



**GRANT FINAL REPORT:
SUPPORTING STUDENTS AND SCHOOL STAFF—PILOT PROJECT
(YEAR 2 OF 2)**

**Please note that this Sample Grant Final Report is based upon an elaborate fictional project (e.g. multiple funding sources, several pre-launch activities, numerous activities provided to different audiences in three sites, dual reporting targets, an evaluative component and a few knowledge sharing activities). Your grant report may be much shorter as your program or project may not be this complex.*

Grant Description

Name of Organization: ACME Community Organization of Canada Inc.

Mailing Address: 99 First Avenue, Big City, ON A1B 2C3

Telephone Number: (000) 555-1234

Name, Title and Email of the Person Responsible for Overseeing this Project: Mary Noname,
Program Manager (mnoname@acme.com)

Project Title: Supporting Students and School Staff—Pilot Project

Project Duration: Two Years

Project Dates: July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2014

Reporting Period: July 15, 2013 to July 14, 2014 (Year 2)

Grant Amount: \$81,500

Total Project Budget: \$170,000

Additional Sources of Funding (if applicable): \$40,000 (Grant provided by XYZ Community Foundation Inc.) and \$48,500 in-kind from ACME Inc.

Description of Outputs and Outcomes

The answers to these questions provide an overview of the original intent of the grant and compares how the project did during this reporting period and over the lifecycle of the grant versus what was initially intended. They also provide insight into how this grant affected the community you serve and your organization during both periods.

Please describe specifically what you aimed to accomplish with your project. (This content appears in the Goals & Objectives section of your Grant Application) *ABOUT 100 WORDS*

Our Supporting Students and School Staff Pilot Project will test our violence prevention model that provides students an alternative to using violence to resolve disputes. In brief, this approach will teach students to practice non-violent conflict resolution techniques that will steer them away from violent outbursts (verbal and physical) towards each other and staff members. This model also includes conflict intervention training for school officials and students caregivers to support students in resolving conflicts peacefully. We are also instituting a mechanism (Restorative Justice Model) to allow those involved in incidences of violence (perpetrators, victims, and witnesses) to find an agreeable resolution to the problem. Doing so will decrease the likelihood that the dispute “flares up” again.

This intervention was designed to improve conditions in high schools leading to greater academic success for the student body. A more peaceful workplace likewise provides better working conditions for staff members therefore improving their career outcomes.

What progress was made toward realizing the outputs of this Reporting Period? (These outputs appear at the top of the Project Description section of your Grant Application. They are also outlined in your Logic Model Diagram submitted with your Grant Application) *ABOUT 200 WORDS*

- The Theoretical Conflict Management Sessions were held in the first week of October in all three high schools (557 students) followed by the Modeling Conflict Management Sessions in the second week of November (529 students). These were delayed two weeks due to the Fall exam schedule. The same delay occurred in Year One. The Follow-up Conflict Management Sessions were completed in the second week of January as planned (544 students).
- The Theoretical and Follow-up Conflict Intervention Sessions were held as scheduled. While the former took place in November (198 caregivers and 98 staff), the latter were held in March (193 caregivers and 92 staff).
- The schools continued to use the Restorative Justice model instituted the previous year as planned.
- The Project Impact tracking mechanisms occurred as planned. We collected the benchmark statistics (violent incidences and workplace H.R. indicators) and compared this data with statistics from the Pilot Project phase. The End of Project Impact Survey was completed. (See Appendix C) Findings will be included in the Project Review Report.
- ABC Evaluation Corporation Inc. monitored the project as planned. Their first Implementation Review took place on September 24th. It was repeated on December 12th

and March 22th. They have submitted a draft report which we are reviewing. We expect to have the final version by the end of July. The Developmental Evaluation Implementation Review Report will be finished by the end of the month. The Project Review Report will be submitted in early August.

