



AGENDA - COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL (CRC) 5 2017

Tuesday, 8th August 2017

6:19pm, ANUSA Boardroom

Item 1: Meeting Opens and Apologies

1.1 Acknowledgement of Country

I wish to acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of the land we are meeting on, the Ngunnawal and Ngambri peoples. I wish to acknowledge and respect their continuing culture and the contribution they make to the life of this city and this region. I would also like to acknowledge and welcome other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who may be attending today's event.

1.2 Apologies

- Kat Reed
- Anya Bonan
- Tom Kesina
- Marcus Dahl
- Allissa Li
- Robyn Lewis

Item 2: Minutes from the Previous Meeting

Motion: That the minutes from the previous meeting be accepted

Moved: James C

Seconded: Tanika

Status: Passed

Procedural: That the following reports be passed en bloc

Question of accepting late reports, such as the CAP Report. Decided to be discussed as a separate

James: Noting the resignation of Yuka and Tess. This is very sad, and I would like to publicly thank both of them for their work, and would like to discuss CRC metrics, putting out applications soon.

Moved: Fred

Seconded: Eleanor

Status: Passed

Item 3: Executive Reports

3.1 President’s report (J. Connolly) [Reference A]

3.2 Vice President’s report (E. Kay) [Reference B]

3.3 Education Officer’s report (R. Lewis) [Reference C]

3.5 General Secretary’s report (K. Reed) [Reference D]

Item 4: College Representative Reports

4.1 College of Arts and Social Sciences (R. Pflaum)

4.4 College of Engineering and Computer Science (E. Boyd and A. Wang) [Reference E]

4.5 College of Law (E. Dowling and S. Woodforde) [Reference F]

4.6

Motion: That all reports be accepted en bloc.

Moved: Eleanor Kay

Seconded: James Connolly

Status: Passed

Item 5: Discussion Items/Motions on Notice

Procedural: “That so much of standing orders be suspended to allow for a free discussion for the next two items”

Moved: Eleanor

Seconded: Emma

[Arrival of General Representative Lewis Pope]

Status: Passed

5.1 College Society Committees - submitted by E. Boyd

Emma: Was a topic on the camp. Have been speaking to the CEC societies, have sent out an expression of interest to them, drawn up a rudimentary proposal. CEC really keen to see a joint body like this, particularly in the light of the cultural audit done last year that is being released, will be the topic of follow up discussions.

A College Society Committee is something that CEC wants to see to centralise information dispersion and other purposes. CEC wants to call it “Heads of State”.

Ellie: Talking about the influence of non-society student organisations that we wanted the input of, such as Law Reform and others.

Emma: Happy to to call it “Joint colleges heads of state”, but wanted to see how people feel about it.

Ellie: Law is keen, and we’re nearly done, when I was talking to Tess, she was also keen to get the CASS underway. JCOS origin of the “Heads of State” term. [Discussion about the exact terminology of the name]

Ash: problem with very similarly named bodies like CRC, CEC, etc.

Emma: open to names. Student experience officers happy to sit in on the meeting and to assist with student coordination.

Howard: In discussion with Mitch, CAP was looking at doing this.

Ellie: meeting on friday to standardise with Cap and discuss it further.

[Multiple]: Friday is problematic.

Ellie: Discussion about how no one uses Slack and a Facebook group may be more effective.

Eleanor: Discussion about how the ANUSA 2017 is used for priority messages, while things go through Slack at first instance.

Ria: Clarifies the exact nature of the plan in regards to what was decided at retreat.

Emma: Group drive established at retreat, has been used by JCOS.

Howard: Have we consulted with the Clubs Council and the Branch Officers?

Emma: Considered not to be appropriate, given the differing non-academic purpose of the branch system and the council.

Ria: About 35 CASS societies at a guess.

