



Australian Government

Community  
Grants Hub  
Improving your grant experience



---

# Native Title Anthropologist Grant Program 2019-22

General feedback for applicants

---

## Overview

The Native Title Anthropologist Grant Program 2019-22 will run over three financial years from 2019-20 to 2021-22. The program is part of the Australian Government's wider investment in the native title system.

The objective of the program is to increase native title anthropology capacity by supporting native title anthropologists working in the system. This facilitates native title parties having access to qualified and experienced anthropologists, to support the resolution of native title claims and the effective management of native title. Promoting claims resolution achieves recognition and protection of native title for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and contributes to land tenure certainty, which is critical to achieving economic growth for Indigenous Australians and Australia generally. The program objective will be achieved through grants to promote collaboration amongst this specialist sector, including delivery of targeted training and professional development and increasing the expertise of those working in native title anthropology.

This grant opportunity is intended to:

- provide professional development and support for native title anthropologists working in the native title sector, particularly mid to senior level native title anthropologists
- provide stronger linkages between academic and applied anthropological work, particularly for mid to senior level native title anthropologists
- support mid to senior level native title anthropologists to continue to develop their technical skills through access to higher education courses.

The application period opened on 13 March 2019 and closed on 2 May 2019. Up to \$1.001m (GST exclusive) over three years is available for this grant opportunity, starting from August 2019 and finishing in June 2022. A total of five applications were received, of which five were eligible, making the selection of successful grant recipients competitive. After assessment, three applications were selected for funding, totalling \$1.001m. Successful applicants may have received less funding than requested.

The feedback provided below on behalf of the Attorney-General's Department is to help grant applicants understand what generally comprised stronger and weaker responses to the assessment criteria for this grant round, and how to strengthen future applications.

---

---

Future grant opportunities may be available for this program. You can find out about new grant opportunities on [GrantConnect](#).

## Selection process

An open competitive selection process was undertaken, allowing a range of organisations that met the eligibility criteria to apply.

Applications were first screened for eligibility and compliance against the requirements outlined in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines, including the provision of the required proposed budget, two referee reports (required for prospective PhD students only) and a trust deed and any subsequent variations (if applying as a Trustee on behalf of a Trust). All eligible and compliant applications were then assessed and moderated by the Community Grants Hub (the Hub) against the three assessment criteria.

A Selection Advisory Panel independent of the Hub, with a mix of relevant policy, program and delivery expertise, from the Attorney-General's Department, then made funding recommendations to the Attorney-General's Department's Delegate. The recommendations were based on the strength of responses to the assessment criteria and the applicant's ability to meet the grant requirements outlined in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.

The Selection Advisory Panel considered all applications and their assessment results and made recommendations on applications having regard to:

- whether the project, or any of its elements did not align with the program objectives
- value for money
- conformance with eligibility criteria
- service provider mix
- how the services and/or project will be delivered.

The Attorney-General's Delegate made the decision to approve the funding to the successful grant recipients.

The successful applicants proposed activities that were eligible, appropriate and considered effective for achieving the program objectives. They demonstrated their suitability for public funding, value for money and met all of the eligibility requirements in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.

### General feedback

Applicants could have generally strengthened their application by:

- ensuring they thoroughly read the Grant Opportunity Guidelines
  - ensuring all aspects of the criteria were addressed
  - demonstrating their consideration of the Grant Program's objectives
  - only including relevant information that is not ambiguous
  - supporting claims with relevant, reliable and current evidence
-

- linking claims back to the policy objectives and the project description/services to be delivered.

### Criterion 1

**Outline the needs of native title anthropologists, particularly mid to senior level anthropologists, and the needs of the native title system that your proposal will address.**

Strength	Feedback
<p><b>Strong applications clearly demonstrated an in-depth understanding of the needs of native title anthropologists and the native title system.</b></p> <p><b>Strong applications clearly provided evidence of how the proposal will increase the capacity of native title anthropologists in order to address the identified needs.</b></p> <p><b>Strong applications clearly referenced one or more of the grant priorities.</b></p>	<p>Stronger responses clearly described:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing issues in the native title system and identified emerging issues in the sector.</li> <li>• Which of the activities will address the identified needs of native title anthropologists and how.</li> <li>• How the proposal will:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ support the professional development of native title anthropologists,</li> <li>○ create stronger linkages between academic and applied anthropological work; and/or</li> <li>○ support native title anthropologists to continue to develop their technical skills.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Weaker responses did not clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate the need for the activity.</li> <li>• Identify a clear need the proposal will address in order to support the capacity of native title anthropologists.</li> <li>• Outline how the proposal would achieve the grant objectives.</li> <li>• Describe how the proposal would benefit the broader anthropologist community.</li> <li>• Outline how the proposal would have systemic impact in achieving the grant objectives.</li> </ul>



