

Summary of the feedback received by the Blaggrave Trust from partners and applicants in 2022

We ask for feedback at four key stages in the grant-making process. To do this, we send out a request for the completion of an anonymous online survey. Each survey takes on average 5 minutes to complete.

This report includes;

1. End of Grant Survey: this survey is sent to partners at the conclusion of a three-year funding relationship.
2. Monitoring our Grant Agreement Survey: this survey is sent to partners mid-way through a three-year funding relationship.
3. Grant Offer Agreement Survey: sent to partners after a grant offer has been made.
4. Outline Proposal Survey: sent to applicants whose applications for funding was unsuccessful.

In 2022, the number of partners completing the survey rose from last year as we implemented a new way of working, sending out questionnaires more consistently.

- The end of grant survey was sent to 42 partners and received 24 responses (57% response rate)
- The monitoring grant survey was sent to 22 partners and received 9 responses (40% response rate)
- The grant offer agreement survey was sent to 52 partners received 35 responses (67% response rate)
- The outline proposal survey was sent to 242 applicants and received 62 responses (25% response rate)

These are higher response rates compared to last year, which means we can review our processes and ways of working based on the increased feedback.

The questions have remained unchanged since 2018 so we can track changes year to year. Overall, the feedback was very positive about our way of working. One thing that stood out was that partners consistently ask us to do more to share lessons and experiences among those who are working on similar issues. In response to this we are planning to spend more time this year convening and connecting partners and have built in the time and resources to do this in our strategic business plan.

We have seen slight dips in some of the feedback around the application process, and this seems to accompany the fact that in 2022 we ran a number of competitive call outs. At the moment it is not possible for us to investigate further as we do not differentiate feedback by funding stream. In the coming year, we plan to associate feedback with funding stream so we can interrogate further.

In addition, we have different funding for individuals and organisations, and as our work continues to grow, we will be launching differentiated surveys for these partners.

This year we plan to undertake team training to review what both giving and receiving 'good' feedback looks like. We want to work as a team to look at what the word 'feedback' means and set a minimum standard across all areas of our work for how to give good feedback to our partners.

By asking partners to indicate which of our funding programmes they are involved in, and adapting our approach when asking for feedback, we hope to identify the areas that need improvement and structure our response accordingly.

END OF GRANT SURVEY

This survey is sent to partners at the end of their grant relationship with us.

Below show the responses to the first 7 questions where partners were asked to rank their agreement with the above statements on a scale of 1 – 10 (with 1 being strongly disagree and 10 being strongly agree).

Q1. The Blaggrave Trust's reporting requirements are simple and easy to comply with

The average response received was **10 out of 10** (24 responses) This hasn't changed since 2021.

Q2. How well does the Blaggrave Trust understand your intended beneficiaries' needs?

The Average response received was **9 out of 10** (24 responses) This hasn't changed since 2021.

Q3. We understand what the Blaggrave Trust does with the information we provide.

The average response was **9 out of 10** (24 responses) This has decreased since 2021 where the average response was 10 out of 10. As a result of this finding, we intend to undertake team training on how we provide feedback to partners.

Q4. The Blaggrave Trust explained when it expected to stop working with us.

The average response was **9 out of 10** (24 responses) This has decreased since 2021 where the average response was 10 out of 10.

Q5. Blaggrave Trust staff are respectful, helpful, and capable.

The average response was **10 out of 10** (24 responses) This hasn't changed since 2021.

Q6. The Blaggrave Trust does not make excessive demands on our time to support their work.

The average response was **10 out of 10** (24 responses) This hasn't changed since 2021.

Q7. How likely is it that you would recommend the Blaggrave Trust as a funder to another charity?

The average response was **10 out of 10** (24 responses) This hasn't changed since 2021.

Explanatory comments given by charities can be found in [Appendix A](#).

MONITORING OUR GRANT AGREEMENT

This survey is sent to partners halfway through their grant agreement with us.

Partners were asked to rank their agreement with a series of statements on a 1 – 10 scale (with 1 being strongly disagree and 10 being strongly agree):

Q1. The reporting requirements of the Blaggrave Trust are easy to understand and comply with

The average response received was **10 out of 10** based on 9 responses. This has increased since 2021 where the average response was 9 out of 10.