Harry: Where do we think we’re at with this discussion? Move discussion to a separate meeting

[Ellie, Emma, Ria]: potentially a good idea

[Discussion about meeting times]

Meeting closed.

5.2 ASA Project- submitted by E. Kay [Reference G]

Eleanor: Thank you Harry, I attached an Appendix for this agenda item, technical difficulties, it's in Slack. We've moved from things with admissions, we've moved on to scholarships, and on what basis you should be able to award someone a scholarship. We're going back to ground zero with scholarships, ANU has a very limited set of scholarships, basically extreme academic achievement and indigenous scholarships.

This paper is due for feedback on the 16th of August. Four questions

- Check to see whether the University has excluded any major bases for the awarding of scholarships that ought to be considered as part of its scholarships reform project;
- Check the assessment of each of the basis for awarding of scholarships against the University's requirements;
- Check the University's interim assessment of each of the basis of the awarding of scholarships; and
- Notify the University if there is any additional published research on any of the bases of awarding of scholarships that should be taken into account.

Eleanor provides a brief overview of the various different scholarship models proposed in the paper, referenced on page 4 of the report.

ATAR/Equity model: Discussion

Tanika: how does this interact with bonus points.

Eleanor: Includes bonus points, but the bonus point system may not exist on implementation of the admissions changes.

ANU Award:

School could choose students to give the award, and then the ANU could select based on criteria.

Ria: Every school

Eleanor: Every school- 2800

Harry: Reservations because I don't trust schools. I don't trust anyone.

Eleanor: Do you trust the University more?

Harry: Yes.

Ria: Would there be obligations for the school to disclose about the nature of the opportunities, and do things openly?

Eleanor: I would expect that part of the requirements would be released and available.

Fred: Would there be any requirements for the schools to select people for scholarships?

Eleanor: More details on the paper, the award will be determined by the school on criteria selected by the ANU. Criteria is broad and undetermined, it's listed as investigate further.

Tanika: Two points: even if all the schools get the information how do we ensure students get it. Usyd has a thing that the students apply to a list that is then provided to the schools.

Ellie: How come school recommendation is listed as don't investigate further. Is this not the same as ANU award.

Eleanor: I'll investigate further. I'm sensing ambivalence about this one?

Fred: In principle it doesn't sound like a bad idea, but there is a substantial issue in unfair decision making at school.

Harry: too decentralised, likely to make selection dependent on local factors, I'm leaning towards no

Co-Curricular:

Eleanor: Demonstration of involvement in school and other co-curricular.

Ria: Does the part time work contribution that we discussed in relation to admissions applying here? Otherwise this may present an equity issue as low-SES students don't have the time to engage in co-curriculars.

Eleanor: Will investigate further.

Harry: What is the purpose of these scholarships? Is it to increase equity or to attract talent?

Eleanor: The main goal of the changes on the whole is equity, but I think the university wants to maintain its elite image additionally.

[Discussion about the ANU Spotify add]

Eleanor: I think that the goal of our changes is to maintain excellence but to move beyond conventional private school definitions of excellence. Bringing those incredible students to the ANU and providing them with the means to do so

[Cam brings in bread and hummus. There is much rejoicing]

Eleanor: The amount of a scholarship on academic merit may depend on your SES background.

Harry: I have a friend who qualified to represent his state on touch, but due to circumstances he couldn't go. How are we going to account for this. Also people lie about extracurriculars.

Eleanor: ANU plans to audit 10% of co-circulars. Eleanor is going to speed for the next few, because I think there will be broad recommendation.

Harry: Do we want to extend time?

Eleanor: Yes.

Eleanor: CV we all think is a really bad idea, we all agree? [General nodding]. First in family?

Harry: I think that this should not be a sole determinant.

Ria: Problems arising over international universities in immigrant families,

Eleanor: Substantial discussion about the definition of first in families?

Howard: Would you be rendered ineligible for this scholarship if your elder sibling went? Because of birth order

Eleanor: At the moment, yes, and this may be inequitable.

