



Australian Government

Community
Grants Hub
Improving your grant experience



Information Linkages and Capacity Building (ILC) Mainstream Capacity Building Grant Round 2019-2020

General Feedback for applicants


Overview

The National Disability Insurance Agency (NDIA) is pleased to share this feedback as part of our commitment to sharing information with the sector and to acknowledge the time and effort applicants put into developing applications. This feedback will help applicants to prepare future applications by understanding how to prepare strong responses to the assessment criteria.

The Information Linkages and Capacity Building (ILC) Program's Mainstream Capacity Building Grant Round 2019-2020 seeks to build the capacity of the community to create opportunities for people with disability to use and benefit from the same mainstream health services as everyone else.

This grant opportunity contributes to the NDIA's ILC program, which funds new ways to increase the independence, social and community participation of people with disability. The aim of this grant round is to stimulate and encourage practice change in mainstream health services, to develop and trial new approaches that are more inclusive and welcoming for people with disability.

The application period for this Mainstream Capacity Building Grant Round opened on 9 September 2019 and closed on 21 October 2019. A total of \$35.2 million (GST Incl.) was available to applicants over the three year funding period. The available funding in this grant round ranged from \$110,000 (GST Incl.) to \$2,475,000 (GST Incl.) over three financial years until FY2021-22.



This was a highly competitive grant round, with almost 250 applications received seeking over \$347 million (GST Incl.) in funding.

The Delegate (The NDIA Board) awarded over \$35 million (GST inclusive) in funding to 28 projects.

Future grant opportunities may be available for this program. You can find out about new grant opportunities on [GrantConnect](#) and about ILC activities by signing up to the [eNewsletter](#).

Selection process

The open competitive selection process allowed a broad range of organisations to apply. Applications were assessed for eligibility against the *Mainstream Capacity Building Grant Round 2019-2020 Grant Opportunity Guidelines* (Grant Opportunity Guidelines).

All eligible applications were then independently assessed and ranked against the three equally weighted assessment criterion in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.

A Selection Advisory Panel (the Panel), considered this merit-based assessment and made funding recommendations to the Delegate. The Panel comprised experts relevant to this grant round including: clinicians, academics, policy leaders, disability advocates and NDIA staff.

Recommended projects were determined with consideration of value for money including:

- The relative value of the grant sought
- The project's alignment with state/territory funding priorities
- Whether the proposed project is in scope of the ILC policy
- The extent to which the applicant demonstrates a commitment to the social model of disability
- Other factors as set out in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.

General feedback

The following feedback is provided to assist applicants to prepare a strong application for future Mainstream Capacity Building Program grant opportunities.

Successful applications in this Mainstream Capacity Building grant opportunity:

- Provided a short and clear project description.
- Answered all assessment criterion questions and provided sufficient detail in their answers, using the available word count in the application form.
- Were activities that showed value with relevant money.
- Met eligibility requirements as outlined in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.



Stronger Applications:

Explained how people with disability were at the centre of project design and activity delivery by outlining the following:

- Specified which group of people with disability would be engaged with the project.
- Demonstrated credible connections with disability cohorts and mainstream health services.
- Clearly outlined how people with disability (not only family or carers) would be included across all aspects of the project including design, delivery of activities and governance structures.
- Described how the project activities would be designed in collaboration with people with disability and connected this description to prior work, an evidence base or other relevant information to illustrate this co-design approach.
- Clearly described the processes or structures of how people with disability would be engaged in the delivery of activities, providing examples or other relevant supporting information.
- Evidence within the project budget of employment or other expenses that support the inclusion of people with disability during the project.

Demonstrated an effective project approach that contributes to ILC program objectives and outcomes by detailing the following:

- Detailed how the project outcomes would align with and support the objectives of the National Disability Strategy & / or State & Territory Disability Inclusion and Action Plans.
- Detailed how the project activities would contribute to achieving ILC policy objectives and outcomes.
- Identified novel approaches with a strong evidence base and justification for piloting within a new context or cohort
- Proposed catalytic activities likely leverage systemic change to impact the health system.

Explained how the project would deliver Mainstream Capacity Building Program outcomes and provided evidence to support their claims by:

- Describing how the proposed activities would build the capacity of the health service system for people with disability.
- Explaining how the project addressed and delivered outcomes for the funding priorities for the jurisdiction nominated in the application.
- Chose appropriate activities to effect positive changes to address the identified mainstream health system issue/s for people with disability.
- Providing relevant, credible and current evidence to support their claims about the need for the project in the mainstream health service in nominated geographic area.

Clearly established that the ILC Program is the most appropriate funding source for the proposed project through:

- Detailing how the proposed activities are not able to be funded through other government sources and drew distinctions between funding sources. (Some applications were unsuccessful because the proposed activity is the responsibility of other federal, state, territory or local government bodies.)

Where relevant, formed partnerships or consortiums with other organisations to deliver the project.

- Detailed existing and confirmed new partnerships to be formed during the project. For example, 'We will team with University XYZ and have an existing partnership agreement in place.'
- Described the role of partner/consortium organisations, rather than listing organisations without any detail as to their role in the project.
- Formed partnerships or consortiums with other organisations with disability and/or mainstream system expertise in the project's location.
- Evidence of the partnerships was demonstrated in budget documentation.

Described the difference between an organisation's daily activities and the project activities.

