowledge in their fields, falling in the 99th percentile.

RWJF outscored the median of its peer funders by 14 percentage points.

Responses in 2013 were significantly higher (p<.05) than those in 2006, 2007, and 2009, and compared to peer funders.

“The funding that we receive helps to build our field and its evidence base. Without RWJF, the field wouldn’t be where it is today.”

—RWJF GRANTEE FROM THE CEP SURVEY
Grantees rated RWJF significantly lower on providing objective information in 2013 (77%), compared to 2011 (85%), failing to meet its target of 80 percent.

Scores from 2013, however, remain significantly higher than ratings from 2006, 2007 and 2009.

Grantees affiliated with national programs, which include the national program office, as well as the national program’s sites and projects, rate the Foundation higher on providing objective information than independent grantees (80% versus 69%).

Responses in 2013 were significantly higher \((p<.05)\) than those in 2006, 2007, and 2009 but were significantly lower \((p<.05)\) than those in 2011.
More than three out of four grantees (79%) perceived RWJF as making a difference on the problems on which it focuses, surpassing the target of 70 percent.

Although this rating remains significantly higher than those of 2006, 2007, and 2009, it reflects a slight decrease from the 84 percent reported in 2011.

Responses in 2013 were significantly higher (p<.05) than those in 2006, 2007, and 2009.
Grantee Relations explores the effectiveness of the Foundation’s service to its grantees, illuminating RWJF’s strengths and weaknesses in helping grantees carry out their work. The Grantee Perception Report® from the Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP) enables Foundation staff members to better understand how an important constituent— their grantees—perceives RWJF’s service. This biennial survey enables staff members to see change over time and to compare RWJF with peer foundations.

### Table 4: RWJF Performance Measures for Grantee Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee Relations Performance Measures</th>
<th>Present Score</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Percentage of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantee satisfaction</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness in treating grantees</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness of Foundation staff</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of goals and strategies</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2013 grantees’ rating of overall satisfaction with RWJF was similar to that of 2011 ratings. Although nearly 9 in 10 grantees reported being satisfied with the Foundation, results were just shy of the Foundation’s target of 90 percent.

The Foundation’s rating for 2013 marks a significant improvement from scores in 2006 and 2007.

Responses in 2013 were significantly higher (p<.05) than those in 2006 and 2007. CEP removed this question from their larger survey in 2013, so no scores from peer funders are available for comparison.

“Staff were extremely helpful in defining the project and connecting the dots between our strengths and contributions to this work. Spirited and tactical guidance was provided throughout the process, and we felt nurtured and appreciated.”

—RWJF GRANTEE FROM THE CEP SURVEY
CEP analysis shows that there are a number of attributes that are related to grantee satisfaction (see Chart 12). Improvements in these five measures (shaded) lead to improved interactions and communication and are related to satisfaction. RWJF has made targeted efforts to improve these areas through quality improvement activities. Results for some of these measures are presented in charts 13–15.

**Chart 12: Key Components of Funder-Grantee Relationships Measure**

- Fairness of treatment by funder
- Comfort approaching funder if a problem arises
- Responsiveness of funder staff
- Clarity of communication of funder’s goals and strategy
- Consistency of information provided by different communications

This chart depicts the quality of interactions and the clarity and consistency of communications that together create the larger construct CEP refers to as the “Funder-Grantee Relationships Measure.”
CHART 13: Grantee Views on Staff Fairness

- Grantees’ rating of the Foundation’s fairness has remained consistently below the target of 95 percent since 2006, showing no significant changes over the last eight years.
- RWJF, however, did score above peer funders in perceived fairness (87% versus 84%) in 2013.

CHART 14: Grantee Views on Staff Responsiveness

- In 2013 RWJF fell just short of the 85 percent target for grantee views on staff responsiveness (82%).
- From 2011 to 2013, compared to peer funders, RWJF moved from higher than average ratings on responsiveness to slightly lower than average ratings.
Grantees rated RWJF lower than in 2011 on the clarity of the Foundation’s communication of its goals and strategies (63% in 2013 compared to 75% in 2011).

While the Foundation still rates slightly above its peer funders, the 2013 score is 12 percentage points below its target of 75 percent.

Approximately 14 percent of grantees provided feedback about needing a better understanding of how their work fits into larger strategies and asked for more clarity and consistency in communications. These sentiments may reflect grantees’ uncertainty as a result of the Foundation’s strategic planning efforts.
Other Key Findings:

- Streamlining the application and reporting processes and making them quicker and clearer were the most frequent suggestions from grantees.
  
  - In 2013 grantees’ perception of the helpfulness of application and reporting processes in strengthening their work declined.
  
  - In addition, the time grantees reported spending on these processes over the lifetime of a grant significantly increased from 70 hours in 2011 to 90 hours in 2013.
  
  - The amount of time RWJF grantees spent on application and reporting processes (90 hours) is greater than the median of 62 hours found in CEP’s peer funder sample.

- RWJF grantees across the Foundation’s teams and portfolios gave similar ratings. Overall, grantees rated the Foundation most positively on perceived impact on their respective fields but rated the Foundation relatively low on measures of community and organizational impact.

- RWJF grantee ratings for sustainability of funded work have declined in the past five years, now falling below the 25th percentile, compared to grantees of other funders in CEP’s full dataset—a significant drop from 2006 and 2007.