Halls of Residence: Halls get money to distribute.

[General Discussion]

Tanika: Affiliated colleges scholarships are positive however.

Eleanor: I will take that about looking at affordability and accessibility of residences.

Interview: Currently under do not investigate further. Hard to be good at interviews at 17 unless you have a good careers counsellor. Also non-scalable.

Harry: problems over accessibility for rural and remote students accessing things.

Lewis: Particularly if the internet connection is bad.

Ash: I think that interviews are potentially good for full ride scholarships.

Ria: What would they talk about? Also how good people are at interviews may not align with scholarship metrics.

Eleanor: problems with inherent bias and judgements in interviews. Should we say cautious, applicable in some circumstances.

Tanika: Phone interviews?

Eleanor: May be happening for some.

James: Keep in note that phone interviews disadvantage the interviewee, because they can't gauge responses.

ICSEA Values: Scholarships with ICSEA values, based on that government metric. Thoughts?

Harry: Like first in family, should be considered but not sole metric.

Howard: Most Selective schools have really high ICSEA values,

Ria: Disagree, you can't generalise selective schools.

Tanika: Seconding, my own school was partially selective but not high SES.

Richard: How do we account for equity scholarships to prestigious high schools?

Eleanor: They want this system to be transparent to students.

Legacy Status: If you have family members, you get a scholarship. General agreement that this is a bad idea.

Location, remoteness, distance:

James: Should be used to fill gaps in current government programs

Ash: Is this by distance or remoteness, problems for students from distant urban centres (perth) over near rural centres (like rural NSW)

Eleanor: No clarification from the group so far, happy to investigate further with James's advice of filling gaps.

Member of Disadvantaged Groups: If you're a member of a disadvantaged group.

[General consensus this is a worthy thing to investigate further]

Member of underrepresented Group: Currently do not investigate further largely because they're worried about risk and the arguments about pitfalls associated with affirmative.

Ria: What is an unrepresented group.

Eleanor: Undefined, but indigenous groups are a good example.

Tanika: People of colour?

Eleanor: probably.

Howard: Would this count towards unrepresented regions, such as western sydney or outer melbourne?

Eleanor & James; No.

[Further Discussion leading to consensus that disadvantaged groups rather than underrepresented groups is a better method and about the ambiguity of the term]

Personal Statement: Similar to CV, it's being dismissed, because what 18 year old sells themselves well.

Portfolio: Similar to CV but for artwork, would only apply to certain courses. This is for a scholarship purposes rather than admission.

Ria: My problem with this is that art is inherently subjective, and this creates problem.

Tanika: Would this be streamlined as part of the admission process.

Eleanor: Maybe, they have noted that this process is very labour intensive. Happy with do not investigate further but it include it in academic merit.

References: Considered bad, for obvious reasons related to CV.

School Rank: Based on internal school ranks subject.

[Cross talk, mixture of feedback]

Ria & Ellie: Problems with differing systems across state lines, problems with course ranks not whole ranks.

Tanika: We should look at the school, because number 10 at one school may be putting in a lot of effort than someone at another school which is getting number 1.

Eleanor: ANU wants to consider the top rank of poorly performing schools more highly than close top ranks. We want students that come top of low performing schools to reflect SES.

Howard: Problems with different states placing different emphasis on year 11.

Eleanor: Will investigate further.

Procedural: Extend the meeting (Harry)

Seconded: Howard

[Passed]

School Recommendation: Refer to previous discussion on ANU Award, more clarity on distinguishing.

Subject Performance: Talking about generalisation, general consensus that this should be re-examined for music and art students that are dependent on subject performance but perhaps not generally.

General Discussion on this item:

Arjun: Does this apply to International Students

Eleanor: Not currently, they are looking at it down the line, but this is not part of current scholarship considerations.

