

External Grant Funding Search Tool Survey
Data Collected July and August 2013

System	Number of Responses	System Characteristics									
		Convenient and Easy to Access		User-Friendly		Useful Training/ Technical Support		Comprehensive, Timely Information		Success In Securing External Funding	
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Foundation Directory Online	5	4.4	4–5	4.2	3–5	4.0	2–5	4.2	3–5	3.8	3–5
Grant Forward	5	3.8	1–5	3.8	1–5	3.2	2–5	3.0	2–5	3.0	1–5
Grant Resource Center	4	3.0	2–5	3.5	2–5	3.0	2–4	2.8	2–4	2.5	2–3
Pivot	6	3.8	1–5	3.3	1–5	3.7	2–5	3.7	2–5	3.0	2–4
SciVal	1	2.0	n/a	2.0	n/a	1.0	n/a	2.0	n/a	1.0	n/a
SPIN	3	4.3	4–5	4.0	4–4	4.0	3–5	4.3	4–5	3.7	3–5

Respondents' Comments

Grant Forward:

- Good technical support
- Adds features based on user suggestions
- Limited information on foundations
- Poor sorting options
- Does not work on iOS*
- No e-mail alert service*

Grant Resource Center

- Some information is outdated
- Attached to AASCU membership
- Limited keyword searches

Pivot

- Expensive but worth it
- Not worth the price
- Negative reputation
- Good system for storing/tracking opportunities
- Cost has gone up substantially

SPIN

- Willing to negotiate on price

Other Notes

Institutions with greater than \$31 million in external research funding reported using: Grant Resource Center, Pivot, SciVal, and SPIN.

Institutions with less than \$31 million in external research funding reported using: Foundation Directory Online, Grant Resource Center, Pivot, and SPIN.

One respondent noted that Google was just as effective as the proprietary search tools.

*After posting the results on RESADM-L on 8/29/2013, we received several e-mails stating these comments were incorrect.

This document last updated 8/30/2013