Q2. The Blaggrave Trust gives us useful comments about the reports we send them.

The average response received was **8 out of 10** based on 9 responses. This has decreased since 2021 where the average response was 9 out of 10. In response to this we plan to have team training on giving and receiving 'good' feedback.

Q3. What two things would you most like the Blaggrave Trust to do to improve its monitoring and reporting in the future?

The top 3 answers shared were:

- Share lessons and experiences among organisations working on similar issues.
- Respond and discuss our reports with us.

- Involve us in deciding how to monitor and report progress.

The top 3 responses (the first is by far the most popular) haven't changed since 2021. We're building this into our plans, doing more to connect and convene partners.

Explanatory comments by partners can be found in [Appendix B](#).

GRANT OFFER AGREEMENT

This survey is sent to partners at the outset of the grant agreement.

For the below 4 questions, applicants were asked to rank their satisfaction on a scale of 1-10 (with 1 being not satisfied and 10 being extremely satisfied)

Q1. The application form was easy to use and proportional to the grant

The average response received was **9 out of 10** based on 35 responses. This hasn't changed since 2021.

Q2. The amount of funding is well matched to our needs.

The average response received was **9 out of 10** based on 35 responses. This hasn't changed since 2021.

Q3. The length of funding is well matched to our needs.

The average response received was **9 out of 10** based on 35 responses. This has increased since 2021 where the average response was 8 out of 10.

Q4. The Blaggrave Trust gave us enough support to help us finalise the agreement.

The average response received was **10 out of 10** based on 35 responses. This has increased since 2021 where the average response was 9 out of 10.

Explanatory comments given by partners can be found in [Appendix C](#).

OUTLINE PROPOSAL

This survey is sent out to partners who have been rejected for funding. As these partners applications for funding have been unsuccessful, we recognise the increased burden we are potentially placing on them by asking for feedback. We deliberately keep this survey very short: just one question.

Applicants were asked to rank their satisfaction 1 – 10 (with 1 being unsatisfied and 10 being extremely satisfied).

Q1. How satisfied were you with the explanation you were given by the Blaggrave Trust for their decision?

The average response received was **7 out of 10** based on 61 responses. This has increased since 2021 where the average response was 6 out of 10. This reflects our increased effort to give personalised and meaningful feedback. We plan to build on this in the year ahead.

Explanatory comments given by partners in response can be found in [Appendix D](#).

APPENDIX

Appendix A

Below are the additional comments left by partners/applicants who completed the 'end of grant' survey.

- I love working with Blaggrave, it is an absolute joy. There is really nothing negative I can say. Great experience.
- We have found working with Blaggrave a very positive experience.
- We particularly appreciated the flexible approach, especially as we are very different organisation to most primary youth support organisations that Blaggrave works with.
- Would like to have an ongoing, regular dialogue about the issues, and severity of issues, that our young people are experiencing. It would be really valuable to receive feedback from the Board about what we submit to them - a more ongoing dialogue rather than one-way. We are continuing to work with Blaggrave, and hope to work together into the future therefore have not discussed ending our work together.
- A breath of fresh air as a funder we are so grateful for our partnership with Blaggrave.
- Blaggrave Trust staff supported us at every stage of this process, and we remain hopeful that they will be able to help us find another funder who is willing/able to carry forward this vital, and now proven, 'pilot' work.
- Enjoyed working with The Blaggrave Trust - their support has been helpful. We would love to find ways of working with you again.
- The main piece of feedback which I gave during the end of the project learnings workshop on 27th January 2022 is that running a workshop during or before the application stage involving those who ran projects in the past (e.g. Restart Youth Phase 1) and their learnings, plus those looking to apply for Phase II, followed by another workshop early after the start of their projects would have been very useful. I say this because there was so much helpful information to share and support during the learning workshop in January that the general agreement was that we could have all done with more of that from the outset, which would have aided us in formulating a more realistic project plan and expectations and cross-project collaboration around similar challenges faced would have helped inform delivery. That's not a complaint, just that hindsight is always better than foresight. Referring to Question 1, I did not have a good enough understanding of the end of grant reporting requirements from the outset until the end of the grant report form was sent. So, I imagined a scenario in which I wouldn't be able to fulfil the reporting requirements because I believed they would be heavily dependent on data I