Please read the paper,

Item 6: Other Business

CAP/CASS Representative Call Out (Discussion Item)

Speaker: James

I need to appoint another two representatives, i will be using the previous metrics, which focus a lot on diversity within the team to ensure a mixture of skills. And also experience and knowledge of college related matters. Is the CRC happy for me to use the current model for appointment?

[The CRC is]

National Science Week (Discussion Item)

Speaker: Eleanor

Whole load of major events, particularly

[Insert the events here]

The Science reps have put in a massive amount of effort into this, and there's a lot of things happening in this space, such as science ball as well.

Arts Week

Speaker: Ria

This is happening in week 9, we're looking at mobilising student societies, look forward to it. Please get involved if you can.

Item 7: Date of Next Meeting and Close

The next meeting of the College Representative Council is scheduled to be on Tuesday, 29 August 2017 at 6pm in the ANUSA Boardroom.

Close of Meeting: 7:35PM

Released: 7 August 2017 by Kat Reed

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

James Connolly

To note I took leave the day after SRC 5 so there are no substantive updates that differentiate my CRC 5 and SRC 5 report.

Executive Summary

1. CRC Reform
2. Course Representative Reform
3. Appointments & Resignations
4. Education Review
5. Student Partnerships

Further Information

1. CRC Reform

CRC Reform was discussed at the last meeting of CRC without a resolution reached. I put a call out for feedback on top 3 issues/questions from the CRC and am now developing a proposal to take forward. With other projects and commitments I have been unable to complete the proposal yet.

2. Course Representative Reform

Training has been organised for Course Representatives within the Joint Colleges of Science once again and has been extended to Reps within the College of Engineering and Computer Science. This has all been organised for Week 3 of Semester 2.

I have written a memo for the College of Law Executive which was passed at the Col College of Education Committee that I attended concerning the implementation of Course Reps within Law. I have been working with the ADE, Wayne Morgan, on developing a pilot for Semester 1, 2018.

I have been on the selection panel for an Advocacy & Engagement Officer that PARSA is seeking to recruit. This position is currently to be paid from PARSA's SSAF reserves but long term it is my desire to see this position become a joint member of staff and to administer the Course Representative scheme on ANUSA's end.

3. Appointments & Resignations

Following the resignation of Matthew Faltas I sought to appoint Bobby Clark to the position of CBE Rep. Bobby's appointment was done in consultation with the current CBE Representative James Yang and I believe that they would work well together. Bobby demonstrated a strong understanding of the College and had a number of ideas that were realistic over the remainder of the term.

To note the General Secretary received the resignation of Tess Hemmings for the position of CASS Representative. I take this opportunity to thank her for her work in this space and wish her the best for the future. I will be seeking metrics for the appointment of a new CASS Representative at this meeting.

4. Education Review

I received general support to proceed with working with the ANU on engaging the Hornery Institute on this project. I have participated in a teleconference with the DVC (A) and a representative from the Hornery Institute. I have also had an in person meeting with a representative from the Hornery Institute to discuss the proposal, timelines and their approach.

5. Student Partnerships

A Student Partnership Agreement has been drafted to be between the Academic Board, ANUSA and PARSA. I put a call out for feedback from the SRC. I put a call out to the student body for ideas for projects and engaged the ANU leadership as well for projects in the pipelines. The process of consultation was not ideal but the best that could be done in the timeframe I was afforded.

Preliminary conversations have also been had about the future of the Agreement i.e. it being endorsed by Council to expand its remit. The Agreement was discussed at Academic Board on the day of SRC 5 and I'm glad to report that it has passed.

VICE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Eleanor Kay

Executive Summary:

1. College Rep Support
2. Union Court Working Groups
3. ASAPRG
4. English Language support
5. Changes to teaching structures with the Redevelopment

Further Information:

1. College Rep Support

We're back for the new semester and I will be hoping to meet with you all in due course to see how we get the best out of the next semester together. Looking forward to seeing how you're all going!

