

Community Partnership Grant Eligibility Screening & Assessment Matrix

Name of organisation, group, or service provider	
Project title	

Eligibility Screening			
Does this grant benefit a community within local government area of a FRRHSA campus? <i>(one or more boxes MUST be checked)</i>	Adelaide Hills Council Alexandrina Council Barossa Council Berri Barmera Council City of Onkaparinga City of Mt Gambier Wattle Range Council	District Council of Karoonda East Murray District Council of Loxton & Waikerie District Council of Yankalilla Kangaroo Island Council Light Regional Council Grant District Council Southern Grampians Shire	Mid Murray Council Mount Barker Council Murray Bridge Council Renmark Paringa Council Victor Harbor Council Naracoorte Lucindale Council
Applicant type <i>(one box must be checked)</i> <i>If Other* the Grant Advisory Committee must be satisfied the project meets the aims of the program and the grant is appropriate.</i>	Registered community group Non-government organisation Education/health service provider Other* <i>(please specify)</i>		
Does the request for funding relate to the following purpose/s? <i>(one of more boxes MUST be checked)</i>	providing access to resources and information to improve community awareness of health-related issues providing access or opportunity for the community to make healthier choices or participate in activities with a prevention focus that delivers real health and wellbeing outcomes purchase of communication and technology equipment purchase of scientific or technical instruments one off projects for a specific purpose demonstrate sustainability beyond the funding period to develop and strengthen communities to assist in reducing social disadvantage to assist with solutions to community problems		

	<p>to ensure as many people as possible benefit from the project funded include a financial and/or in-kind co-contribution</p>
<p>Does the request ask for funding toward any of the following? (a check mark in any box will deem the applicant <i>ineligible</i>)</p>	<p>debt reduction reduction of a Australian Taxation Office debt operational and administration costs to support previous grant recipients who have not completed their final report requirements * indirect expenses and business overheads that cannot be directly tied to the approved grant project lobbying projects which give donations to other organisations projects that are capable of attracting funding from other sources funding for projects known to be in existence or funded by other funding bodies to support applications from individuals</p> <p><i>*The University may consider and approve funding of an application from an organisation or body that has not met the requirements of a previous grant round where the Grant Review Panel is satisfied that the failure to meet the requirement was unavoidable, or there is otherwise a reasonable explanation. An explanation regarding any failure to meet the requirements of a previous round should be submitted with the application should the applicant wish the application to be considered further.</i></p>
<p>Is a Project Plan provided?</p>	<p>YES NO</p>
<p>Has the applicant signed the Grant Agreement</p>	<p>YES NO</p>

ASSESSMENT MATRIX

Criteria	Not Evident (0)	Evident (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Evidence of project and community need.	Unclear and/or not evident.	Evident.	Clear.	Clear, convincing, but not distinctive.	Clear, convincing, and distinctive.	Very clear. Convincing and distinctive.
Project Plan.	Not evident, unconvincing.	Evident but basic.	Some attempt to identify some key activities and locations.	Clearly identifies key activities and locations.	Clearly identifies all key activities and locations including how acknowledgement of University sponsorship will be promoted.	Very clearly identifies and expands on all key activities and locations including how acknowledgement of University sponsorship will be promoted using multiple communication methods.
Number of people and region that will benefit from the project.	Not evident, unconvincing.	Evident but not specified.	<10 people directly in limited location (i.e. 1 town). OR No evidence of indirect benefits to the broader community.	10 – 20 people directly in limited location (i.e. 1 town). OR Little evidence of indirect benefits to broader community.	20 – 50 people directly with convincing evidence of additional indirect benefits to the broader community.	>50 people directly with convincing evidence of additional indirect benefits to the broader community across multiple locations.
Extent of benefit/outcome to community (effects on local and rural regional communities)	Not evident, unconvincing.	Evident.	Some attempt to identify basic, short term benefits and outcome to the community.	Clearly identified basic, short term benefits and outcome to the community.	Clearly identifies and justifies realistic short term and long-term benefits and outcome to the community.	Very clearly identifies and effectively justifies realistic short term and long-term benefits to the community via improved health and wellbeing service delivery, community development and education.