



## **Competitive Grants Program Assessment Report 2008**

A total of 88 applications in the form of 65 expressions of interest and 23 full proposals were received. From the expressions of interest, 17 applications have been asked to submit full proposals. The Board Standing Committee approved 7 full proposals for funding. A further 2 proposals were given provisional approval subject to the applicants providing additional information about the proposal to the Standing Committee. 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 proposed in applications with sound rationales and dissemination strategies
- Many applicants demonstrated an awareness of the need to align project aims and outcomes with the Carrick mission of supporting strategic change
- The best proposals acknowledged work being undertaken in other Carrick projects, identified the gaps in the Carrick project profile well and argued well for a distinctive contribution
- Rigour of approach was generally lacking. Applicants need to specify the outcomes more clearly and cross check the internal consistency between methodology and outcomes
- The overall quality of applications was rated from poor to good, with medium being the rating of 8 of the 15 assessors.
- The weaknesses identified in proposals included:

- dissemination poorly understood and addressed
  - design of many projects could be improved with greater roles for partner institutions
- Written guidelines may not be sufficient as some applications do not adequately follow them. Carrick may want to encourage universities to run in-house training or fund mentors to assist applicants in the proposal development.
- While a larger number of expressions of interest addressed priority area 1: Research and Development (compared to other priority areas), the percentage of these applications which were asked to submit a full proposal was less than for other priority areas.