I also want to formally thank Tess Hemmings for her hard work as CASS rep so far this year. It is devastating to see Tess go and I'm thankful for the work she's put in. James and Kat will be coordinating finding a new CASS rep, and I'm meeting with Ria in the meantime to make sure CASS students are well represented and supported until we have a new rep.

2. Union Court Working Group

The project coordinators approached me at the end of last semester to assist them in setting up a target group of undergraduate students to provide feedback and insight on the internal designs of the new Teaching and Learning Building in the new Union Court.

I have tentatively suggested that the college reps might be good people to sit on this group, as you all have some insight into the big issues and are already thinking strategically about the space requirements for a teaching building. I will contact you about further details once I have them, but would be keen to know if you're interested. Please let me know.

3. ASAPRG

The ASAPRG are now discussing scholarships! Please see attached item for discussion.

4. English Language Support

We have been coordinating regular English Language Classes in the boardroom, with ASLC running the discussion.

We are continuing these informal classes for semester 2. They are happening 12-1pm Tuesdays and Wednesdays in the boardroom, and 5.30-6.30pm at 71T Balmain Crescent (Alumni Relations). If you are able to circulate this information around your college it would be appreciated.

5. Changes to teaching structures with the Redevelopment

There is a lot of new teaching venues with the redevelopment – 7/11 Barry Drive, Llewellyn Hall, split lectures in Copland and the Tank etc.

A reminder that ANY issues you hear of, please pass them on to me immediately. I will take them straight to Marnie for an immediate fix. The redevelopment shouldn't be affecting our education so if things are not working, we will work towards a solution ASAP if its communicated well.

For example, the accessible pathway from the Pop Up Village to Chifley is no longer only swipe-access – all students can access it 24/7. This change is due to the hard work of Amy Bryan, Deputy Disability Officer, who called out the issue, was willing to put some effort into articulating the issue formally, and I passed it on to the Deputy Vice Chancellor. I thank Amy for her advocacy, and encourage you all that change is possible if we are all communicating effectively!!

Reference C

EDUCATION OFFICER'S REPORT

Robyn Lewis

Please refer to report submitted to SRC 5 for full report.

Reference D

GENERAL SECRETARY'S REPORT

Kat Reed

Please refer to report submitted to SRC 5 for full report.

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE REPRESENTATIVES' REPORT

Emma Boyd & Ashley Wang

Executive Summary:

- 1. Cultural Audit Release and Discussions**
- 2. College Society Committee (CSC)**
- 3. Continuing coordination with student experience coordinators**
- 4. Course Representatives**
- 5. College Rep Meetings**
- 6. Innovation Challenge**
- 7. CSSA Industry Trip**

1. Cultural Audit Release and Discussions

Late last year, an external consultancy was asked to perform a cultural audit of the CECS undergraduate community. The findings from this audit are to be released very soon, and we were asked to attend a meeting last week to discuss the actions that the College has taken since receiving the audit findings, and to discuss how we could coordinate a constructive and proactive response.

While the specific details of this meeting are confidential at this stage, the College intends to ensure appropriate support networks are available for students on the day and following the release of the results. A second panel will also be available a few days after to allow for follow-up questions and to encourage further engagement. The results of the audit have also highlighted a need for conversation between the clubs and societies within CECS. This follows well with the existing plan to establish the CSC.

2. College Society Committee (CSC)

The idea for the College Society Committee was developed in early June this year. The CSC is intended to be a dedicated group made up from clubs/societies affiliated with the college and the purpose of this committee is to improve communication and collaboration for joint events, and to expand the network of student feedback available.

This will be run independently of the Clubs Council, and will focus primarily on student experience, upcoming CECS events and coordination. A similar group has been created in JCOS under the name "Heads of State". While the FB group will be the main point of contact for sharing events within respective groups, we intend to have a formal meeting around twice a semester for a chance to have some face to face discussion.

