



**GRANT FINAL REPORT:  
SUPPORTING STUDENTS AND SCHOOL STAFF—PILOT PROJECT**

*\*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 Dates:** July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013

**Reporting Period:** July 14, 2012 to July 14, 2013

**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 versus what was initially intended. They also provide insight into how this grant affected the community you serve and your organization.*

**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 project? (These outputs appear at the top of the Project Description section of your Grant Application. They are also outlined in your Logic Model Diagram) *ABOUT 200 WORDS***

- The Project Planning phase of this initiative was completed on time including hiring Mark Nobody as Program Assistant (See Appendix A: Job Description and CV for Mark Nobody) and developing the Project Activities critical path and Curriculum (See Appendix B). The Theoretical Conflict Management Sessions were held in the first week of October in all three high schools (546 students) followed by the Modeling Conflict Management Sessions in the second week of November (531 students). These were delayed two weeks due to Fall semester exam schedules. The Follow-up Conflict Management Sessions were completed in the second week of January as planned (541 students).
- The Theoretical and Follow-up Conflict Intervention Sessions were held as scheduled. While the former took place in November (187 caregivers and 103 staff), the latter were held in March (192 caregivers and 101 staff).
- Our Restorative Justice activities were briefly delayed to accommodate school staff schedules (preparation for mid-term exams). Certification took place in October instead of September and the institution of the model occurred in January in each school.
- The Project Impact tracking mechanisms were instituted 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. Beginning and Mid-Project Impact Surveys were completed. (See Appendix C).

- ABC Evaluation Corporation Inc. monitored the project as planned. Their first Implementation Review took place on September 26<sup>th</sup>. It was repeated on December 18<sup>th</sup> and March 8<sup>th</sup>. 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.

**What progress was made 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 have shown some very positive findings about the influence of this initiative. Here are some highlights that will be included in the Project Review Report:

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

Sir John A. MacDonald High School 22% fewer; Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School 16% fewer; and Lester B. Pearson High School 20% fewer.

Indicators of academic performance increased in all three high schools:

Grade Point Average: Sir John A. MacDonald High School 8% higher; Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School 11% higher; and Lester B. Pearson High School 14% higher.

Graduation Rates: Sir John A. MacDonald High School 2% higher; Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School 3% higher; and Lester B. Pearson High School 1% higher.

Human resource indicators showed a significant improvement:

Staff absences: Sir John A. MacDonald High School 11% fewer; Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School 10% fewer; and Lester B. Pearson High School 14% fewer.

Staff sick days: Sir John A. MacDonald High School 5% fewer; Sir Wilfrid Laurier High School 3% fewer; and Lester B. Pearson High School 4% fewer.

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

Impact Survey findings showed increased awareness of non-violent dispute resolution techniques in all groups: Students 68%; Staff 42%; and Caregivers 72%.

**Did internal or external factors (e.g. new staff, unanticipated delays, increased funding, a partner organization stopped providing services, etc.) 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: We briefly delayed the Conflict Management Sessions and Conflict Intervention Sessions in order not to interfere with the Fall exam schedule. This did not affect the original Goals & Objectives.

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

- Positive: The students in all three institutions mentioned how they would welcome the opportunity to be involved in planning and running this initiative. We did not expect them to want to take ownership of this type of project. In response to their request, we are considering ways to include student input/feedback in this process.
- Negative: In several instances the Conflict Management Sessions led some students to air out their grievances with their peers. This was oftentimes disruptive and led to some tense moments. We have decided that, in the future, we will emphasize that these sessions are not a forum for dealing with existing problems.

**Did the grant lead to any capacity-building 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 had the three staff members completed their Restorative Justive Training certification. Mary has reached out to a few of our community stakeholders about providing her services to their employees. This process will help us build stronger ties with our partner agencies.
- Lisa Anonymous took part in shadowing the ABC Evaluation Corporation Inc. team in the developmental evaluation activity. She will receive further her training in evaluation strategy in the coming months. This knowledge will be applied in our grant application and reporting responsibilities.

**Did you undertake any anticipated or unanticipated political activities with funds provided from this grant? 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.

## **Lessons Learned**

*This section is intended to encourage you to reflect on what you have learned from this 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 about your organization and/or the clients you serve? How might they impact your future thinking, performance, or services? *ABOUT 200-300 WORDS***

- **Organizational Learnings:** Although we felt that we had done a good job at getting to know personnel at the high schools as well as their institutional policies, some delays could have been avoided if we had done this better. For instance, we did not have a clear grasp of how school administrators have such tight deadlines leaving little room to maneuver in case something goes wrong with the timing of a planned activity. We learned that they are more likely to cancel the activity as moving around a packed schedule is hardly ever an option. Spending more time learning the work culture of these institutions is key. We have decided that the Program Assistant should work from the respective high schools one day per week during this project to better understand their scheduling needs/limitations.
- **Learnings about our clients:** Although gender-based differences were taken into consideration in planning our Conflict Management Sessions, it became apparent that this approach needed to be infused in all aspects of our intervention. We will continue to hold separate Conflict Management Sessions since females and males oftentimes have different perspectives about conflict/conflict resolution, but it would be best to bring these two groups together at the end of the sessions to briefly go over how their counterparts experience conflict/conflict resolution. We believe that taking this approach will promote greater understanding across gender-groups.

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

The three-step approach to teaching students about non-violent conflict management worked very well. This strategy allowed them to ask clarification questions due to “real world” situations that came up after the sessions. Instituting the Restorative Justive Model in the respective high schools was worthwhile as it provides another opportunity to teach emphathy which is an important factor in choosing non-violent conflict management strategies.

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

Some students reported that their caregivers were not enthusiastic about devoting their time to being told by outsiders about how to raise their children. It took a lot of time to address the defensiveness that these parents exhibited.

**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 above, some caregivers were quite apprehensive about the project as they felt the curriculum was designed to undermine their expertise in the household. We could address this issue by clarifying that our approach is meant to support them by providing another viewpoint that they could adapt to their existing practices.

**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 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 will receive the Year End Report at the end of July.
- B) Meeting planned with the Ministry of Education in August to discuss Year End Report and submitting a funding application for 2014 Board-wide roll-out.
- 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 intend to pursue funding to scale our initiative on a Board-wide basis.

**What progress did you make towards documenting and disseminating the 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 have been submitted to the respective high schools for their feedback. We will make the necessary changes and provide final versions of these documents by the end of August. They will be posted on our website at the same time and forwarded to the Big City School Board. Our presentation proposal to the High Schools Learning Conference for their July 2013 event was accepted. We will be speaking at this event on July 30<sup>th</sup>.

**How have you disseminated materials (manuals, training guides, implementation handbooks) generated as a result of this grant outside of 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.

### **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 (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.**

## **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**

<b>REVENUE</b>	<b>14/07/12 to 31/12/12</b>	<b>01/01/13 to 14/07/13</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
ACME Inc. (in-kind)	\$23,500	\$7,500	\$31,000
XYZ Community Foundation Inc.	\$11,250 (one payment)	\$8,750 (one payment)	\$20,000
The Counselling Foundation of Canada	\$22,460 (two payments)	\$20,375 (two payments)	\$42,835
			\$93,835

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

	<b>INCOME</b>	<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
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 is being held until the final version of the Year 1 report has been submitted. It is expected by the end of July. This amount will be paid at that time.