



**LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE GRANT PROGRAM
RENEWAL (SECOND) WEB SITE GRANT
NARRATIVE FINAL REPORT**

Background and Instructions

Submission of the this Narrative Final Report (Narrative Report) meets one part of the final reporting requirements for LSC Renewal (Second) grants for Statewide Web Sites (SWWS). The other part of these requirements is submission of the online LSC Web site evaluation surveys. The tools and instructions for the online Web site evaluation surveys are at: http://www.tig.lsc.gov/eval_materials.php. The online reporting system for these evaluation surveys is at: <http://www.tig.lsc.gov/techsite/survey/default.asp>.

LSC seeks information about grantees' statewide Web sites (SWWS) so it can:

1. Effectively assess the range of SWWS systems, approaches and strategies funded through the Technology Initiative Grant (TIG) program,
2. Help legal services programs identify and implement the SWWS systems and approaches that can most effectively strengthen their ability to serve clients, and
3. Demonstrate the ways and extent to which SWWS can improve clients' access to services and/or the efficiency and effectiveness of services LSC-grantees provide clients.

The Narrative Report should include narrative information and pertinent qualitative and statistical information, and, as appropriate, should present data in tabular or graphic formats. Grantees may include appendices that present graphic, tabular and other information which document their projects' accomplishments and activities. Information should be provided for the client, advocate and pro bono components of the SWWS.

Please note that the information collected through the Web site evaluation surveys are a valuable source of information for this report. These surveys are the Advocate Web site evaluation surveys, the Client Web site evaluation surveys and the Client User survey.

LSC realizes that it may be unfeasible for some grantees to submit all of the information requested for the Narrative Report. In those cases, the grantee should identify the missing information and explain why it cannot provide these data. LSC seeks to understand why requested data are unavailable so it can explore options for generating this information. Possible reasons why the grantee may not be able to provide the requested information can include but are not limited to:

1. Insufficient resources to support the staff time needed to accomplish the identified tasks.
2. Lack of necessary staff expertise.
3. The short time the site (or its key components) has been operational.
4. The absence of baseline data collected when the site was first implemented.

Please present the report's information in each of the designated sections. Do not exceed the maximum page lengths specified for each section. (Appendices are not included in the maximum page calculations.)

This report should **not** be submitted on the online reporting system for Web site evaluation surveys. Instead, it should be submitted on the grant online milestone reporting system on which milestone information is submitted for all grants, regardless of whether they are Web site or non-Web site grants.

For questions about the Renewal Web Site Grant final report, contact Bristow Hardin, LSC Program Analyst (202-295-1553; hardinb@lsc.gov), or Taylor Healy, LSC Program Analyst (202-295-1565; healyt@lsc.gov).



Renewal (Second) Web Site Grant Narrative Final Report

Grantee Name:
Date report submitted:

TIG Grant #:

Contact Person:
Email address:

Telephone:

As noted in the Instructions, the following information should be provided for the client, advocate and pro bono components of the Statewide Web site (SWWS). *LSC realizes that grantees may not have all of the information requested in the report.* The instructions also identify reasons why it may be unfeasible for some grantees to obtain the requested data. In those cases where requested information is missing, the grantee should identify the information that it lacks and explain why that information is not available. LSC seeks information about why specific data are unavailable so it can explore options to help grantees generate this information.

Please note that the information collected through the Web site evaluation surveys are a valuable source of information for this report. These surveys are the Advocate Web site evaluation surveys, the Client Web site evaluation surveys and the Client User surveys. Much of the information requested should have been provided in the milestone reports. That information should be included here as well so that LSC can have these Web site data in a single report.

I. Project Goals (maximum 1 page). Identify specific goals that were developed for the Web Site Renewal grant that were based on the assessment of the activities and accomplishments of the First (Initial) Web site grant.

II. Web Site Description (maximum 2 pages). Describe the development history and the current status of the Web site. Discuss information such as:

1. Template choice.
2. Launch dates.
3. The breadth and depth of content on the client, advocate, and pro bono Web site components, such as the number of resources and the substantive areas in which these materials are available. (Much of this information should have been provided in the milestone reporting).
4. Multimedia capacities, such as text, audio, video and streaming video, animation tools, webcasting, or webcast archive tools.
5. Availability of document assembly systems, such as, but not limited to, HotDocs, ICAN! and A2J. (If document assembly is available, include the number of advocate forms and the number of client forms.)

6. Existing standards and quality control protocols. (Much of this information should have been provided in the milestone reports.)
7. Usability and usefulness. (This information can be obtained from the Web site evaluation surveys).

III. Achievements to date (maximum 3 pages). Provide an overall assessment of the quality of the SWWS. Also discuss the extent to which the goals identified in Section I that were accomplished as well as any significant unanticipated accomplishments. Incorporate into your assessment appropriate references to the information contained in Section II above or in Section IV below. For example, the Advocate Surveys, the Client User Interviews, and the Client (public) Surveys will provide valuable information about the site's usability and usefulness. Information obtained from community groups and organizations serving low-income people, the courts, other legal services and other stakeholders can also be useful.

IV. Partnerships (maximum 2 pages). Discuss the ways and the extent to which partnerships with the courts, community groups and other organizations have increased the quality of the web site. Discuss information such as:

1. Partners' assistance in the design, implementation and content of the site.
2. The extent to which partners have increased access to the web site through marketing and outreach, establishing computer stations where clients can access the Internet, content development, and so on.

Discuss any financial or in-kind support in Section VI below.

V. Factors affecting ability to implement the SWWS and accomplish project goals, and the strategies to address these challenges (maximum 3 pages). Discuss any significant challenges the project confronted. Describe any factors that significantly enhanced or limited the project's accomplishments. Also discuss the strategies used to address these challenges.

VI. Financial and in-kind support for the Web site (maximum 2 pages). Provide estimates of the following:

1. The financial and in-kind resources devoted to supporting the development and on-going implementation of the Web site that *exceeded* the total amount of the first and second TIG Web site grants.
2. The entity (or entities) that provided the resources identified in the previous bullet.
3. The expenses paid and activities supported by the financial and in-kind resources received from all sources (i.e., the amount of the LSC Web site grants and the resources provided from all other sources).

VII. Major lessons and recommendations (maximum 2 pages). Address factors such as:

1. The most significant lessons learned.
2. Recommendations for other grantees.