- Progress on developing the Project Review Report and Implementation Guide has occurred as planned. Staff convened in January to develop the outlines and meetings were held throughout the next four months to discuss new versions of both documents. The final Project Review Report and Implementation Guide are attached as appendices (See Appendix D and Appendix E)

What progress was made over the lifecycle of this grant towards realizing the outcome(s) of this project? (As per the outcome indicators agreed upon in the Grant Letter of Agreement that correspond to the Logic Model Diagram submitted with your Grant Application)

ABOUT 200 WORDS

Data during this period compared to statistics for the three years before the Pilot Period and Year 1 of the project have shown some very positive findings about the influence of this initiative. Here are some highlights of the findings that are included in the Project Review Report:

Instances of violent incidences declined in all the three high schools:

Sir John A. MacDonald High School 26% fewer than the pre-intervention period; Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School 21% fewer than the pre-intervention period; and Lester B. Pearson High School 28% fewer than the pre-intervention period.

Indicators of academic performance increased in all three high schools:

Grade Point Average: Sir John A. MacDonald High School 9% higher than the pre-intervention period; Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School 13% higher than the pre-intervention period; and Lester B. Pearson High School 11% higher than the pre-intervention period.

Graduation Rates: Sir John A. MacDonald High School 3% higher than the pre-intervention period; Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School 5% higher than the pre-intervention period; and Lester B. Pearson High School 3% higher than the pre-intervention period.

Human resource indicators showed a significant improvement:

Staff absences: Sir John A. MacDonald High School 16% fewer than the pre-intervention period; Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School 13% fewer than the pre-intervention period; and Lester B. Pearson High School 16% fewer than the pre-intervention period.

Staff sick days: Sir John A. MacDonald High School 7% fewer than the pre-intervention period; Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School 5% fewer than the pre-intervention period; and Lester B. Pearson High School 5% fewer than the pre-intervention period.

Staff turnover due to poor working conditions: Sir John A. MacDonald High School—All staff will be retained in both years (compared to average loss of 3 staff in previous years due to burnout related reasons); Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School—No changes in Year 1 and one staff lost in Year 2 (retired); and Lester B. Pearson High School—Two staff replaced in Year 1 and no staff turnover in Year 2 (compared to average loss of 5 staff in previous years due to burnout related reasons).

Impact Survey findings showed increased awareness of non-violent dispute resolution techniques in all groups: Students 74%; Staff 48%; and Caregivers 78%.

Did internal or external factors (e.g. new staff, unanticipated delays, increased funding, a partner organization stopped providing services, etc.) over the lifecycle of this grant affect the achievement of your project or the anticipated timeline? If yes, tell us how these modifications affected the original Goals & Objectives mentioned in your Grant Application? *ABOUT 100 WORDS*

External: As mentioned in the Grant Progress Report, we briefly delayed the Conflict Management Sessions and Conflict Intervention Sessions in Year 1 in order not to interfere with the Fall exam schedule. We did the same in Year 2. These changes did not affect the original Goals & Objectives.

Were there any unanticipated results, either positive or negative, throughout the lifecycle of the grant that you have not already described above? If yes, please tell us about them and describe the implications. *ABOUT 100 WORDS*

Positive: Students that took part in Year 1 were very pleased with the experience and were very interested in promoting the initiative to their peers. They helped develop a short booklet that captured how participating in the project enhanced their experience in school.

Negative: none noted.

Did the grant lead to any capacity-building throughout the lifecycle of the grant within your organization? If yes, describe what capacity-building was accomplished and how it will enhance what you do? (Please refer to the content mentioned in the Project Description section of your Grant Application) *ABOUT 100 WORDS*

- Mary Noname has used her Restorative Justice Training to build ties with a agencies that work in our community. She has provided four presentations about this model and how it can be used by different client groups. These new ties will certainly help our organization as it has enhanced our outreach potential
- Lisa Anonymous completed her training in evaluation strategy in March. She has passed on her knowledge to our other managers in two “Lunch and Learn Sessions”.

Did you undertake any anticipated or unanticipated political activities with funds provided from this grant during this Reporting Period? If so, please describe and explain how much of the grant amount was dedicated to these activities. (This content appears in the Confirmation of Outputs section of your Grant Letter of Agreement) *ABOUT 200 WORDS*

-Not applicable

FICTIONAL PROJECT

Lessons Learned

This section is intended to encourage you to reflect on what you have learned from this grant during this reporting period and over the lifecycle of the grant and to think about whether this learning points you toward making minor or major adjustments to your organization programmatically or changes in resource allocation.

