

The Foundation Dam, Health spring 2017 FEEDBACK

During the previous call for proposals the review committee evaluated a total of 639 applications and distributed a total of 90 million to the 210 projects. There is little doubt that the assessment work you reviewers are doing is very important.

In our analyzes of last year's grants we find no evidence of systematic bias in the distribution of funds. For example, many have been concerned that the reviewers rate applications from large organizations higher than applications from small organizations. As the table shows, there is no significant difference between how the proportions are distributed between applied and granted projects.

SIZE OF ORGANIZATION	Applied	Granted
Small member organization (<5.000 members)	11 %	12 %
Medium member organization (5.000-25.000)	26 %	22 %
Big member organization (>25.000)	17 %	19 %
Umbrella organizations (medlem)	7 %	14 %
Organization that are not members of the foundation	39 %	33 %

We also see no difference between applied and granted projects when it comes to the health area and the age group the project is targeting or what interventions the project is using. This is a good indication that you reviewers are not emphasizing elements that are not part of the review criteria.

As mentioned earlier, there is not always a match between the scores you give the same application. One possible reason for this is the training we give you. We see, among other things, that the rating scale is used differently by different reviewers. This is how the rating scale was used by the committee as a whole during last year's reviews. Probably the distribution will be about the same this year as well.

