



Competitive Grants Program Assessment Report 2007

A total of 154 applications in the form of 111 expressions of interest and 43 full proposals were received. Of these 4 EOIs were outside the Program guidelines and not forwarded for assessment. From the expressions of interest, the Board Standing Committee has approved 28 applications to submit full proposals. 15 full proposals have been approved for funding and three applicants requested to resubmit revised proposals.

A minimum of 1.5 million dollars is available for the expressions of interest resubmitted as proposals in Round 2.

The assessment of full proposals was based on the following criteria defined in the program guidelines using a scale of 1- 5:

- Project outcomes and rationale
- Approach
- Value and need for the project
- Value for money and project management
- Capacity of project team to deliver proposed outcomes

The assessment of expressions of interest was based on the following criteria defined in the program guidelines using a scale of 1- 5:

- Proposed outcomes and rationale
- Approach of the proposed project
- Value and need for the project

General Comments regarding the applications:

- There were interesting and innovative ideas demonstrated.
- It was good to see an increasing number of collaborations by institutions
- The strongest applications clearly outlined current problems and developed well grounded, multi-institutional methodologies to address the problems identified.
- A significant number of applications lacked focus and were poorly structured and argued. Many did not specifically address the priority area/s of the Competitive Grants Scheme.
- The overall quality of applications was rated medium to good
- The weaknesses identified in proposals included:

- single institution applications without clear applicability to the sector and wider community
- dissemination poorly understood and addressed;
- requirements for project management not considered
- IP issues not addressed
- Dissemination of project outcomes so that the sector gains maximum benefit was not well understood by a significant number of applicants. It is recommended all applicants refer to the Carrick Dissemination Framework, and reports available on the Carrick website under [Additional reading](#):
 - *Strategies for effective dissemination of project outcomes*
 - *Dissemination, adoption and adaptation of project innovations in higher education.*
- Many budgets contained simple errors, while a number did not use the template provided. In a number of cases the budgets appeared unrealistically high. Budgets need to be clearly related to activities and outcomes detailed in the application.
- There was inadequate preparation in terms of literature reviews, and situating applications in relation to current and past work.