couldn't produce. Relevant to my answer to Question 2, had we better understood the challenges and vital importance of forming effective working partnerships with the statutory service providers supporting our intended beneficiaries, male care leavers, the experience of getting the project off the ground would have been better. Regarding Question 4, I was surprised that, in essence, the Restart Youth initiative ended and that there were no plans it seems to continue onto Phase III. Our project's direct and lasting result was how it underscored the vital importance of forming effective working partnerships with the Leaving Care services, the gatekeepers in accessing our primary beneficiaries, which has informed a new and better approach to how we go about achieving that.

- As I was not involved in the application process for our Grant, I cannot say whether it was made clear when the Trust expected to stop working with us. However, following the end of our grant and having spoken with [Grants Manager] it was suggested we would be welcome to apply again.
- We've felt very well supported by Blaggrave :)
- Blaggrave have been hugely supportive of our work and we're very grateful.
- The grant application and reporting process was straight forward and easy to follow and the Blaggrave Trust has been a supportive funder enabling flexibility with timelines during our grant.
- I joined the fundraising team towards the end of our multi-year funding from the Blaggrave Trust and one of my first priorities in the role was to complete a final report. The nature of the funding meant that we were relatively free to design our own report, which turned out to be an enjoyable experience and helped me learn about several areas of the charity's participation and learning programme. It also became clear just how significant the Trust's funding had been, allowing us to make huge strides forward in our ambition to become a truly youth-led organisation and include young people's voices at every stage of our project design, decision-making and governance processes. It's the kind of funding that doesn't come around very often and I know I speak on behalf of everyone at here when I say thank you for your very generous support.
- The funding is very focussed now so many organisations we work with are outside of the remit.
- Although Blaggrave did not tell us they were stopping working with us we knew it was going to happen as we had come to the end of the funding period. We have gained an enormous amount from the relationship which was somewhat challenged by Covid. The 2 events we attended were helpful and great opportunities to meet other grantees but most importantly to hear from young people. We are so pleased that one of the young people we recommended for the panel has been successful in becoming a part of Blaggrave - this is one of the highlights of the whole experience. It was excellent to meet Eli and would love another chance to look at how we can work with [Grants Manager] and Blaggrave in the future.

Appendix B

Below are the additional comments left by partners/applicants who completed the "Monitoring" survey.

- Monitoring and reporting is a very individual process for each organisation. We have tried and tested many structures and have eventually come up with what we think suits us best. But this process may not suit another organisation. Hope this makes sense! :)
- Blaggrave has one of the best and most flexible monitoring and reporting processes we have ever come across. Being able to submit data, evidence etc in an existing format (rather than in a 'trust specific' way) is so helpful. We ticked the visit us more often box, not because you don't visit enough but because being able to have a face-to-face relationship with funders is one of the things we most highly value. We really appreciated this especially in pre-application stages and more face-to-face contact could only really be a good thing! On a similar note, in ticking 'respond and discuss our reports' we're not saying that you don't respond... You do and in quite a comprehensive way however we'll always welcome more opportunities for discussion.
- I appreciate that Blaggrave Trust held an event to get together the charities that they support, but unfortunately it was difficult due to timings. It would be fantastic to read and share specific experiences of other charities, to understand where we might learn together.
- I have ticked the above 2 boxes however this is something you have done over the course of our 2 grants. We would love to welcome you again.
- The current way of monitoring is perfect.
- We had some good conversations about how to most effectively engage young people and it was really useful to share and discuss how we do that most effectively.

Appendix C

Below are the additional comments left by partners/applicants who completed the "grant offer" survey.