- Clearly described how the grant would be used to deliver a project and not fund business as usual activities.
- Explained how the proposed activities were different to standard practices/responsibilities and/or activities the applicant is currently funded to deliver.

Stronger applications also demonstrated how the organisation would continue to promote or use the resources/products beyond the project's timeframe. They also demonstrated the sustainability of the project.

Some applications received would have been better aligned to a different ILC program (e.g. National Information, Economic and Community Participation or Individual Capacity Building Programs).

Assessment criteria feedback

The Grant Opportunity Guidelines required applicants to answer three equal weighted selection assessment criteria. The feedback below outlines how applicants provided stronger responses to the assessment criteria.

Criterion 1: Need and Suitability of the Mainstream Capacity Building activity

Describe the Mainstream Capacity Building activities you intend to deliver and why these are needed in the proposed location.

In your response, you should cover:

- *the activities to be delivered and how they relate to the relevant jurisdiction and/or national funding priorities (what will you do?)*
- *the people that the activities are expected to support (who will you assist?)*
- *where you seek to deliver the activities and why these are needed in the proposed location/s (where will you work and why those areas?)*
- *how the proposed activities directly benefit people with disability (how will it help?)*
- *how you will develop and deliver the activity in collaboration with people with disability (who will you work with and how will you work with them?).*

Strong responses to Criterion 1:

- Explained how project activities would deliver jurisdiction funding priority outcomes for people with disability in the chosen location.
- Provided specific relevant, credible and current evidence supporting the claims about the need for the project in the mainstream health service/system for people with disability. These applications did not just repeat previously published general census or scientific data.
- Described the geographical location or jurisdiction where activities would be delivered, and provided specific relevant, credible and current evidence to support the claims of the need for the project in the chosen area.
- Explained how the activity would directly benefit people with disability, the benefits and linking these with the proposed activities. This included explaining how the project activities would:
 - Build capacity for people with disability to access mainstream health services and systems; and/or
 - Improve the quality of those services and the experience of people with a disability within those systems.
- Clearly described which group/s of people with disability would be engaged with in the project.
- Directly involved people with disability (as opposed to family or carers) in all aspects of the project including design, delivery of activities and governance structures
- Described how the processes or structures would be designed in collaboration with people with disability using examples, an evidence base or other relevant information to illustrate this co-design approach.

Criterion 2: Contribution to ILC outcomes

Describe how you expect the Mainstream Capacity Building activities will help to achieve the following outcomes:

- *Increased understanding of mainstream personnel about disability and inclusion*
- *Improved inclusive, relevant, high quality health services.*
- *Improved individual attitudes and service culture in the health service system.*

In your response, you should describe:

- *the current capacity of targeted mainstream health organisations*
- *how and why the proposed activities will address the above outcomes for mainstream health organisations and people with disability*
- *any additional evaluation activities (beyond those stipulated by ILC) intended to be used to monitor the progress of the project and the people who participate.*

Strong responses to Criterion 2

- Provided specific, clear descriptions of the current capacity of the mainstream health organisations/system or service, supported by relevant evidence or other supporting information.
- Described how the proposed activities would build the capacity of the health service system for people with disability. Specifically how activities would:
 - Increase health service personnel's understanding of disability and inclusion for people with disability;
 - Build inclusive, relevant and high quality health services for people with disability; and/or
 - Improve attitudes and the service culture for people with disability in the focus health service system.
- Stated what would be achieved for people with disability (outcomes) rather than simply listing the number of activities to be undertaken (outputs).
- Explained how the project activities would provide inclusive, relevant and high quality health services for people with disability and/or improve individual attitudes and service culture for people with disability in the health service system.
- Described how data would be collected and the success of the project measured.
- Explained how the organisation would monitor the progress of the project and participants, not just listing the proposed evaluation activities.

Criterion 3: Capability of the organisation to deliver

Describe how you will implement and manage the activities.

In your response, you should describe:

- *The top six key milestones or stages of your Project Plan*
- *How you plan to engage people with disability in the planning and delivery of the project (including employment)*
- *Who will manage the project and the role of your board/committee in oversight of the activities*
- *Partnerships or collaborations you intend to undertake*
- *How you will implement and manage the activities.*

Strong responses to Criterion 3

- Described a project plan, including a short description of the key project stages and/or milestones.
- Detailed the project management structure, specifying the role of the organisation's board/committee.
- Clearly described the organisation's history and connection with the health system and project participants.
- Describe the ability, experience and capacity of their organisation, partners and project staff to deliver the project, including their connection to the focus cohorts and locality.
- Demonstrated the project was of an appropriate scale and scope relative to the size of the organisation seeking to deliver the project.
- Requested funding that matched the proposed project's scale and scope, rather than requesting the maximum allowable funding and longest possible timeframe.
- Included a project budget that reflected the scale of the project activities and participant numbers.
- Listed the key personnel/roles in project governance and oversight processes, their relevant skills, qualifications and experience.
- Described the role of partner/consortium organisations; rather than listing organisations without any detail as to their role in the project. Responses detailed existing and confirmed partnerships to be formed. For example, 'We will team with University XYZ and have a partnership agreement in place.'
- Described how the project activities would be designed in collaboration with people with disability using examples, an evidence base or other relevant information to illustrate this co-design approach. Applications also clearly described the processes or structures of how people with disability would be engaged in the delivery of activities, providing examples or other relevant supporting information.