What were the primary lessons that you, your staff and/or volunteers learned from this project during (a) this Reporting Period and (b) throughout the lifecycle of this grant about your organization and/or the clients you serve? How might they impact your future thinking, performance, or services? *ABOUT 300-400 WORDS*

Organizational Learnings:

- Reporting Period—Our decision that the Program Assistant should work from the respective high schools one day per week during Year 2 of the project was quite beneficial. It allowed us to better align project activities with the timelines of the respective schools. This approach will be adopted as of Year 1 of the project in the future.
- Lifecycle of the Grant—Veteran staff members at the respective institutions seemed a bit reticent to adopt our approach. They mentioned that they had been using their own methods to address this issue. We have decided to tailor some content of the program to speak to the different experiences of staff members in order to ensure the greatest uptake.

Learnings about our clients:

- Reporting Period—Our decision to continue to hold separate Conflict Management Sessions since females and males oftentimes have different perspectives about conflict/conflict resolution, while bringing these two groups together at the end of the sessions to briefly go over how their counterparts experience conflict/conflict resolution was very beneficial. We will use this approach as of Year 1 of the project in the future.
- Lifecycle of the Grant—We noticed that there were some differences in receptiveness to our model that could be attributed to cultural factors. We are interested in doing further research to see how we can adapt our model to better reflect the cultural practices of sub-populations including new Canadians and Aboriginal Peoples.

What do you consider to be the greatest strength(s) of the project? *ABOUT 100 WORDS*

The impact of the Restorative Justice Model was greater than we could have expected. Students and staff members really enjoy the opportunity to air their grievances in a “safe place” that is dedicated to finding solutions instead of laying blame.

Were there any disappointments in this project? If yes, please elaborate. *ABOUT 100 WORDS*

Testing this model in three sites at once proved quite difficult. We did not anticipate how different each high school would be as we assumed that there would be more commonalities than dissimilarities. We need to do a better job at identifying these differences and adapting our model/approach accordingly in order to save time/energy once the project has launched.

If you had an opportunity to re-do this project, are there things you would do differently? If yes, what? *ABOUT 100-200 WORDS*

As mentioned in the previous question, we need to spend more time before instituting our project in a given site identifying the factors that could influence the outcomes of our intervention. This may lead us to develop a project grid outlining the notable variables (for instance, characteristics of the student body, staff, and caregivers) and potential solutions. We could gather this information through an intake interview process with a sample of key informants from the targeted institution.

If the project involved collaborating with another/other organization(s), please comment on the collaboration’s effect on the project and how this process influenced you, your organization, and your partner organization(s). *ABOUT 100 WORDS*

We collaborated with three high schools: Sir John A. MacDonald High School, Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School and Lester B. Pearson High School. This collaboration made the project quite complex as we had to take into consideration the viewpoints/practices of three different institutions. We also learned quite a lot from this experience leading us to consider devising an Implementation Model with greater flexibility in order to allow the participating schools to adapt our model according to their specific needs and capabilities.

Future Plans

These questions allow us to get a sense of the legacy of a grant. We are interested in knowing if a program or project will continue or not, and if it will, how you intend to secure financing for it after funding from the Foundation ends. We also want to find out how others will have an opportunity to learn from the efforts of this grant.

If you noted in your Grant Application that you planned to contact one or several funding organizations to secure financing to sustain or expand this program/project, what have you done during this Reporting Period to accomplish this milestone? (Please refer to the content mentioned in the Sustainability section of your Grant Application) *POINT FORM ANSWER*

A) Initial contact made with the Ministry of Education (September 28) and follow-up meeting held on November 14th. The Ministry received a project update report at the end of Year 1.

B) Meeting held with the Ministry of Education in August to discuss Year 1 update report and to discuss submitting a funding application in September 2014 for Board wide roll-out in 2015.

C) Violence Prevention Program Fund: Grant application for \$75,000 submitted on May 18th. (See Appendix D)

If discontinuing the program/project, what factors led to this decision? *POINT FORM ANSWER*

-Not applicable as we are pursuing funding to scale our initiative on a Board-wide basis in 2015.

What progress did you make during this Reporting Period towards documenting and disseminating learnings from this grant? (Please refer to content mentioned in the Knowledge Transfer section of your Grant Application) *ABOUT 100 WORDS*

Drafts of the Project Review Report and Implementation Guide were submitted to the respective high schools for their feedback. The final versions of these documents will be available by the end of August. They will be posted on our website at the same time and forwarded to the Big City School Board to allow it to disseminate internally. We presented our project model to the High Schools Learning Conference in July 2013.

