Small Grant Assessment Criteria 2025

Mandatory Criteria

Criteria	Assessment
1. The applicant is a registered organisation with an ABN or an auspice arrangement.	Yes
	No
2. The organisation is willing to uphold National Principles for Child Safe Organisations and provide documentation around Child Safety if required.	Yes
	No
3. The event takes place any time in August 2025.	Yes
	No
4. The activity is not limited to school students and staff—it demonstrates a clear benefit to the wider community.	Yes
	No
5. The applicant has provided a clear budget.	Yes
	No
6. The applicant commits to collecting participant feedback and meeting reporting requirements.	Yes
	No

General Criteria

Criteria	Assessment
1. The event description is clear and considered.	No or limited description provided.
	Description is clear but lacks planning.
	Description is clear and well thought out.
2. The project will provide participants with a positive and impactful STEM experience.	No or limited impact demonstrated, with no clear benefit to participants.
	Some indication that participants may have a positive STEM experience, but the impact is unclear.
	Clearly explains how participants will have a positive STEM experience, with defined benefits.
	Demonstrates a strong, lasting impact, ensuring participants gain a meaningful STEM experience beyond the event.
3. The applicant demonstrates capacity to successfully deliver on the project. Including necessary skills, experience, infrastructure, equipment and	No or limited capacity demonstrated, with no clear plan for project delivery.
	Some capacity demonstrated, but gaps remain in skills, resources, or planning.

technology needed to successfully run this project.	Demonstrated clear capacity to deliver the project, with appropriate skills, resources, or partnerships in place.
4. The project/event uses sustainability practices to minimise environmental impact during planning and delivery.	No or limited environmental impact information provided.
	Environmental impact information is provided but lacks planning and consideration.
	Environmental impact is clearly considered and mitigated where possible.
5. The project/event target audience is an underrepresented community in STEM.	The target audience is not an underrepresented community in STEM
	The target audience is an underrepresented community in STEM.
6. The project/event works with or is an organisation that represents an underrepresented community in STEM.	No or unclear representation of underrepresented groups in the project planning
	Some representation of underrepresented groups in the project planning and delivery
	Clearly demonstrates working with or is an organisation that represents an underrepresented community in STEM
7. Letters of support or supporting documentation are provided from project partners or organisation that represents an underrepresented community.	No or minimal supporting documentation provided.
	Clear supporting documentation provided that showcases a clear partnership or the group represents an underrepresented community.
8. The applicant clearly identifies the target audience and demonstrates engagement.	No or limited target audience identified.
	Target audience identified but lacks planning and consideration.
	Target audience clearly identified, clearly considered and demonstrates planning.
9. The applicant demonstrates a clear strategy for promoting the project/event and attracting the target audience.	No or limited marketing strategy provided, with no clear method for attracting the target audience.
	Limited strategy with only one promotional avenue, with a vague method of attracting target audience.
	Clear strategy using multiple promotional avenues, with a well-explained method for attracting target audience.
10. The applicant demonstrates a clear strategy for collecting feedback from participants.	No or limited strategy for collection of feedback and attendance.
	Strategy is vague or lacks detail.
	Strategy is detailed and outlines how attendance and feedback will be collected with thought to the audience/event.

11. The applicant has assessed the risk and has plans for mitigation.	No or limited consideration of the risks associated with the event.
	A moderate understanding of the event risks is demonstrated, and a vague mitigation strategy is outlined.
	An in-depth understanding of the event risks is demonstrated, and a detailed risk mitigation strategy is outlined.
12. The applicant has provided a budget demonstrating value for money, effective and efficient use of funds.	No or minimal breakdown with weak justification.
	Budget is completed but lacks justification or detail.
	Budget is detailed, well-structured, and includes clear justifications.
13. The project/event demonstrates an efficient and effective use of resources with respect to the number of participants, audience reached and depth of engagement.	The experience is expensive for the engagement offered / the project demonstrates an inefficient use of resources or fails to demonstrate how resources will be used.
	Budget is clear but lacks effective value for money. Some consideration of cost to attendees is provided, with some acknowledgment of depth.
	Budget is clear, well thought out and demonstrates value for money. Consideration of cost to attendees is highlighted and clear acknowledgment of depth.