

Priority Projects Program

Assessment Report May 2006

A total of 71 applications in the form of expressions of interest and full proposals were received in the ratio of about 4:1. From the expressions of interest, the Board Standing Committee has approved 13 applications to submit full proposals and one full proposal to be further considered in the second round. Four full proposals have been approved for funding.

The assessment of full proposals was based on the following criteria:

- Relevance to program criteria as listed in the Program Guidelines
- Quality of project design
- Value for money
- Importance of proposed project outcomes to the Carrick Institute's mission, objectives and responsibilities
- Capacity of the project team to deliver the proposed outcomes

The assessment of expressions of interest was based on the following criteria:

- Relevance of program criteria as listed in the Program Guidelines, in particular those dealing with the scope and intent of the program, the significance of the proposed change and potential usefulness beyond the project site
- Approach of the proposed project
- Importance of anticipated deliverables and outcomes

General comments regarding the applications:

- There were some very innovative projects and a variety of approaches to each of the program priorities.
- The applications demonstrated an enthusiasm for learning and teaching.
- There were some innovative applications using IT solutions for assessment, particularly of large classes.
- Some of the best project proposals/expressions of interest had strong collaborations between institutions.
- Discipline specific applications were strengthened by links with professional bodies/regulatory bodies.
- Some applications, particularly expressions of interest, were very vague. There needs to be more attention to defining what is to be achieved and how it is to be achieved – that is the aims, methods and outcomes need to be clearer and the application needs to demonstrate how it meets the program criteria.

- Applicants need to distinguish between normal university business, such as review of a program or course, and projects that have implications to benefit a number of institutions, the sector or the discipline at large.
- In the poorer proposals, there was often limited consideration given to dissemination and the potential wider implications/applicability. To assist in developing this aspect of the proposal, applicants should refer to the Carrick Dissemination Framework and the two reports on dissemination available under [Dissemination](#) on the Carrick website:
 - *Strategies for effective dissemination of project outcomes (2005)*
 - *Dissemination, adoption and adaptation of project innovations in higher education (2005).*
- Many applications were jargon rich and difficult to follow.
- Proposals were often weak in terms of evaluation strategies.
- On the whole, budgets were not well developed for full proposals and were not supported by explicit links to the project outcomes. If international travel is proposed, there needs to be a clear relationship between the travel and the project outcomes. The Carrick Institute will not fund computers, mobiles or large equipment budgets.