



2009 Renew Washington Communications Grants

Final Narrative Report Cover Sheet

Date September 30, 2010 Contract # G-10/267 Grant # _____

Library Mount Vernon City Library

Title of Grant Renew Washington Communication Grant

Amount Awarded \$6,000

Grant Period

Start Date April 13, 2010 Through September 17, 2010

Reporting Period

Start Date April 13, 2010 Through September 30, 2010

Submitted by Brian M. Soneda

Signatures Certifying the Final Report

We certify that all of the information contain herein is correct to the best of our knowledge. We certify that 12 of 12 objectives of this grant have been achieved. We certify this report includes an analysis of each objective of this grant and an evaluation of the impact this grant has made on our services. We certify \$3,987.45 has been claimed and \$2,012.55 of the amount originally awarded was not used and the reasons are explained in this report.

Signatory _____ Date _____

Fiscal Agent _____ Date _____

Signatory: Defined as the person who would sign the grant contract and whose signature will be a representation that the legal entity submitting this report has authority to enter into the grant contract; and that the signatory has the authority to sign the grant contract on behalf off the legal entity.

Fiscal Agent: Defined as an individual authorized by the Grantee's governing body to obligate it to the financial liabilities and accountable to the Grantees governing body for the integrity of the official accounting system and the financial statements that the system provides.

Submit this form and the Final Narrative Report to: **Anne Yarbrough
Grants Program
Washington State Library
Post Office Box 42460
Olympia, WA 98504-2460**

In addition, send electronic copy to: anne.yarbrough@sos.wa.gov

Final Narrative Report

1. Do you feel this grant has helped you provide better service to your customers?

x	Strongly agree
	Agree
	Neutral
	Disagree
	Strongly disagree

Please explain: As a communications plan grant project, the intended customers were essentially the “targeted stakeholders” who received the mailed library brochure and inserts, and then the survey/invitation to the Dessert Reception. These customers, who are “funders” or “funder-influencers” or “connected” people, particularly those who both received the brochure and attended the Dessert Reception are certainly now more aware of the library, of its role and of its capacity to help them or the people they care about. We hope that likewise these customers are more likely to support the library as funders or advocates than they were prior to this project.

2. Summarize the project, the situation it was intended to address, and the objectives of the project. The project as it evolved featured two main components, first, a targeted mailing of a custom designed brochure about the library and its role (with inserts of a companion bookmark and the excellent OCLC two page document *How Libraries Stack Up: 2010*) to approximately 120 community stakeholders (including elected officials and other key funders or funder influencers); and second, an after-hours Dessert Reception at the library showing off said library, to which the same community stakeholders were invited. The situation was the lack of familiarity, or the less than ideal level of familiarity, that many of the “powers that be” in Mount Vernon and Skagit County had with the Mount Vernon City Library. The specific objectives of the project are laid out in more detail in narrative section #5.
3. Summarize the results of the project, including activities accomplished, and any problems or unexpected outcomes encountered. One “unexpected outcome” should in retrospect not be considered unexpected. We seriously under spent the awarded \$6,000 and “left” over \$2,000 on the table. The roots of this go back to the original grant application and the objectives of that application. That application was for \$3,400 and when we were informed that much more money was available and filed the requested amendment, we were unable to “scale up” in any significant way other than to slightly expand the circle of “targeted stakeholders” (and thus print run of brochures and bookmarks) from the original list. I remain very convinced that the \$3,987.45 was money very well and

judiciously spent, and that the general outcome of the project was entirely positive.

4. Quantify, where possible, the results of the project, including how many people have directly used the new services and resources provided by the project. Since the desired result of the project was heightened familiarity with the library by the powers that be, and an accompanying willingness of those stakeholders to be vocal advocates for the library or future funders of the library, I cannot realistically quantify the results. I am appending the results of our brief survey (that was part of the RSVP return form), which give some feedback on “intent” of the relatively few responding stakeholders to be more vigorous advocates for or funders of the library. (But even here I note that with so many final RSVPs tracked down by phone after the mailing back deadline passed, the survey part of the RSVP package was thus lost in many cases, and of the mailed RSVPs, a significant number did not include survey participation.)

From the 12 surveys returned:

Question #1: I received the Welcome to the City of Mount Vernon Library brochure and found it, A. Spectacular and inspiring [2], B. Helpful and informative [10], Fine but left me wanting to know more about the library [0]

Question #2: Receiving the brochure and bookmark has, A. Made me much more likely to support/advocate for better funding for the library [2], B. Made me somewhat more likely to support/advocate for better funding for the library [4], C. Not changed my level of support [6].

Question #3: Receiving this brochure has given me a better understanding for the need for a new library facility: True [10] False [1] No answer [1]

5. Did the project meet its stated objectives? Compare the project objectives to actual accomplishments.
 - Identify targeted elected officials, appointed officials, and other local and nearby regional stakeholders--accomplished.
 - Design and layout one page illustrated and bullet-pointed flier about the value of the library to the community and how that value can and will be enhanced by ongoing and hopefully increased support, including funding support—accomplished; this was the one objective of the Communication Plan that actually was more involved and “glitzy” than originally laid out.
 - Design and layout bookmark with excerpted and focused highpoints from the flier—accomplished.
 - Have flier professionally printed—accomplished (printed along with along with bookmark).
 - Mail flier to targeted officials and stakeholders—accomplished, flier (brochure) mailed along with bookmark and OCLC’s “How Libraries Stack Up: 2010” two page document.
 - Draft short follow-up survey on impact of flier and intent of recipients to act in pro-library way in response to receiving flier—accomplished*
 - Mail follow-up survey with a stamped and library-addressed envelope to targeted officials and stakeholders—accomplished*
 - Compile and tabulate survey results--accomplished.
 - Plan reception at the library--accomplished.

- Draft written invitation with stamped and addressed return envelopes to the reception—accomplished—in combination (*) with the follow-up survey to save time and postage; the funding was available but the time to do three mailings was not.
- Send out invitation to all targeted officials and stakeholders to reception at the library to talk with staff, board, Friends and Foundation members about the value of the library and the value of supporting the library; invite media—accomplished (with good stakeholder attendance but no media attendance).
- Hold reception—accomplished, stunning success.