



## Mid-tier Grant Assessment Criteria 2026

### Mandatory Criteria

Criteria	Assessment
1. The applicant is a registered organisation with an <a href="#">ABN</a> or an auspice arrangement.	Yes
	No
2. The organisation is willing to uphold the National Principles for Child Safe Organisations, comply with all relevant Western Australian child safety laws and provide documentation upon request.	Yes
	No
3. The project engages an underrepresented community group in a STEM-based activity, as described in the grant overview.	Yes
	No
4. The event takes place in August 2026.	Yes
	No
5. The activity demonstrates a clear benefit to the wider community. Projects limited to school students and/or staff are <b>not</b> eligible.	Yes
	No
6. The applicant has provided a budget that aligns with the grant guidelines.	Yes
	No
7. The applicant commits to collecting participant feedback and meeting reporting requirements.	Yes
	No
8. The applicant has no outstanding obligations from previous Inspiring WA funding (reporting, acquittals, deliverables).	Yes
	No

### General Criteria

Criteria	Assessment
1. The event description is clear and provides detailed information about the planned activities.	No or limited description is provided.
	A description is provided, but details of event activities are limited or unclear.
	The description is clear, well-considered, and provides detailed information on the event activities.
2. The applicant demonstrates clear and appropriate strategies to actively engage the selected community or communities.	No or minimal explanation of how the selected community or communities will be engaged.
	Engagement strategies are described but lack detail, depth, or practical examples.
	Engagement strategies are clear, appropriate, and actively involve the selected community or communities, such as through partnerships, speakers, or meaningful participation.



3. Letters of support or other documentation demonstrate collaboration with, or engagement of, the identified community or communities, or the applicant organisation itself is a representative of the identified community.	No documentation is provided and the applicant organisation does not represent the community being engaged.
	Documentation is provided, or the applicant organisation itself is a representative of the identified community.
4. The STEM content is relevant and clearly detailed, including information about how it will be delivered.	No or limited STEM content provided.
	STEM content is mentioned but lacks clarity, relevance, or details of delivery.
	STEM content is clearly defined, relevant, and includes information about how it will be delivered.
5. The outcomes and community benefits of the event are clearly outlined and realistic.	No clear outcomes or community benefit described.
	Some outcomes or benefits are described, but they are vague or not clearly linked to the activity.
	Outcomes are clear, realistic, and demonstrate benefits to participants or the community.
6. The promotion strategy is clearly outlined and demonstrates how the event will reach the target audience using multiple avenues.	No or limited promotion strategy is provided, with no clear method for reaching the target audience.
	A promotion strategy is described, but it is limited in scope, lacks detail, or uses only one promotional avenue.
	The promotion strategy is clear, detailed, and uses multiple avenues to effectively reach and engage the target audience.
7. Potential challenges are identified, with a clear plan to manage them.	No or minimal consideration of challenges.
	Challenges are identified but mitigation strategies lack detail or clarity.
	Challenges are clearly identified, with practical and realistic mitigation strategies.
8. The strategy for tracking attendance and collecting participant feedback is clear and practical.	No or minimal strategy for tracking attendance or gathering feedback.
	Strategy is described but lacks clarity or detail.
	Clear and practical plan to track attendance and collect meaningful participant feedback.
9. The applicant demonstrates the experience, skills, and resources needed to successfully deliver the event.	No or limited experience, skills, or resources demonstrated.
	Experience, skills, and resources are demonstrated, showing the organisation can successfully deliver the event.



10. The project demonstrates potential to create future STEM opportunities or have a lasting impact beyond the event.	No or limited evidence of future STEM opportunities or lasting impact.
	Clear evidence that the project will create future STEM opportunities or have a lasting impact beyond the event.
11. The project demonstrates consideration of environmental impact and steps to minimise it.	No or limited consideration of environmental impact.
	Consideration of environmental impact is evident with practical steps to minimise it.
12. The event cost to participants is reasonable and proportionate to the event described.	Cost is high, unclear, or not proportionate to the event described.
	Cost is reasonable and proportionate to the event described.
13. The budget is clear, detailed, and demonstrates value for money, including justifications and in-kind support where relevant.	No or minimal budget breakdown is provided, with weak or no justification.
	Budget is completed but lacks sufficient detail, justification, or in-kind support.
	Budget is detailed, well-structured, and clearly demonstrates value for money, including justifications and any in-kind support.
<b>Maximum possible score</b>	