

Avant Foundation Member Grants 2026 – Microgrant assessment criteria



	Category	Sub-Category	Criteria	1 = Not evident	2 = Fair	3 = Excellent	Weighting	Score out of 3	Weighted Score
Applicant	Applicant may be an individual or a practice	Esteem	Individual: Applicant has distinguished academic/career history – relevant to career stage Practice: Practice is established and reputable	I: Poor academic/career history P: Not established/disreputable	I: Good academic/career history P: Reasonably established/reputable	I: Outstanding academic/career history P: Established and reputable	15%	3	0.45
		Project	Project may be for research, education, equipment, or career development or an initial research phase.	Rationale	Unclear rationale	Moderately clear rationale	Clear rationale	20%	3
Importance	The problem that the project is seeking to address is important	The problem that the project is seeking to address is not important		The problem that the project is seeking to address is somewhat important	The problem that the project is seeking to address is important	20%	3	0.6	
Outcomes	The proposed outcomes have been clearly articulated. <i>(Please note, the outcomes do not need to be achieved during the grant period, however the proposed outcomes and impact of the work must be clear)</i>	Poorly articulated impact		Moderately articulated impact	Clearly articulated impact	15%	3	0.45	
Reasonable budget	The budget is reasonable for what is proposed	Not reasonable		Somewhat reasonable	Very reasonable	15%	3	0.45	
Budget clarity	There is clarity in how the funding will be allocated (e.g. personnel, direct research, equipment)	Lack of clarity		Moderate clarity	Clarity	15%	3	0.45	
TOTAL							100%	3	

Final weighted score