- Have really enjoyed process of working with [Grants Manager] and the team. Can see Blaggrave really thinks about its approach to funding, works in a meaningful and effective way with the charities it supports and – importantly – sees the value in core funding. Thank you; we very much look forward to continuing our work together.
- The Blaggrave Trust is an incredible funder. It is such an honour to be able to work in partnership, particularly as they live their values through everything they do and centre high impact in all of the actions.
- The 'partnership' approach to our application was very welcome. We greatly appreciated the time taken to understand our programme and give us the opportunity to explain our work. The constructive feedback we received was extremely helpful.
- The support we received from [Grants Manager] Hibbert was excellent, she took us through the bid process in a calm and logical fashion and we were well supported throughout the process.
- The application form was very straight forward. We liked the process of not having to fill out a budget and confine ourselves to line items that might change in the future, as we start building out the strategy. [Grants Manager] was extremely helpful throughout and checked in on us every step of the way.
- A very simple process which made it really easy for us to apply. The grant manager has also been very responsive to our messages which is really appreciated. Thank you!
- Overall, the process was excellent and clear, so any constructive feedback is given in this light. The briefing event was really good and very helpful. In the future I would consider a further stage to the process. An initial one pager / EOI used to whittle down the 100 applicants to, say, 20 who then do the fuller application and then the final candidates do the due diligence. When a fund is very oversubscribed it's a positive that its clearly well aligned to need, but also leaves me worrying about all the people hours that went into application forms that went nowhere. If we put a per hour cost against that it would total a fair amount of £.
- We have always found the Blaggrave Trust to be extremely supportive, giving us flexibility and encouragement which as a small charity has been so hugely helpful. Thank you so much.
- The process was great – I particularly liked that the application was short but then we spoke about the idea and project at length with [Grants Manager] and agreed together the way forward.
- A really positive and enjoyable experience so far, thank you so much to Edd and colleagues. Especially impressed by the proactive contribution to our costs and time to engage fully with the Learning groups as the project unfolds. Thank you!

Appendix D

Below are the additional comments left by partners/applicants who completed the "rejection" survey.

- Easy to fill.
- Too many applicants for a small pot of award funds makes it difficult to justify decisions – funding known entities or those already known to you is natural under these circumstances. We need new entrants to the pool who have more innovative ideas and often this is overlooked in the industrialisation of spec and tender award processes.
- I was satisfied – it was helpful feedback.
- No feedback provided.
- Our projects being out of England do not qualify for the grant opportunities.
- Satisfied that I understood the reason why the funding was not approved.
- I thought [Grants Manager] Hibbert was very personable and felt her feedback was fair and specific to us. I really appreciated her efforts, regardless of the fact we were not awarded a grant.
- We would have loved the opportunity to expand our services in line with Blaggrave values.
- I felt that [Grants Manager]'s email with the decision was very well written and sounded genuine, which really helped digest the rejection. I appreciated her personal touch, meaningful explanation, and warm wishes for the future. Thank you, [Grants Manager] – you are an asset to the Blaggrave Trust.
- It was very clearly explained why we didn't meet the criteria as we aren't solely a charity focused on young people but are intergenerational.
- I think it was useful and relevant rationale. It would have been useful to have more detail were resources available.
- My overall explanation of the work was an initial overview. I will know next time to be more specific about how we would go about changing policy.
- Initial rejection email stated that 'the more detailed and individual feedback that we're committed to providing' would follow the general mail-out, but this has not yet been received.
- In the decision email I received, it mentioned we would receive individual feedback – which we didn't receive despite following up. It'd be great to hear what was lacking in our proposal, so that there might be scope for future applications! Thank you.
- The feedback offered little connection to the questions asked in the application. If we were asked to identify the decision / policy makers we are working with, we would have included this within the answers.
- We were kept well informed about the process and given helpful feedback (which is all too rare so thank you).
- I found the explanation really useful and can see how the decision was made from this. I haven't given a 10, as I suppose 1-1 feedback would warrant a 10, but can understand that would not be possible with so many applicants, so generally speaking would say very satisfied!

