# Level Up Your Logic Model: Foundation, Federal, and State/Provincial Funder Strategies

Webinar Transcript • September 17, 2026

*Presented by Michael Paddock and Christina Fernandez, Grants Office, LLC*

## Welcome and Introductions

**Michael Paddock:**

So it's going to be a little bit more of a deep dive into a particular element of grant seeking that hopefully will be valuable to you across the board. As we've indicated, foundation, federal and state funder strategies hopefully will be beneficial to you across the board as you continue your journey toward grant seeking mastery and obtaining all the funds your organization is looking for. So we're talking specifically today about logic models. I am joined by a really capable grants development consultant here at Grants Office, Christina Fernandez. She will have lots of great information to share with you.

So logic models have been around since about 1983. They were originally created as an extension of the United States Agency for International Development's logical framework — log frame, it was called — and have been really more widely adopted since the 90s. Even though it started at the federal level, it was really initially in foundations, and that's where I first was exposed to foundation logic models. If you were writing grants in the 90s, pretty much every foundation, every application required you to fill out a logic model as part of your application. It was definitely one of the things that everyone was doing.

And unlike a lot of those fads, the logic model has had some staying power, and has had actually a reintroduction and a regrowth of interest since probably the mid-2010s, where we're starting to see more and more grant applications require logic models as part of the application, and not just foundations. So I think it's a timely conversation.

For those of you who have done logic models, it may be a good opportunity to sort of reflect on not only what the logic models are asking you to complete as part of the application, but what that means in terms of planning for your organization, in terms of contemplating what the outcomes of your projects are going to be, and so on. A lot of times it may feel like — and it certainly does feel like — a little bit of just an exercise, more of an academic exercise, because your organization is already heavily involved in producing the outcomes that you're working toward. And so the money that you're requesting is going to be used to help advance those outcomes.

But it also gives the organization as a whole a chance to sort of reflect on what are we trying to achieve — not just with this funding that we're requesting, but overall with our projects and programs. What are we trying to achieve, and how are we going to go about doing it? And it was really my first introduction to the sort of logical progression from what you're doing to what the outcomes were going to be that you were trying to produce. There have been many versions of that, certainly in the public sector, in the nonprofit, in the business world, but it was my first introduction to this sort of logical progression between activities and outcomes.

## Today's Speaker and Agenda

So we'll be talking about that. And Christina will be taking us through a number of different elements of a logic model ecosphere. What are logic models? How do logic models change by funder type? And then, how do you level up your logic models? And then we'll get to questions. Feel free to ask any questions you have using the chat interface at the bottom right-hand corner of your screen. You should be able to see it.

Kate, our intrepid webcast producer, has already posted a couple of items in the chat about where the replay will be available. We'll talk more about that toward the end, and about the FUNDED article that provides additional context on developing your logic model, "Developing a Logic Model for Your Grant Application." For those of you who haven't subscribed to FUNDED — I imagine most of those of you on the call today have. If you haven't, feel free to go to this article and subscribe from there. You can go to grantsoffice.com and subscribe from there. It's free and full of lots of great information on grant seeking, no matter what area you're in. Whether you're in education, healthcare, in the nonprofit space, in state and local government, there's going to be content for you. FUNDED comes out four times a year and it's free.

So that's what we're covering today. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Christina Fernandez to take us through leveling up your logic model. Christina.

## What Are Logic Models?

**Christina Fernandez:**

Thank you so much, Michael, and thank you so much for everyone who is able to join us today. Before I dive into the funder-specific strategies of logic models, I do want to take a step back and make sure we're all working from that same foundation. I certainly wasn't working on grants in the 90s, but I think there's this new connection with logic models and the role that they really play in grant applications. So I want to make sure that we're all on that same page. Even though this is an advanced session, everything

that we cover today is really going to build on our clear understanding of what a logic model actually is now, and how it all pieces together.

I will start by just saying it is definitely not meant to substitute your detailed project plan. It's not meant to capture every task or timeline or deliverable. In short and simply, it's meant to link your resources to your activities to your goals, like Michael said, but in a more scannable snapshot, which is why a lot of funders really like it. So I want to first get into when logic models are actually used, and then we'll go into their different components.

