Information Linkages and Capacity Building (ILC) Economic and Community Participation Grant Round 2019-2020
General Feedback for applicants

# Overview

The ILC Economic and Community Participation Grant Round 2019-2020 contributes to building the capacity of the community to create opportunities for people with disability to contribute to community prosperity and participate in community life.

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 strengthen future applications by understanding how to prepare strong responses to the assessment criteria.

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 application period opened on 9 September 2019 and closed on 21 October 2019 with a total of $30 million (GST exclusive) available to applicants over the funding period. This was a highly competitive grant round, with almost 600 applications received.

After assessment by the Selection Advisory Panel (the Panel) 28 applications were selected for funding, totalling $32,662,570.29 million (Incl GST). The Panel considered whether the application provided value with relevant money (as defined by Section 8 of the *Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013* (Cth). Successful applicants may have received less funding than requested.

Future grant opportunities may be available for this program. You can find out about new grant opportunities on [Grant Connect](https://www.grants.gov.au/?event=public.home) and about ILC activities by signing up to the [eNewletter](https://www.ndis.gov.au/community/information-linkages-and-capacity-building-ilc) .

# Selection process

The open competitive selection process allowed a range of organisations that met the eligibility criteria to apply. Applications were screened for eligibility and compliance against the Grant Opportunity Guidelines requirements, including the following required attachments:

* A Project Indicative Budget.
* An Activity Project Plan.
* A copy of the organisation’s most recent audited financial statements or accepted alternative documentation, if audited financial statements were not available.
* A completed Auspice Declaration (only applicable to organisations using an auspicing arrangement to authorise another organisation to apply on their behalf).
* The signed trust deed and any subsequent variations, if applying as a Trustee on behalf of a Trust.
* If an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander organisation is registered with the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations (ORIC), a copy of their Certificate of ORIC registration.

Eligible and compliant applications were assessed against three equally weighted assessment criteria.

A Selection Advisory Panel (the Panel) consisting of a majority of people with disability with a mix of relevant policy, program and delivery expertise then made funding recommendations to the NDIA decision maker. The Panel considered:

* The strength of alignment the project, or any of its elements, had with the program objectives.
* If the project provided value with *relevant money.*
* Conformance with eligibility criteria.
* Distribution of projects across all disability types and priority cohorts.
* How the project will be delivered.
* How well the level of project resourcing matched the intended scale of program delivery relative to the particular population/s.
* Existing and/or potential market failure (if known).
* Avoiding and/or minimising duplication with other federal, state or territory government programs and/or service delivery.

The NDIA decision maker approved the funding to the successful grant recipients.

# General feedback

Successful applicants demonstrated their suitability for public funding, value with *relevant money,* met the Grant Opportunity Guidelines requirements and included strong responses to the assessment criteria.

Further detail about what constituted a strong response to each assessment criterion is discussed below, as well as feedback on how applicants might strengthen future applications. Key feedback themes from this grant round are:

* **Demonstrating the need** – strong responses provided specific details of the need for the project, including evidence that the need exists within the community, rather than repeating previously published census or scientific data.
* **Demonstrating that the proposed approach would be effective and contribute to ILC outcomes** - strong responses detailed how specific activities would address the identified need and explained how the approach contributes to ILC policy outcomes.
* **Clearly establishing that ILC is the most appropriate funding source** **for the proposed project** – some applications were not funded as the proposed activity was the responsibility of other federal, state, territory or local government bodies.
* **Ensuring that the proposal clearly aligned to the Economic and Community Participation Program outcomes** - some applications were not funded as they better aligned to a different ILC program (e.g. National Information Program or Individual Capacity Building)
* **Clearly outlining proposed stakeholder engagement** – strong applications clearly explained:
	+ Connection to community.
	+ Partnerships and the role of other organisations in delivering the proposed activity.
* **People with disability at the centre of design and implementation** – strong applications were able to demonstrate how the program would meet the needs of people with disability in design and delivery, stating the anticipated outcomes of the project.
* **Use of appropriate models for targeted demographics**- strong applications applied appropriate models to programs (e.g. for proposals regarding children and young people recognition that community participation must be considered within the context of family, and delivering child centred and family enabled practices).
* **Appropriate scale and scope**- Strong applications were commensurate with the proposed scale and scope of the business and community requirement of the project.
* **Delineation between mainstream responsibilities and ILC** - Strong applications were clear about how the ILC grant would enable them to do something different to what they are funded for or to their standard practice.