- Disparities among grantees of different races have largely disappeared. Differences in ratings observed in 2009 (non-White respondents rated higher) and 2011 (White respondents rated higher) were not seen among this survey’s respondents.
INTERNAL MEASURES
Grantmaking, Communications, Web, and Social Media

This section examines RWJF’s grantmaking, communications, web, and social media activities. RWJF tracks the number and amount of grants the Foundation makes, as well as the distribution of funding by program area through the Investment Unit and the Foundation Program Information Management System. Important quality improvement measures, such as the time it takes the Foundation to process a grant, are also included. Finally, grantee and health policy expert survey data, as well as web and social media analytics, were assessed to understand the Foundation’s reach to external stakeholders through its website, email, Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube.

FACTS-AT-A-GLANCE FOR GRANTS AWARDED IN 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of grants awarded was</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median award amount was approximately $200,000, a slight increase from $199,900 in 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately $359 million in grants was awarded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of an average grant was</td>
<td>2.6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 39 percent of grantees were based at universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 22 percent of grantees were engaged in advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some 75 percent of grantees had previously received RWJF funding, an increase from 69 percent in 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than half (53%) of the funding awarded in 2012 went toward grants in RWJF’s targeted program areas: Childhood Obesity, Coverage, Quality/Equality, and Public Health.

Slightly more than one-fifth (21%) supported awards in RWJF’s Human Capital portfolio.

A smaller portion of funding supported RWJF’s Vulnerable Populations (10%), Enterprise-Level (9%), Pioneer (3%), and New Jersey-related portfolios (3%).

Distribution of funding is for the $359 million in grants awarded in 2012. Percentiles do not sum to 100 due to rounding.
Prior to July 2011, all grants and contracts for $750,000 or more were presented to the Foundation’s Board of Trustees for their approval. In the July 2011 Board meeting, the Trustees changed the policy to require Board approval only for those funding items greater than or equal to $5,000,000. (Table 5 reflects this change and the grantmaking categories have been adjusted accordingly.)

For proposals received through RWJF’s independent grantmaking process (ad hoc grants), the processing time from receiving proposals to making a grant of $5,000,000 or more decreased to 98 days in 2012 from 216 days in 2011. In 2012 there were four independent proposals of over $5,000,000.

Independent proposals under $5,000,000 took a median of 94 days to process in 2012 (up from 70 days in 2011). There were 138 of these proposals that were awarded grants.

The proposals for grants that were part of national programs took a median of 48 days (up from 37 days in 2011). There were 228 of these proposals that were awarded grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Days to Process</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$5,000,000 Independent Proposals</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤$5,000,000 Independent Proposals*</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All National Program Proposals**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Independent proposals (ad hoc grants) are unrelated to an authorization or a national program. In addition, they do not include “abbreviated awards,” which are $200,000 or less.

** 2010 was the first year RWJF tracked this measure.
Foundation as an Information Source

**CHART 17: Grantees’ Points of Contact with RWJF**

- According to CEP’s survey, grantees are using a range of social media tools to interact with RWJF, but the Foundation’s website is the most common mechanism (83%).
- The high prevalence of visits to the website is not surprising given that RWJF’s calls for proposals are now entirely online, with applications filed via the website as well.
The vast majority (87%) of health policy experts have had at least some contact with the Foundation, including going to the Foundation’s website or meeting its representatives at various conferences.

More than half (60%) of the health policy experts surveyed indicated that they had visited the Foundation’s website, consistent with findings from 2011. Since 2006, the percentage of health policy experts visiting the website has increased from 52 to 60 percent.

There are some differences between stakeholder groups: state legislators are the least likely to visit the Foundation’s website (29%) compared to the 66 percent of other health policy experts.

Other Key Findings:

Nearly all health policy experts who have gone to the Foundation’s website (95%) have looked for at least one of six specific types of information:

- Information on health or health care issues (81%)
- Issue or policy briefs (76%)
- Information about specific programs (75%)
- Reports or journal articles (64%)
- Chart books or data (51%)
- Information about grants, such as how to apply (44%)
The quality of the information on the website is highly rated by those who have used it. The majority of health policy experts perceived RWJF’s website to be clear in its writing (67%), provide accurate information (66%), reflect objectivity (56%), be timely (56%), be well organized (56%), and provide an adequate level of detail (54%).

From 2011 to 2012, rwjf.org experienced a 24 percent increase in unique visitors and a 22 percent increase in visits. While the number of page views overall decreased by 9 percent during this same time period, the number of page views per visit (or the amount of content consumed) remained nearly unchanged (2.8 page views per visit in 2011 compared to 2.9 page views per visit in 2012).
Social Media Analytics

The growth in traffic on RWJF’s website is consistent with the growth in email subscribers and followers of online channels like Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube over the last two years.

**CHART 21: Number of RWJF Email Subscribers**

- Email continues to grow and be the most successful driver of traffic to rwjf.org.
- RWJF email subscribers increased by 17 percent from 2011 to 2012.

**CHART 22: Number of RWJF Followers on Twitter**

- Twitter followers grew by 75 percent from 2011 to 2012, increasing on average about 16 percent every quarter since January 2011.
- Mentions of RWJF on Twitter grew by 30 percent, and retweeting of tweets where RWJF was mentioned grew by 73 percent from 2011 to 2012.
CHART 23: Number of RWJF Facebook Fans

- RWJF Facebook fans doubled from 2011 to 2012.

CHART 24: Number of YouTube Video Views

- As part of the launch of RWJF’s new website in September 2012, the Foundation transitioned its video platform to YouTube, which increased consumption of video content through embedded YouTube videos on rwjf.org.
- The number of times RWJF YouTube videos were viewed increased by 76 percent from 2011 to 2012.