



## OFFICIAL

# Community Language Schools Grants Program - Fluency in Asian Languages - Round 1

---

## Feedback for applicants

---

Thank you for your interest in the Community Language Schools Grants Program - Fluency in Asian Languages - Round 1 grant opportunity. We appreciate the time and effort you put into your application.

The Department of Home Affairs (the Department) is providing the following general feedback for grant applicants to support future grant applications.

### Summary of the Grant Opportunity

**Application period:** opened 20 November 2025 and closed 17 December 2025.

**Applications received:** 103

**Summary of the round:** This grant opportunity provided funding to organisations involved in, or supporting, language education to develop initiatives that would help more students, regardless of their background, become fluent in Asian languages through to years 11 and 12. For this grant opportunity, up to \$2.5 million (GST exclusive) of funding is available over 2 years from 2025–26 to 2026–27. A total of up to \$1.25 million (GST exclusive) will be available in each of the 2 years.

### Conflict of Interest Management for Assessment Staff

All Community Grants Hub and departmental staff were required to declare any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest before participating in the assessment process. Where a conflict was identified, appropriate steps were taken to manage it, which could include:

- Excluding the team member from undertaking assessment related to the affected application(s).
- Assigning the application(s) to an alternate assessor.
- Documenting the conflict and the management action in accordance with the Department's Conflict of Interest Policy.

### Selection Process

The Community Grants Hub reviewed all applications to confirm they met the eligibility and compliance requirements for the grant opportunity. This information was provided to the Department's Grant Opportunity Delegate, who made the final decision on whether each identified grant application met those requirements. Grant applicants whose applications were identified as ineligible or non-compliant were notified of the outcome in writing by the Community Grants Hub.

The Department undertook the preliminary assessment of all eligible and compliant applications through a Open Competitive grant process. This involved assessing applications

against the published selection criteria and any additional requirements outlined in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.

Following the preliminary assessment, the Department convened a Selection Advisory Panel to make final recommendations to the Financial Delegate. The Selection Advisory Panel was made up of subject matter experts whose role was to review the assessed applications, provide advice, and make recommendations to the Grant Opportunity Delegate.

Before participating in the assessment process, all Selection Advisory Panel members were required to declare any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest. In cases where a conflict was identified, appropriate management strategies were applied to ensure the integrity of the process. These strategies included:

- Excluding the panel member from discussions or decisions related to the affected application(s).
- Documenting the conflict and the management action in accordance with the Department's Conflict of Interest Policy.

In undertaking their role on the Selection Advisory Panel, panel members were required to consider:

- Whether applications met all eligibility and compliance requirements listed in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.
- How well responses addressed the published assessment criteria.
- The overall quality of applications compared to others received.
- The completeness and relevance of supporting attachments.
- Whether the proposed project demonstrated value for money.
- How the proposed activities aligned with the objectives of the grant opportunity.
- Any risks identified and the strategies proposed to manage those risks.

## **Selection Results**

The preferred applicants demonstrated their ability to meet the requirements outlined in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines based on the strength of their responses to the published assessment criteria. Applicants were notified of the outcome of their application in writing at the end of the selection period.

The following feedback is provided to assist grant applicants in understanding what comprised a strong application and what quality responses looked like against the requirements of the grant opportunity.

## **Common Mistakes to Avoid**

### **Read the supporting information before applying:**

It is critical to read the Grant Opportunity Guidelines prior to applying, as it will assist you in understanding the requirements and expectations of the grant opportunity. Resources including the Questions and Answers and recorded information session can also offer further clarification and guidance.

Using these materials before preparing an application helps to support the development of a clear, accurate, and complete application.

**Eligibility evidence:**

To be eligible for this grant opportunity, applicants were required to provide evidence demonstrating that its organisation is involved in, or supports, language education in Australia. The type of evidence required, and examples of types of evidence, were outlined in section 7.1 of the Grant Opportunity Guidelines. Applicants were also required to indicate the sections of the evidence that it considered would demonstrate that it is involved in, or supports, language education in Australia.

Strong evidence included clear information about the applicant's involvement, or support, in language education in Australia. The evidence also indicated the relevant sections of the document showing the applicant's involvement or support in language education.

Strong applicants clearly indicated the sections which they considered demonstrated involvement, or support, in language education in Australia.