- Our application was not successful however there was detailed feedback given and we are hoped to work with the trust in the future
- I realise that there is limited capacity to do this, but some degree of individual feedback would, of course, be useful. Non-the-less, it is useful to receive the broad contextual information as provided.
- The feedback we received was - "This is due to less clearly defined routes to policy impact the strongest proposals in this area named specific individuals or teams with whom they hold strong, direct relationships; the mandate they've been given to carry out this work alongside policy makers; and/or showed how they would hold policy-makers accountable for what they heard from young people on an ongoing basis." - In our application, we named several key organisations, MPs and policy figures whom we have worked closely with and continue to hold relationships with. It would have been helpful to get more specific feedback on why this wasn't compelling enough to be successful.
- We are leading the biggest youth voice project to ask 5000 young people what think a fairer society looks like, working with every violence reduction unit across the UK, 10 charities and Government. I guess we thought you'd be interested. Maybe we didn't get it across adequately. The explanation we got seemed generalised and we wanted more specific feedback.
- Aside from the notification that we were not shortlisted, there was no feedback.
- I felt this was a disappointing application process. We felt that the Blaggrave team had a very clear idea of both who and what they wanted to fund prior to applications being received (and said so to people we spoke to around the funding process) but put out a very broad call which led to time being wasted on applications that they knew they weren't going to accept. We felt that the team were wanted a very particular process to be followed and it would have been better to be open about that. The application questions themselves were tough to answer and not particularly intuitive (there was no clear place to just say what you were going to do) and which was far more time consuming to write. It would be better to ask for 2/3 sides of A 4 covering a series of points/questions to allow people to recycle basic information about us as an organisation. We are also still waiting for feedback on our application.
- The feedback made sense in that the application did not meet the ask as well as some others, but given the time taken to fulfil the application, thinking through the project etc. some more detailed feedback would have been useful.
- We weren't given an explanation.
- The grant officer kept in touch and managed our expectations throughout the process, the explanation of why you couldn't support us was clear (and we agreed with it!). This is NOT our experience of a lot of other grants making bodies and it has really helped us to focus our work for the coming year - thank you!

- We do work with young people on the counties which are of primary interest to the Trust, but we understand the reasoning behind the decision. We thank you for taking the time to give a full personal explanation – it is rare and appreciated.
- I received a very swift response to my query. Unfortunately, I had mis-interpreted the eligibility criteria.
- Helpful, quick to respond.
- Very good feedback from Phillipa – as we had read the criteria incorrectly. However, we offered to support other organisations, and this was welcomed.
- I understand that Blaggrave needs to choose which projects to fund but I did think from the description on the internet that we might have had a chance.
- You did provide feedback, but it would have been useful to have more information as to how our application was deemed weaker on influencing services. We would like to apply again but have a longer discussion with you before our next attempt.
- We were given very full and clear feedback as to why we were unsuccessful in our bid but feel disappointed that our location was considered not recognising that we have areas that we work in that are deprived.
- It was quite clear and had some detail. However, it's useful to have full and honest explanations. This rarely happens, if ever, and it would have been great to have more information. Especially when the funding was designed to be proposed and assessed by young people themselves. Proper feedback helps young people to hone their skills, often it's quite clear that feedback given is generic and that is disappointing and not something they can learn from.
- Overall, the whole process was quick and easy (unlike many other funding application processes) and there was really nice ongoing support/dialogue during the funding application process. As a very small organisation, this is important. If I remember correctly, the explanation at the time did feel like a generic response but know that this is standard practice given the number of applications Blaggrave will have received, so this is not a criticism.
- I was responded to in a considerate and respectful way. It was clear the reasons why we are not suitable to apply at this time. Thank you.
- Very often we receive no feedback at all on applications, and this can be frustrating as it means we are unable to better understand the focus of a funder, or how we might improve our applications further. To understand that our services are not sufficiently user-led for the Blaggrave Trust to fund, enables us to reflect on how we develop our courses and consider changing how we do things to improve.
- Following the feedback from the Blaggrave Trust we have looked closely at how we bring the voices of the young people we help to the forefront of our work. We have always had input from our trainees, but it was clear that we needed to show the impact of this in a clearer way. Not only do this group of young people suffer marginalisation in general society but doubly so in the workplace. We just need to find a way to make their voices heard. Thank you for helping us to focus on this and maybe we can work together in the future.