

This is an edited version of a document that was shared with the Board. It has been redacted, in alignment with the guidelines on our [Approach to Transparency page](#). We do not indicate each redacted item. However, we may indicate specific places where redactions were made if they improve the readability of the document (for example, clarifying that a link has been made confidential, or explaining the jump from one topic to another) or may make minor clarifying edits.

Board Review Questions

July 14, 2022 Board Meeting

Attachment B: Organizational Updates – June 2022

Section: Departures of senior staff members

1. **GW said:** These departures include the people who were leading our engagement with the global health and development community, our high-leverage grantmaking, and our marketing. [Details redacted]

Norma asks: Could you say more about what work [on engagement with the global health and development community] will continue, what work won't, and what impact you think this will have on GiveWell? I'm also interested in what your takeaways are from these efforts on engagement, and if there are parts of the work that you aren't currently continuing but you think could be worth it (e.g. with the right hire).

GW response:

Because our engagement work ran for a fairly short period of time and took on a few different forms, we don't have a great sense of exactly how valuable it was. We believe it was valuable to communicate and build relationships with many of the people we had reached out to. The benefits are diffuse and hard to evaluate, but we felt that over time, our engagement work would lead to more people in the global health and philanthropy sectors having a solid understanding of GiveWell, and us having a better understanding of them.

But with this departure, it felt too costly for other senior staff to pick up most of this work. We also believe it would be particularly hard to find someone new who could represent GiveWell so well to the outside world, especially to a research-focused audience.

An activity related to engagement that we plan to scale up is building our networks in

specific program areas. For example, one of our Senior Program Associates works on grantmaking to anti-malaria programs and is scaling up her engagement with the malaria community. This is less a continuation of our specific engagement work and more a conceptual outgrowth of that work.

2. **GW said, paraphrased:** The Program Officer who was leading our work on high-leverage grantmaking, which so far had primarily focused on [public health regulation](#), left GiveWell. With his departure, we may pursue only a subset of the high-leverage work we had previously taken on, which would represent a meaningful reduction in the scope of our grantmaking.

Julia asks: because it will be too hard to hire someone else for? Because it wasn't going that well?

GW response:

We think these grants are good, and we'd ideally like to see this program continue.

This departure reopened a long-standing question of whether GiveWell is the best long-term home for this type of work. We're considering whether we should continue this work; if we don't, another organization might take it on.

Section: Foreign Registration: UK

3. **GW said:** We can share more about the changes we're planning to our top charities list if the Board is interested.

Norma says: I am interested, but please don't create anything new.

Tim asks: What kind of changes are these?

GW response:

This document [link to internal document redacted] was written to preview these changes to GiveWell staff earlier this year. In brief, we're revising our criteria to be more clear and consistent about when something should be added to or removed from the top charities list. We want to make our top charities list easier to manage while better reflecting our actual work and beliefs.

As a result of the changes to our criteria, we'll remove GiveDirectly and the four deworming organizations from our list, leaving AMF, Malaria Consortium, Helen Keller International's vitamin A program, and New Incentives. We're making removals

mid-year rather than during Giving Season because the end of the year is a particularly sensitive time for our recommended organizations to receive any negative publicity.

We don't plan to heavily advertise these changes because our current presentation seems to be working well for our donors. We also plan to frame this as "we've modified and clarified our criteria – these are now our four top charities" rather than emphasizing the removal of the other five charities. We may add additional charities to the list in the future.

We also still intend to direct funding to deworming programs, as we do with several non-top charities (e.g., Dispensers for Safe Water). We haven't recommended marginal funding to GiveDirectly in several years.

Attachment E: Staff Compensation

[Questions redacted – this document is unpublished]

Attachment F: Risks to GiveWell

Section: Planning for an unexpected sudden departure

4. **GW said:** We're in the process of working with key staff to ensure that we have access to a comprehensive list of their responsibilities so that nothing important would be inadvertently lost if they suddenly left.

Julia said: [redacted link to another organization's template for this]

GW response: Thanks for sharing, Julia!

Attachment G: CEO Compensation Recommendation

[Question redacted – it related to the comparisons to other staff]

Attachment H: CEO Evaluation

[Question redacted – it related to redacted information from last year's evaluation]