## When Logic Models Get Used

So as you can see, logic models are really going to be used at every stage of a project's life. In the planning stages, logic models are going to force you to name the problem that you're solving before you jump to figuring out its solutions. So you're working through if-then logic: if we have these resources and do these activities, then this is what happens. That's going to be one of the benefits of using logic models during those planning stages, because it's going to keep your planning focused on the elements that actually matter instead of everything that could matter. So it's going to be a bridge between where you are now and where you want to end up, and it really works whether you're planning something more broad and strategic or designing a more specific program. So, great either way.

They can also be used in the implementation and management of a project. The logic model becomes really the backbone of your management plan at this stage. Once you're under way, you're going to be using it to track whether your operations are actually running the way you said they would. And it's really going to help keep you honest about the fidelity to the plan, and making sure you're not just getting lost in busy work.

In the evaluation stage it's mainly used as more of a starting point. It tells you what's actually worth evaluating and where to put your evaluation resources. So you're testing whether your program theory really holds up in reality. A lot of people assume that a logic model is just an evaluation tool, because evaluators use it the most, or I would say most heavily. But it's definitely more accurate to say that it tees up the success of your evaluation plan, which can be useful for everyone.

And I think the most important use case of a logic model is during your stakeholder conversations. Logic models can really allow for discussion not just about what is happening today or what the problem is right now, but what the program can look like in the future and the possibilities of where it can really go. So it's going to be your clearest way to get everyone on the same page about what the project is and what needs to be done in order to get there.

## Logic Model Components

I will start off by saying that not all logic models are going to look the same, and that's definitely by design. Like I just said, there are a lot of use cases for logic models, and the type of model that you build is really going to vary depending on the purpose you're using it for, or the type of project you're trying to implement. So the components here on the screen are just the main components that you'll see across most logic models in one form or another. Here's how I like to think about going through these different components. Like we said before, each component is really going to build off one another.

So your resources and inputs are going to support your activities. Your activities are going to generate your outputs, and your outputs are going to lead to your outcomes. And then all of that together is going to create an impact. That's how it should read, going from left to right. But how I'm going to talk about each component is actually from right to left, because that can also ensure alignment so that it reads fluidly in either direction.

So if you're starting with your statement of need, this is going to be the environment in which your problem or issue exists. When developing this statement, you're going to want to ask yourself plainly: what is our problem? Why is it a problem? And then think a little bit deeper into what's actually causing it and who it's affecting. Once you've stated and named that problem, it's actually going to make sense to jump to the outcomes next, because outcomes are essentially going to be the inverse of that need. If your need statement describes the problem, your outcome should describe the desired change that you're trying to make.

And not all outcomes show up all at once. So you have short-term and long-term ones there. Some are going to happen more quickly, and so you're going to be thinking about it in different stages as well, which we'll dive into later on in the presentation. After outcomes, that's going to bring us to our activities — the processes, the events and the actions that are a critical part of how you want to implement your program. So this is going to be operational: what needs to be done, by whom, and in what sequence, in order to produce the outcome that you just defined.

And then outputs are the direct results of those activities — the tangible evidence that they actually happened. So, how many workshops did you run, how many people participated, things like that. And that naturally leads us to the input section: the resources you actually need to carry out those activities. Whether they be existing or requested resources, that can include things like your staff time, the funding that you're requesting, the facilities in which your project will be taking place, whatever it will take to really make those activities happen.

And then lastly you have your assumptions and external factors. This is really going to be one of those varying components, and potentially optional depending on the funder. But these are going to be the beliefs that underlie the decisions you make about the program: what you believe to be true about the

problem, how you believe the program will operate, and what you believe it can achieve. And then the external factors are going to be everything outside of your control that can still potentially shape the outcome of your project. So that's going to be things like the economic climate, policy shifts, and even the community that your participants come from.

