



Fostering Integration Grants Feedback Summary

Feedback for applicants

Overview

The Fostering Integration Grants (FIG) grant opportunity will assist migrants to integrate into Australian social, economic and civil life; a critical element in building social cohesion.

The objective of the FIG grant opportunity is to more effectively facilitate the integration of migrants by:

- encouraging the social and economic participation of migrants by developing skills and cultural competencies to integrate into Australian social, economic and civil life, and build community resilience
- promoting and encouraging the uptake of Australian values and liberal democracy and amplifying the value of Australian citizenship
- addressing issues within Australian communities that show potential for, or early signs of, low social integration
- promoting a greater understanding and tolerance of racial, religious and cultural diversity.

Grants will fund services, activities and events that seek to work with:

- newly arrived migrants
- first and second generation migrants
- communities showing early signs of or potential for integration challenges and/or racial, religious or cultural intolerance.

Priorities within the categories above included:

- Young people: Young migrants can face significant challenges in their integration, including acquiring English language skills, finding employment, moving between cultures, negotiating cross-generational relationships, and navigating mainstream services.
- Women: Migrant women, particularly those with significant caring responsibilities, can face additional social isolation and barriers to economic and civic participation. In Hearing her voice: report from the kitchen table conversations with culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) women on violence against women and their children participants articulated that social isolation is a key problem for CALD women.

- Communities with a demonstrated low level of social integration and/or English language proficiency.
- Communities that promote successful regional migration.

Selection process

The Community Grants Hub used an open competitive selection process to select providers to deliver the FIGs.

The Community Grants Hub received 498 applications for funding, each of which was required to address the following three assessment criteria:

Criterion 1: Demonstrate a strong need for a fostering integration project within your target community/communities.

Criterion 2: Describe the project in detail including how it will be delivered and how it will address the grant objectives.

Criterion 3: Demonstrate your organisation's community engagement and expertise.

Selection results

216 organisations were selected to deliver FIGs Funding Round.

Preferred applicants were identified based on one or more of the following factors:

- how well their application met the assessment criteria
- a demonstrated ability to meet the grant requirements
- how their application compared to other applications
- whether their proposal would be self-sustainable into the future
- whether their proposal provided value for money.

Further detail about what constituted a strong response to each of the assessment criteria is provided below.

Criteria specific feedback

Criterion 1: Demonstrate a strong need for a fostering integration project within your target community/communities.

A preferred response will:

- identify and describe your target community (including geographical location, ethnic or cultural background and whether it covers a priority group as defined in section 1.4 of these guidelines), citing statistics where relevant
- identify any gaps in existing services available to migrants within your target community/communities
- describe the issues facing your target group/community and how they relate to the program objectives and outcomes.

Strength	Example
Strong applications clearly identified and described the target community (including geographical location, ethnic or cultural background and whether it covers a priority group as defined in section 1.4 of these guidelines), citing statistics where relevant	 Strong responses provided: information and evidence that is specific to the particular target group/community as opposed to general information about migrants or a geographical area a clear indication as to the priority group the target/group community falls within quantitative evidence from relevant and recent data sources such as an Australian Bureau of Statistics Census, the Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas or other Government Department reports; and/or strong anecdotal evidence including results of community forums, surveys or interviews conducted with the target community.
Strong applications clearly identified any gaps in existing services available to migrants within your target community/communities	 Strong responses identified: gaps in services within the particular geographic location or target group/community barriers to use of existing services, where services were available in the geographic location.
Strong applications clearly described the issues facing the target group/community and how they related to the program objectives and outcomes.	 Strong responses: identified the issues facing the target group/community (e.g. job readiness or language barriers) demonstrated a strong need for integration support for the target community provided a strong case through relevant and current evidence to support the need.

Criterion 2: Describe the project in detail including how it will be delivered and how it will address the grant objectives.

A preferred response will:

- outline the project and its intended deliverables
- explain how the project will address the grant objectives
- outline how the project will be sustainable into the future
- explain how you will involve local key stakeholders in delivering the project.