In general, applications were strengthened by:

* Ensuring all aspects of the assessment criteria were addressed, including using the character count available to provide sufficient detail.
* Innovative models were underpinned by an evidence base/promising practice approach that assists with disrupting the cycle of unemployment.
* Linking claims between the project description and services/activities to be delivered and policy objectives.
* A program’s ability to access and utilise key influencers/enablers in communities to assist in creating inclusive communities/systems.
* A sound understanding of the complex issues of employment and stated clear risk mitigation strategies the program had in place.
* An understanding of resources that have been developed and leveraged upon within the project.
* Ensuring the project supported opportunities for inclusivity for people with disability to connect into sporting and arts communities.
* Ensuring that proposed activities or services did not duplicate those on offer through federal, state, territory or local government programs or another source.
* Clarifying how a proposed activity sufficiently varied from an ongoing ILC project, ensuring that the project budget reflected an appreciation of the total program budget.
* Ensuring the project budget reflected the scale of the project with respect to number of people that the project aimed to engage.
* Ensuring a strong focus on measuring outcomes.
* Demonstrating the link between the desired change/outcomes expected to happen as a direct result from the activities in program.
* Ensuring that people with disability are employed in delivering all aspects of the project
* Providing evidence that relevant skills and expertise would be available to ensure successful project delivery.
* Clarifying how a proposed activity would lead to a sustainable outcome for people with a disability.

# Criterion specific feedback

## Criterion 1: Need and Suitability of the Economic and/or Social and Community Participation activity

Describe the Economic Participation activities and/or the Social and Community Participation activities that you intend to deliver and why these are needed in the proposed location.

*In your response, you should:*

* *Describe the activities you seek to deliver (what will you do?)*
* *Describe the people that the activities are expected to support (who will you assist?)*
* *Describe where you seek to deliver the activities and explain why these activities are needed in the proposed location/s (where will you work and why those areas?)*
* *Describe how the proposed activities directly benefit people with disability (how will it help?)*
* *Describe how the activity will be developed and delivered in collaboration with people with disability (who will you work with and how will you work with them?).*

| Areas for improvement  |
| --- |
| Generally, applicants may have strengthened their responses to Criterion 1 by: Clearly describing the proposed Economic Participation activities and/or the Social and Community Participation activities. Clearly describing and estimating the number of people the Economic Participation activities and/or the Social and Community Participation activities would assist. Connecting strong, publically recognised evidence with the underlying need for the activity, in the particular location or area chosen. Describing the geographical location the activities would be delivered in, and explaining why the specific location had been chosen.Ensuring that the response effectively and clearly addressed how the activity would directly benefit people with disability, listing some of the benefits and linking these with the proposed activities.Clearly describing how the activity would be developed and delivered in collaboration with people with disability, using examples, an evidence base or other relevant information to illustrate how this would occur.Clearly describing how the proposed activity does not duplicate or overlap a function or program currently delivered or funded by the federal, state, territory or local governments, such as by Disability Employment Service providers. |

## Criterion 2: Contribution to ILC outcomes

Describe how you expect the activities you intend to deliver will help to achieve the following outcomes:

* Increased understanding of community personnel about disability and inclusion
* Improved inclusive behaviour in community activities
* Improved individual attitudes and community culture.

In your response, you should:

* Describe the current capacity of organisations you will target through your project
* Describe how and why the proposed activities will address the above outcomes for employers and community organisations and people with disability
* Describe any additional evaluation activities (beyond those stipulated by ILC) that you intend to use to monitor the progress of the project and the people who participate.

| Areas for improvement  |
| --- |
| Generally, applicants may have strengthened their responses to Criterion 2 by: Ensuring any descriptions of the current capacity of the target organisations were specific, clear, and supported by relevant evidence or other supporting information. Demonstrating a focus on outcomes and not outputs.Clearly describing how and why the proposed activities would result in improvements in understanding of community members about disability and inclusion, improved inclusive behaviour in community activities and improved individual attitudes and community culture. This may have required the use of examples, or other supporting information to illustrate how and why this would occur. Describing an approach to measure and capture data to verify the success of the project.Embedding evaluation into the project design. Ensuring that the descriptions of any additional evaluation activities did not just focus on what those activities were, but also addressed how they would monitor the progress of the project and the people who participate. |

## 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.

| Areas for improvement  |
| --- |
| Generally, applicants may have strengthened their responses to Criterion 3 by: Including a description of the project plan with an outline of the key stages in the response.Clearly describing how the applicant will implement and manage the proposed activities to ensure it meets its milestones to achieve the proposed outcomes, e.g. a project planDescribing the role the board/committee would play within the project. Detailing key personnel/roles involved in the governance and oversight processes, and any relevant skills, qualifications and experience.Describing the role of other organisations, how and when they would be involved through partnerships or collaborations, rather than providing a list of associated organisations without any further detail. Clearly describing the organisation’s history and connection with community or activity participants. Clearly describing the processes or structures of how people with disability would be engaged in the design and delivery of activities, providing examples or other relevant supporting information. |