---

## Criterion 2

Describe how the implementation of your proposal will achieve positive outcomes for native title anthropologists and the native title system.

Strength	Feedback
<p><b>Strong applications clearly outlined the activities that will be used to deliver the proposal (e.g. training courses, professional development workshops, mentoring programs etc.).</b></p> <p><b>Strong applications clearly explained how the implementation of the proposal would increase the capacity of native title anthropologists to support the native title system.</b></p> <p><b>Strong applications clearly outlined the risks associated with the development and implementation of the proposal and how these risks will be mitigated and managed.</b></p>	<p>Stronger responses clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Explained how the proposed activities would increase the capacity of native title anthropologists and support the native title system.</li><li>• Described a sustainable approach to increasing the capacity of native title anthropologists.</li><li>• Outlined the expected results of the proposed activities, with the main goal of increasing the capacity of the native title system.</li><li>• Identified any issues associated with the development and implementation of the proposal and outlined a way to mitigate and manage the possible risks.</li></ul> <p>Weaker responses did not clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Outline activities that will be used to deliver the proposal.</li><li>• Explain how the proposed activities relate to the grant objectives.</li><li>• Explain how the implementation of the proposal would increase the capacity of the native title system.</li><li>• Outline how the proposal and the activities would benefit the broader anthropologist community.</li><li>• Provide any risks associated with the development and implementation of the proposal.</li></ul>



### Criterion 3

**Demonstrate your capability to effectively deliver the grant activity to the sector on time and within budget.**

Strength	Feedback
<p><b>Strong applications clearly outlined the infrastructure that will be used to deliver the activity.</b></p> <p><b>Strong applications clearly described the number of key staff that will manage and deliver the activity and outlined their relevant capabilities (experience, skills and qualifications).</b></p> <p><b>Strong applications clearly demonstrated a proven ability to effectively develop, implement, manage and monitor activities to achieve positive outcomes that are relevant to this grant.</b></p>	<p>Stronger responses clearly described:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposed, current or existing infrastructure that will be used to deliver the activity.</li><li>• The key staff involved in managing and delivering the activity as well as providing their relevant capabilities.</li><li>• The roles of each of the key staff in the delivering the proposal.</li><li>• Previous experience in effectively developing, implementing, managing and monitoring activities, using examples to support claims made.</li><li>• Strategies in place to manage, monitor and evaluate the proposed activities to achieve positive outcomes that are relevant to the grant.</li></ul> <p>Weaker responses did not clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide specific details on the infrastructure required to deliver the activity, including details of access to this infrastructure.</li><li>• Outline if staff contingency plans are in place, demonstrating an overreliance on single staff members.</li><li>• Provide evidence that the relevant skills and expertise would be available to ensure successful project delivery.</li><li>• Provide examples of previous experience at delivering similar or related types of activities.</li></ul>



---

## Attachments

As outlined in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines, the required proposed budget, two referee reports (required for prospective PhD students only) and a trust deed and any subsequent variations (if applying as a Trustee in behalf of a Trust) were viewed by the panel. Most relevant to the panel's assessment of each application was the provided budget, which the panel used to further assess how applicants planned to deliver activities, and their capacity to effectively achieve positive outcomes for the native title system.

### Stronger responses clearly:

- Linked the proposed activities to their budget, providing sufficient details to identify where grant funding is to be spent through each of the three financial years on the correct budget template.
- Demonstrated a considered approach to the cost of activities and the funds required to effectively deliver them in order to support the native title system.

### Weaker responses did not clearly:

- Outline where the grant funding would be spent or provide sufficient detail within the budget to explain how the proposed activities would be delivered.
- Demonstrate value for money to the Commonwealth by identifying how funding would achieve positive outcomes for the native title system.