When you're thinking about this section, you'll want to remember that your project doesn't operate in a vacuum. And so you'll want to be upfront about the potential factors that could influence it, both positively or negatively. Once you've thought of all of those components from right to left, they should read in that if-then logic flow from left to right.

## Outputs vs Outcomes

So now I do want to pause and compare the difference between an output and an outcome, because this distinction does trip people up more than any other component of the logic model. And it's one that reviewers are really going to be looking at and care the most about, I would say. There are a couple of different ways that I like to think about the distinction between them.

The first is quantitative versus qualitative. Your outputs are going to be quantitative. They're going to be the counts: number of workshops, number of people served. And then your outcomes are going to be qualitative. They're going to be the descriptions of what actually shifted — a change in knowledge, or a change in behavior. So that's one way to think about it.

Another way is that one is tangible versus one is going to be transformative. Your outputs are going to be tangible: they're produced directly by your activities and they're fully within your control. Versus your outcomes are going to be more transformative — they're the shift in the people or the systems that your project touched. And that shift isn't always something that you can fully control. So that controllability test right there, I think, is actually one of the fastest ways to help you sort an output from an outcome.

So for example, the number of trainings you deliver — that's controllable. That's an output. Versus whether a parent who attends your program is going to actually walk away with more knowledge because of it: that in itself is going to depend on the parent, and so that's going to be an outcome.

And then last but not least, to really summarize the differences, what your output should be answering is how much did we do, and your outcome should be answering what difference did it make. Those questions are really critical, because sometimes — and I think where the confusion comes in — is we tend to describe our outputs and then think that that is an outcome. But really what we should be doing for the outcome is measuring the change that occurred because of it, and not just counting what the program did. We'll get into articulating outcomes later, but here are just a couple of ways to think about those differences more clearly.

### A Sample Logic Model

And just to show you what it looks like when it all comes together. This is a standard table design layout of a logic model, but like I said, they can come in all different styles. I just prefer this one, or lean towards this one, especially for a program like a college readiness pathway or something like that. So you can see here, it's not super detailed, but it gives you just enough information of what it is you're trying to solve, how you're going to do it, and what you're expecting to come from it.

You'll hear me say it again and again, but not every logic model is going to look the same. And the level of detail is going to change depending, yes, on the type of your project, but it's also going to change depending on who is going to be reviewing it — so, which funder is asking for it. Funders really evaluate whether your logic model is realistic and comprehensive, and they're going to be checking back to your project plan and the mission that you and they are trying to solve. And so each funder is going to weigh those pieces differently.

## How Do Logic Models Change by Funder Type?

### State, Provincial and National Funders

So starting with our public funders — these are going to be state, provincial or national funders. This is really what your logic model actually needs to do for these funders, this audience. First, it is going to serve as an elevator pitch. Public funders are reviewing hundreds if not thousands of applications, and they are pretty limited in the amount of time that they're given per application. And so the logic model sometimes is really the only thing that they're looking at before they move on. So your logic model does need to give them that fast, quick read about your project, to get them engaged and see if it's a fit. And you need to do that rather quickly.

Second is going to be used as a compliance and scoring tool. This is really where funders are looking at logic models to demonstrate technical rigor and show that you followed the funder's guidelines. In US federal applications they refer to it as a theory of action — at least, for sure, the Department of Education does. And they define it as not only an if-then road map, but one that is connecting policies and programs to an intended public outcome.

So public reviewers are checking whether your logic model is going to match the performance measures that they set out. And those performance measures are really rooted deeply in law and all of that. So if these activities and outputs are not lining up clearly to those measures, reviewers are going to catch that gap. So it's really important, and they're really scoring it against those different features.

And so you'll want to keep that in mind, which ties to our evidence-based practices. Public funders expect your activities to align with state, provincial or national priorities, and to be backed by cited

research. So the model is going to provide that one-stop shop where they can see the different assumptions and research that your program is being built on.

And then they're also checking for budget-to-input alignment. So your logic model needs to hold up against your budget. If you are proposing an activity, the resources and inputs that you need to run it are more than likely also going to be reflected, and should be included, in your budget request. And then I touched on this earlier a little bit, but that evaluation — again, this logic model is going to be the blueprint for that. So for public funders it's going to really double as the outline of your evaluation plan, and come up with your evaluation questions, point out different data sources and trace back to that.