How have you disseminated materials (manuals, training guides, implementation handbooks) generated as a result of this grant outside your organization? (Please refer to content mentioned in the Knowledge Transfer section of your Grant Application) *POINT FORM ANSWER*

-Implementation Guide: To be finalized with input from the respective high schools. Product will be available at the end of August.

If you have identified areas where improved collaboration between organizations or sectors would lead to increased positive outcomes for your organization and/or clients, briefly describe your ideas. *ABOUT 100-200 WORDS*

Our organization would benefit from a closer working relationship with soon-to-be educators as they are getting their training. We feel that our approach would work a lot better if we could get the message across at the earliest point possible. We could also hold discussions with elementary schools teachers to see if our model should be adapted for use in their setting.

FICTIONAL PROJECT

Other Comments

We are interested in finding any opportunities to improve how we operate. Your feedback will be considered and is very much appreciated!

Tell us whether the Foundation could have provided you with any type(s) of non-financial supports that would have facilitated your work on this project during (a) this Reporting Period and (b) in general throughout the lifecycle of this grant (capacity-building, introductions, knowledge-sharing session, resources, or leveraging collaborations with other stakeholders).

Please share with us any recommendations you have to enhance our grantmaking, grant application and/or reporting procedures.

FICTIONAL PROJECT

Budget Information

Project budget with revenue sources and all expenditures detailed according to the calendar year(s) and/or portion of calendar year.

Budget income per calendar period

REVENUE	14/07/12 to 31/12/12	01/01/13 to 31/12/13	01/01/14 to 14/7/14	TOTAL
ACME Inc. (in-kind)	\$23,500	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$48,500
XYZ Community Foundation Inc.	\$11,250	\$17,500	\$11,250	\$40,000
The Counselling Foundation of Canada	\$22,460	\$40,750	\$18,290	\$81,500
				\$170,000

Budget expenses per project year: Year 1 (14/07/12 to 14/07/13)

	INCOME	EXPENDITURE	TOTAL
Project Planning	\$10,000	\$10,000	-
Salaries	\$22,500	\$22,500	-
Conflict Management Sessions	\$12,500	\$12,500	-
Conflict Intervention Sessions	\$12,500	\$8,750*	\$3,750
Restorative Justice Certification	\$8,500	\$8,500	-
Restorative Justice Implementation	\$15,750	\$16,270**	(\$520)
Track Project Impacts	\$4,500	\$4,500	-
Developmental Evaluation	\$3,500	\$2,750***	(\$750)
			\$2,480

*Conflict Intervention Session: The projected expense for this activity was \$12,500 but holding the event in one high school led to a savings of \$3,750. A portion of these funds (\$520) were applied to cover the extra costs of the Restorative Justice Implementation. The remaining \$3,230 will be applied to cover extra printing costs as the Foundation agreed to allow us to print 150 copies of the Implementation Guide instead of 75 (email confirmation received on 06/12/13).

**Restorative Justice Implementation: The projected expense for this activity was \$15,750 but the cost of materials was slightly higher costing an extra \$520.

***Developmental Evaluation: A \$750 holdback was held until the final version of the Year 1 report had been submitted. This amount was paid when the report was received in July.

Budget expenses per project year: Year 2 (15/07/13 to 14/07/14)

	INCOME	EXPENDITURE	TOTAL
Salaries	\$22,500	\$22,500	-
Conflict Management Sessions	\$12,500	\$12,500	-
Conflict Intervention Sessions	\$12,500	\$8,750*	\$3,750
Restorative Justice Implementation	\$15,750	\$15,750	-
Track Project Impacts	\$3,500	\$3,500	-
Developmental Evaluation	\$3,500	\$3,500	-
Project Review Report and Implementation Guide	\$10,00	\$10,000	
			\$3,750

*Conflict Intervention Session: The projected expense for this activity was \$12,500 but holding the event in one high school led to a savings of \$3,750. A portion of these funds (\$520) were applied to cover the extra costs of the Restorative Justice Implementation. The remaining \$3,230 was applied to cover extra printing costs as the Foundation agreed to allow us to print 150 copies of the Implementation Guide instead of 75 (email confirmation received on 06/12/13).

FICTIONAL PROJECT