Strength	Example
Strong applications clearly outlined the project and its intended deliverables.	 Strong responses provided: clear responses outlining the project and the intended deliverables across the entire period of the project, such as number of participants, services to be delivered, location of services, equipment to be purchased and/or staff/stakeholders involved details of a project plan including project stages and milestones.
Strong applications clearly explained how the project will address the grant objectives.	 Strong responses: identified the specific outcome(s) the proposed services would address and how these outcomes closely aligned with the program objectives provided clear information on how the proposed services connect with or has a history of connection with the target group/community and will assist the target group/community, whilst clearly demonstrating how the proposal will achieve both the outcomes identified and longer term integration.
Strong applications clearly outlined how the project will be sustainable into the future.	 Strong responses demonstrated: the project will be sustainable beyond the funding period through financial or non-financial support from other sources such as sponsorship, facilities, volunteers, or stakeholders (e.g. local businesses or community groups) outcomes for the project participants beyond the funding period through the skills gained or employment/schooling outcomes achieved.

Strong applications clearly explained how the organisation will involve local key stakeholders in delivering the project.

Strong responses:

- identified key stakeholders within the organisation, target group and broader community that will assist in the delivery of the project.
- provided a clear outline as to how they will engage other stakeholders as necessary to assist in the delivery of the project.
- demonstrated how the stakeholders identified will assist them in connecting and collaborating with the target group/community to make the project successful.
- provided evidence of community engagement activities undertaken or consultations with relevant and committed partners that are involved in service design and delivery.

Criterion 3: Demonstrate your organisation's community engagement and expertise.

A preferred response will:

- describe your organisation's community knowledge, networks, and partnerships
- demonstrate your organisation and staff's experience in delivering these or similar activities to migrants
- demonstrate your organisation's ability to meet all obligations of a grant agreement, including progress reporting and financial reporting
- explain your organisation's approach to delivering culturally competent services to address the particular needs of migrants and new and emerging communities.

Strength	Example	
Strong applications clearly described the organisation's community knowledge, networks, and partnerships.	 Strong responses: provided detailed information to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the target community. provided evidence to demonstrate they are connected to the target group/community and have the networks and partnerships to assist them not only in delivering the project but also in achieving outcomes that are high quality, meaningful and sustainable. clearly outlined how they would connect with the target group/community where current networks or partnerships had not already been established. 	
Strong applications clearly demonstrated the organisation and staff's experience in delivering these or similar activities to migrants.	 Strong responses: demonstrated that key personnel involved in delivering the services have relevant qualifications, skills or experience working with the target group/community. described the organisations experience in delivering grant activities or services similar to those proposed and/or delivering culturally competent services to migrants. provided evidence to detail the organisations performance in previous experience and other achievements. 	
Strong applications clearly demonstrated the organisation's ability to meet all obligations of a grant agreement, including progress reporting and financial reporting.	 Strong responses provided evidence of previously completed projects, noting reporting procedures and milestones met. detailed information and evidence to demonstrate infrastructure, procedures, systems and reporting/governance mechanisms that will assist them in meeting the obligations of the grant agreement. 	

Strong applications clearly explained the organisation's approach to delivering culturally competent services to address the particular needs of migrants and new and emerging communities.

Strong responses:

- described the organisations experience in delivering culturally competent grant activities or services to migrants.
- identified key personnel with specific experience, skills or qualifications in the provision of culturally competent services (e.g. bilingual/bicultural employees and roles and training dedicated to cultural competency).

General areas for improvement

The Selection Advisory Panel identified several general areas for improvement across all applications and/or proposed services/service delivery.

General weaknesses included:

- Proposals that duplicated services already offered through State/Commonwealth Government programs (e.g. the Humanitarian Settlement Program or the Adult Migration Education Program).
- Proposals that did not align with the grant objectives.
- Proposals that would have minimal impact in achieving grant objectives.
- A lack of clarity around how the proposed services would actually achieve the grant objectives.
- Proposals that did not have clear deliverables.
- Proposals that were not likely to be sustainable beyond the funding period.
- Proposals that included budgets with high administrative expenses.
- Proposals that included capital costs in the budget despite the guidelines saying these items were not in scope.
- Assessment criteria responses that identified potential stakeholders but did not demonstrate how they would engage with these organisations or involve them in service delivery.
- Assessment criteria responses that did not demonstrate an actual connection or established relationship with the target group/community. This led to concerns that the organisation would be unable to deliver high quality, meaningful and sustainable outcomes in the proposed community.
- Proposals that did not identify linkages to other partners/supporters. This could have helped to demonstrate that there is community support for the proposal.
- Proposals that were planning to operate in multiple locations/multiple geographies that did not articulate how they would manage and coordinate the project in different locations. This led to concerns that the organisation would be unable to deliver high quality, meaningful and sustainable outcomes with the funding requested.