So all in all, the takeaway is that public funders are going to be looking for rigor, evidence-based practices and alignment. And so that logic model is really going to be doing a lot of that technical heavy lifting for them.

## A Federal Example

And so here's an example of what that looks like. And I do apologize for how much text, and the difficulty of reading this logic model. But really that's one of my points here: I did want to show you just how much more detail a federal funder is expecting from a logic model, compared to the one that I showed you earlier.

And I'll just quickly point out a few things here. This model doesn't just include a situation or a problem statement at the top. It also calls out a specific priority that the project is addressing, and that more likely is coming directly from language stated in the notice of funding opportunity as being one of those absolute priorities that might be required for them to meet. So that's a little bit different here.

Also, you'll notice that activities and partners are grouped under outputs. That's another common way to structure a logic model, and it's definitely a meaningful choice and not just a formatting preference. So for a large-scale federal grant, structuring it this way is really putting emphasis on what activities are happening and who they're actually reaching or partnering with to accomplish that, compared to what I showed you earlier, which put more weight on the outputs and actually delivering the activities themselves. So whichever structure you choose definitely should reflect what the funder is prioritizing, and make sure that it's really aligning with the different call-out priorities that they're emphasizing in that notice of funding opportunity.

## Foundation Funders

So switching gears to now our foundation or private funders. What your logic model needs to do for this audience is going to look a little bit different. And that's just because foundations aren't necessarily tied to the same public policy the way public funders are. They really get to pick and choose who and what

they want to fund based on their own set mission and priorities, rather than scoring against a congressionally directed rubric.

So right away, private funders are going to be looking at logic models as more of a narrative or relationship tool. And that's because they're not just investing in your project, but they're also looking to have a longer-term relationship with you. So the logic model isn't just describing the project, but it's also part of how you show the funder that you're an organization worth investing in.

Second, they're going to be weighing your outcomes a little bit more than your outputs, as foundations are more interested in the change created than the volume of activity or people served. A public funder might want to see scalability, but a foundation is going to be asking a little bit of a different question: what actually shifted for the people that you reached? So that's the lens they're bringing to your model, and definitely worth keeping in mind when going through those components.

Third, theory of change. I mentioned earlier that public funders often refer to logic models as the theory of action. Well, private funders sometimes will refer to it as a theory of change. And this is because they want your logic model to explain why your activities should produce your outcomes, and how you can really tie it back to the mission of the funder. So it's less tied to formal reporting requirements and more about your long-term goal within your community or organization entirely.

Then they're also going to be looking for measurable impact. So even with that emphasis on relationship and storytelling, foundations still want to see a real level of impact backed by results. So evidence is going to matter whether you're working with a private or public funder. The difference is really just going to be a little bit about the amount of detail expected in each.

And then lastly, sustainability and learning. Foundations tend to think beyond the grant in a way that public funders just legally can't, or don't. And so your logic model should signal how your outcomes will continue after the funding ends, and what you'll learn from the work you're implementing. So for private funders, they really want to see more of that mission alignment. Logic models: same tool, but completely different lens for each.

## A Foundation Example

So here's an example from the Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Guide. If you are familiar with logic models, you're familiar with that guide, and it's kind of like the Holy Grail of logic model development. And so that's why I picked this one, because it still shows the right amount of detail. It doesn't oversimplify, even though some private funders do want a much more simplified version — I've seen some just wanting the activities, outputs and outcomes. So I wanted to choose this one. I didn't want to oversimplify it here, because either one is going to serve a purpose, and it's going to still be doing real work regardless of how short or long it is. And so the real takeaway here is really to just make sure

you're always checking the specific guidelines for what they actually want included, because again, it can really vary.

## How Do You Level Up Your Logic Models?

So since this is our advanced session, I want to now jump into some tips on how to really level up your logic model in ways that still stay within those funder guidelines, but make it so that it stands out to reviewers. So we'll also look at some other ways to think about framing those components so that your logic model really does more for you, as well as for the funder.

