

Priority Projects Program Assessment Report 2009

A total of 144 applications in the form of 103 expressions of interest and 41 full proposals were received. The Board Standing Committee approved 13 full proposals for funding in the first round. From the expressions of interest, 14 applications have been asked to submit full proposals. A minimum of \$2 million is available for the expressions of interest resubmitted as proposals in Round 2 (and for any resubmitted proposals from Round 1).

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

- 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 (where 5 is the highest):

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

General comments regarding the applications:

- Many applications were well written and some are innovative and cutting edge (e.g. Web 2.0 assessment).
- Applications are often cross-disciplinary in their relevance and the strong cross-institutional collaboration is one of the strengths.
- Many applications addressed issues of emerging importance within the sector and identified clear needs within the institutions with the ambition of achieving better outcomes for staff and students in teaching and learning.
- Some applications build on prior ALTC work and the continuity is one of the strengths.
- Most applications are based on sound theory and show engagement with the body of knowledge in the area.

- In the weaker applications, the weaknesses identified in applications included:
 - Poor budget justifications
 - Clear evaluation plans, particularly in engaging stakeholders
 - A lack of details about:
 - how outcomes would be achieved;
 - how collaborating partners would work together and what these roles would be;
 - how large project teams would be led and managed to ensure outcomes were achieved and focus was maintained; and
 - how the proposed outcomes have wide applicability.
 - A lack of engagement with key ideas and theoretical concepts
- While there is some evidence of considerable preliminary work or pilot studies by communities, there often appeared to be limited preliminary investigation demonstrated in literature reviews of small pilot studies. E.g. few applications made explicit reference to curriculum design and re-development or research.
- There were numerous applications with interesting concepts but which are not well presented or are poorly integrated with the body of knowledge.

June 2009