It is important to ensure instructions are followed and applicants carefully consider whether evidence will sufficiently meet eligibility requirements.

## **Criterion 1: What is your project?**

When addressing the criterion, applicants:

- described their proposed project
- outlined the key activities and deliverables
- explained how the project would contribute to the objectives and outcomes of the grant program outlined in section 2.1
- detailed how they would analyse, measure and evaluate performance of the project to demonstrate success and outcomes.

### **What strong applications did well:**

- provided a detailed description of the project, including explanations about how the project would benefit or contribute to the wider community language schools (CLS) community or sector (rather than an individual school)
- provided details on the specific activities to be undertaken, timeframes for those activities, and impacts or deliverables to be expected
- described how the project would specifically contribute to grant program objectives and outcomes
- demonstrated the ability to analyse, measure and evaluate performance of the project by outlining specific methods for monitoring, assessing and evaluating project progress and performance.

### **Common gaps observed:**

- not addressing each of the sub-criterion
- insufficient detail or information provided about how the project would benefit the wider CLS community or sector, or how the applicant would work with the wider community or sector to improve outcomes more broadly
- limited detail about the specific actions or plans that would be undertaken to deliver the project, especially how the project would work with the wider community or sector
- not clearly addressing how projects would be analysed, measured and evaluated, making it unclear how project success and outcomes would be demonstrated.

## Criterion 2: How will you deliver your project?

When addressing the criterion, applicants:

- outlined their skills and experiences their organisation had to successfully deliver the project, including their current engagement with Asian languages education
- identified any other organisations or stakeholders they were currently or would work with to deliver the project
- provided details of the personnel in their organisation who would be involved in the project
- explained the potential issues or risks that may arise and how they would manage them.

### What strong applications did well:

- provided evidence of organisational capability by describing current or previous activities and engagement with Asian language education
- outlined well-established or purposeful partnerships, showing how collaboration with those networks would strengthen project delivery and broaden project impact
- clearly set out the roles and responsibilities of personnel involved in the project, indicating how particular personnel would contribute to the delivery of the project
- demonstrated understanding of the potential issues or risks arising from the project and the impacts those issues and risks would have to project delivery
- provided issue or risk planning strategies, including management plans and mitigation strategies, to address potential issues or risks.

### Common gaps observed:

- not addressing each of the sub-criterion.
- limited detail about the capability of the organisation to deliver the project
- lack of specificity about how the organisations and stakeholders that would be partnered with for the purposes of the project would support overall project delivery. In some applications, it was unclear how the organisation or stakeholder would relate to the project
- lack of detail or information provided about how the applicant would work with the wider community or sector to improve outcomes more broadly
- potential issues or risks that would arise during project delivery were not outlined, and if they were specified, limited details were included on how those issues or risks would be managed throughout the project.

## Criterion 3: Project budget

When addressing the criterion, applicants:

- provided an indicative budget outlining the funding they required and the allocation against items
- described how they would manage the grant funds to effectively deliver their grant activities.

### What strong applications did well:

- utilised, and followed the instructions within, the budget template
- provided an indicative budget that demonstrated strong value for money and clear evidence of economic planning
- completed an indicative budget that demonstrated a clear linkage to the project and scope of activities within the project
- provided clear information about how grant funds would be managed over the course of the grant, including the processes that would be used to oversee and track use of grant funding.

### Common gaps observed:

- indicative budgets included ineligible expenditure items as specified in the Guidelines, or items that did not have apparent linkage to the project
- limited details on how grant funds would be managed, such that, it was unclear how expenditure would be managed and monitored throughout the project.

## Tips for Future Applications

- Start early and read the **Grant Opportunity Guidelines** carefully.
- Check eligibility and gather required evidence before drafting your application.
- Provide complete, relevant attachments and references.
- Address each assessment criterion directly and clearly.
- Explain how your proposed activities deliver outcomes and demonstrate **value for money**.
- Identify risks and outline strategies for managing them.

## Next Steps

- Individual feedback will **not** be provided for this grant opportunity.
- If you would like to know about upcoming grants opportunities for funding, you can [register](https://www.grants.gov.au/RegisteredUser/Register)<sup>1</sup> to receive email alerts with [GrantConnect](#) the Australian Government's grants information system.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.grants.gov.au/RegisteredUser/Register>