### Color Coding

So starting with color coding. This is a simple visual technique, but it really does give reviewers a shortcut through your logic. It visually demonstrates which components actually relate to each other. So without having them really trace through lines or reread labels to figure it out, they can quickly glance at your model and immediately see what items are part of the same thread or all relate to each other.

But there's a kind of science to doing color coding well. First, you'll definitely want to make sure that you are assigning colors in a way that makes sense for the reviewer to follow. And there are really two common ways you can do this. You can either color code by columns — so, like in the first models that I showed you, where each stage or each component was its own color: the activities was one color, outputs was the other. And when doing it that way, that helps your viewers quickly distinguish what type of element they're looking at.

Or you can color code by an outcome pathway, where every activity, output and outcome that is tied to the same goal is going to share the same color. So that way a reviewer can just trace that one thread from activity all the way to outcome. Either approach works. The goal really is just to make sure that you're giving a visual shortcut through the logic, instead of making it more complicated for them to figure out the connection.

I would say color coding really is only most valuable when your project has three or more activities, or when you have several goals, multiple partners, overlapping activities all happening at once. That's really going to be the benefit of color coding, because when it's simple — there's only two or three — there's really no added to that. But the more complex your model gets, the more reviewers are going to need that visual help to keep everything straight.

And then my last piece of advice for color coding is to keep it limited to three to five colors. This matters more than people think, because really the whole point of color coding is to reduce that cognitive load for the reviewer. And so the moment you go beyond five colors, you're no longer simplifying it anymore. You're actually just adding another layer of complexity on top of your already complex model. So really

the rule of thumb is to use color when your project is complex enough to need it, and make sure that every color is doing real work and helping guide the reviewer in a way that makes sense, and it's not just decorating the page.

So here's an example of what that looks like without color coding. Still readable. The arrows help you follow the logic from one column to the next, but it's just not as nice on the eyes here. So you have to look a little bit harder to see that flow and connection, versus a logic model that's color-coded. Right away it's just easier on the eyes, a little bit easier to follow.

This one uses that pathway color coding. So you'll notice the activities and outputs are all in one, and it all leads to the one long-term goal, which you can keep in one color because everything is working towards that. You can also keep your inputs as one color as well. Here it's split up by arrows, but in other models that's what all goes into the model itself, so that's also fine to leave in one color. The coding would really come into play in the middle, as that's where things can really branch out and get a little bit confusing.

## Articulating Outcomes

So I want to shift gears to our outcomes now, and some tips on how you can better articulate them. You've seen now outcomes have been broken up into some short-term, some medium-term. And that's not just a template or formatting convention. Each one of those different outcomes really has its own purpose for your project and for the funder.

So breaking it down by time frame: you have your short-term outcomes, and this is typically the easiest outcome to measure, since they show up right after the activity happens and they are the results that you can most directly attribute to what you did. So when you're writing your short-term outcomes, you're going to want to lean on verbs like increase, or improve, or demonstrate — keeping in mind the language that points to a measurable shift in knowledge or skill. And you see I put a little timeline there. Obviously that is going to vary depending on how long your program is. If it's a one-year program, the short-term outcomes will typically show up in months zero to three. But for multi-year projects this will usually be within the first year of the program.

Same thing with intermediate. These are going to be more distant, but they are still anticipated results from the change in action or behavior that is due to the new knowledge that you just gained from your short-term outcomes. So depending again on project length, these outcomes are typically going to show up later, because behavior change doesn't just happen the moment someone has learned something new. So when you're writing these, you're going to want to lean more on verbs like apply or adopt — language that really signals someone is actually putting that new knowledge or skill into practice.

And then for long-term outcomes, this is going to be the ultimate impact of your program: a change in environmental, social or economic conditions that really result from everything you've implemented along the way. So this is really where you bring your big-picture why — the reason that funders should care in the first place. And the verbs shift here a little bit too. I would recommend using verbs like contribute to, or advance, as they're a little bit more modest compared to achieve or solved. And that's really intentional, because at year three, or at the year of your one-year program, you're rarely the only factor driving that change. So framing it as you're contributing to this change is just a little bit more defensible and honest in the real scheme of things with your project.

So to help you actually articulate these outcomes based on the purpose that each one serves, I just wanted to put some guiding questions out there for you to think about as you're working through what should be short versus what should be long. For your short-term outcomes, you'll want to ask yourself: does this reflect something participants actually know or can do differently? So not that they just showed up to the activity, but what was the change that was experienced there?

And then for your intermediate outcomes, you'll want to ask: what behavior or condition should shift once participants act on what they gained from our short-term outcomes? And then for your long-term ones, I would ask: is this outcome still realistically attributable to our project, or does it drift into the territory that we can't really claim credit for? And that sits back with what I just said in my last slide, which is that you do want to think about your project's overall impact, but you do want to stay within the scope of your claim. You're probably not fully solving world hunger, but you might be improving access to food in your particular community. And that's what you'll want to stand behind, and show to the funder that you're actually helping them achieve.

## The Evaluation Roadmap

So here's another way to level up your logic model, and that is to use it as a road map for your evaluation plan. And honestly, we could spend an entire session on just evaluation plans. But in short, really the evaluation plan is trying to answer the same core questions that your logic model should already be pointing you towards. So things like: are we successful? Have we had an impact? What are the most influential parts of our program?

So when you think about your evaluation plan as you're developing your logic model, it's really going to help force you to clarify what that problem is. And that clarity is just going to strengthen your overall logic model, because you're being more precise and intentional about what you're actually claiming your program will do. So developing them in concert is going to just be the best approach moving forward, I would say.

And here's what that would look like in practice. Your logic model is going to help you define the scope of your project: which components exist, how they connect. And that scope is exactly what tells you which components even need to be evaluated in the first place. So the purpose of your evaluation isn't something that you can figure out separately or after the fact. If you have a strong logic model, it really should just directly fall out of that model.

So from there, that same scope is going to shape your evaluation questions. A good evaluation is about asking critical questions that really guide improvement and prove accountability to the funder. But you can't really know which questions are worth asking until you know what you're trying to accomplish, which your logic model will tell you exactly that. So it points you towards what deserves to be evaluated based on your time, resources, and the stakeholders involved.

And I would say that same logic really does carry all the way down to your indicators. The outputs of a strong logic model are essentially going to be the different indicators that you would use in your evaluation plan. And so if your logic model is vague, so will your indicators be. So again, really using them to reinforce each other is going to be key. And then finally, your logic model can help shape your data collection and methodology for your evaluation plan, as it really does help you see when you would want to collect data based on where your project is at that point in time.

So in summary, don't think of your logic model and your evaluation plan as two separate documents. You'll definitely want to be building them together, as they really are meant to reinforce each other and give you that comprehensive direction for your entire project.

## Build One Even When It Isn't Required

And so one last tip before I pass it back over to Michael is that even if a funder doesn't formally require a logic model, I would highly still recommend that you draft one anyway. Because the real value of a logic model isn't really about what the funder wants at all at this point. I think it's more so a really useful tool that your team can use — it gives you that space for clear communication, allows you to have sharper planning conversations, and really is that one-stop shop of where you are all headed, giving that shared sense of goals for you to review.

So whether you're building one for a funder or not, I recommend you build it in the way we discussed today, and definitely treat it as a living document and not just a submission requirement that you're checking off once. You'll want to be pulling it out during implementation, during those evaluations. And you'll definitely want to make sure that your logic model is something that actually works for you and your team, and it's not just something to satisfy the funder. So with that, I will pass it back over to Michael.

# Q&A Session

**Michael Paddock:**

Thanks very much, Christina. A lot of great information there, and certainly appreciate you sharing that with us. We had a couple of questions that have come in. I want to get to those before we wrap up here. So it's two questions that are kind of related to each other. So I'm going to go ahead and just read both and we can combine that answer, Christina.

## Audience Questions

### Q1: If a state RFP doesn't provide a logic model template, is it safer to follow a general federal-style format, or is there a simpler version we should default to? And is there a generic template you would recommend as a starting point?

So the first question is, if a state Request for Proposals doesn't provide a logic model template — and presumably asks for a logic model — is it safer to follow a general federal-style format, or is there a simpler version we should default to? And then the second question related to that is, is there a generic template of a logic model that you would recommend utilizing as a starting point? So what do you think about that?

**Christina Fernandez:**

Yeah, great questions. And I would say that if a template isn't available to you — if your state doesn't provide any additional detail — I would look closely at what it is that they're looking for from your narrative, and what they're going to be scoring your project off of. So, the scoring criteria. I think looking at those two gives you more insight into how much rigor or evidence you'll need to include, and how much detail to include. And then if it's not specific or explicit in there, you'll just want to follow that if-then logic and make sure it clears that. And using again that basic table format, you can develop that either through Word or PowerPoint, something like that, to just create that simple table where you list it out.

### Q2: What software program do you recommend for creating a logic model?

**Michael Paddock:**

And yes, keeping the scoring criteria in mind is always a good idea. And then you kind of answered this, but maybe if you could just explain a little more. The next question was, what software program do you recommend for creating a logic model?

**Christina Fernandez:**

Yeah, I don't have a software in mind. Again, I would use Word to build out that simple table. There's also a ton of free logic model samples online, both for federal programs and foundations as well. So I would just go online and maybe download a free template.

## Resources from Today's Session

**Michael Paddock:**

And speaking of free information, we have lots of great stuff here for you from today's session. Obviously, the recording will be available as soon as the session is over. The slides are available now in PDF. The transcript will also be available, and the FUNDED article that I mentioned at the beginning of today's session, "Developing a Logic Model for Your Grant Application," is also available.

Kate has added the URL to the resources page that has all this information, or will have all this information. You can feel free to check that out. She's also added a direct link to the FUNDED article referenced here. So all that information will be available to you, and I encourage you to use it, pass it along to any colleagues that you think might find the information useful and actionable, and make the best use of the free resources that are available.

## Grants Office Communities

And then lastly, I just want to mention Grants Office Communities, a tool to help you search and develop grant proposals in an organized way. You can organize them yourself if you're an individual, if you're a professional grant writer, et cetera. You can organize them in that way. If you are part of a larger grants development operation, or a larger organization where everyone has decentralized grant seeking responsibilities, you can also develop a team approach using Grants Office Communities as well.

And all those projects will be linked together so that you can escalate opportunities and projects to managers. And then each individual user can work on their own grant seeking activities — identifying grants for specific projects, developing grant proposals, et cetera — all of that managed through the Grants Office Communities portal. So I encourage you to check that out. It's not expensive, but you can also try it for free for 14 days. So, a good resource that we're very proud of, and I encourage you to check it out.

We've got a new facelift coming up for it. If you don't love the way it looks, there's a facelift happening on October 1st. We're constantly working on improvements to this platform. And so you'll see, as you go through time on the platform, that functionality is improved. We're building new AI tools to help you as well. So all that is in our road map going forward.

## Closing

If there are no further questions, I want to thank everyone for participating in today's session. If you have additional questions, you can always send us an email to education@grantsoffice.com. Big thanks to Christina Fernandez for sharing your knowledge and insights with us, and to Kate Ashley also for making sure that everything runs smoothly. And to all of you, thanks for your participation in today's session. I hope you found it a valuable use of your time, and we'll look forward to seeing you again on a future Grantscast®. Have a great day, everybody.

*— End of Transcript —*

Grants Office, LLC • empowering communities • Recorded September 17, 2026

### About This Transcript

This transcript was generated using Webex's automatic caption feature and subsequently reformatted with the assistance of artificial intelligence. While we make every effort to ensure accuracy, errors may remain. If you notice a discrepancy, we welcome your corrections — please reach out to education@grantsoffice.com.

Live sign language interpretation is available upon request for future Grantscast® events. To request an interpreter or learn more about accessibility accommodations, please contact accessibility@grantsoffice.com.