At it's current stage, expressions of interest have been sent to clubs and societies, and we have received one response from the ESA, though are in conversation with a few others through the cultural audit meetings.

3. Continuing coordination with student experience coordinators

I met up with Ben Swift the computer science SEO before the end of term to catch up and discuss anything student experience is planning and how we can work together.

Key points:

- Females in computer science focused events (eg brunches, talks, etc) in response to cultural audit.
- Possible mental wellness week around week 8
- Suggestions on setting up large student run study events like those run by the CSSA

I am setting up regular meeting with him and Jay Hansen, the current president of the CSSA.

discussed some things student experience is working on in response to the cultural audit and am setting up regular meeting with him and Jay Hansen, the current president of the CSSA.

I (Ash) on behalf of Emma met with Fiona Beck (Engineering SEO) Claire Honeyman (ESA representative) and Nick Barnes (head of the CECS honours program this semester) to discuss improving the system for honors students.

Key points:

- Need to define scope of project and responsibilities of students and supervisors.
- Wattle page should be streamlined and students and supervisors could be given and information pack outlining all the important information on the program.
- Students need to take initiative to contact academics to be their supervisor.
- Students don't know how to deal with a conflict with their supervisor.

Resulting action:

- ESA will take this into account when preparing for their honours information sessions in week 4
- Nick will try to inform students that they should go to him to deal with a conflict.

I will have a similar meeting with Ben Swift to see if there is any room for improvement for honours students on the side of CS.

4. Course Representatives

We have put into progress a plan to meet course representatives from every CECS course. This will let us have a direct link to students in each class at greater frequency than what is offered by the college. By having set dates for specific courses (e.g. all first semester first year engineering courses on one date) provided to students at the course rep training (week 3), a session in week 5 will give students enough time to prepare an adequate report in time for their meeting with heads of school. We can provide them with support, templates for surveys, answer questions. Other students in the course are welcome to attend if there are any issues. Give .5-1hr of time.

5. College Rep Meetings

We have set up a poll for college reps to choose a convenient date and time to have casual meet-up. This would go for approximately an hour in the BKSS and allows reps to have a semi-formal catch up time outside the structure of CRCs or SRCs.

6. Innovation Challenge

Emma has been given the role of Participant Planner

Ash has been given the role of Industry Liaison

It's going well, we have secured funding from SEEF and the CECS student experience fund. Having some trouble getting people to work on outreach to high schools. Sponsorships are going well, received a lot of interest from companies wanting to run a workshop or sponsor the challenge. We are still on track to have everything organised by the time the event comes around.

7. CSSA Industry Trip

Emma and I met with one of the organisers Anh, a general rep for the CSSA and organiser of the industry trip to discuss the trip.

Key Points:

- Funding has been secured from SEEF and the CECS student experience fund.
- Set to happen the week after the end of exams.
- Transport in the process of being booked, accommodation booked.
- Considerations on restricting the number of people going or increasing the target group to have a stricter selection criteria.
- Emma and/or I might contribute and go as an organiser.
- Organisers are working with CECS marketing to get shirts for the participants and material for marketing to use to advertise CECS.
- Potential sponsors have been contacted and are in the process of discussing sponsorship terms.
- Organisers willing to work with the ESA to encourage more engineering students to participate.

We're going to continue meeting up with the organisation team to discuss improving the trip in any way.

COLLEGE OF LAW REPRESENTATIVES' REPORT

Ellie Dowling and Sammy Woodforde

Executive Summary

1. CoL Market Day
2. Careers Panel – Run in conjunction with the LSS Careers
3. CoL Student Committee
4. Handover and Elections

Further Information

1. CoL Market Day

At CRC, this will be happening tomorrow!

We would really love you to pop in throughout the day – have a free coffee or just come say hi! If you can help out with set up or pack down, that would be hugely appreciated. We have over ten stallholders from across the university. It will be a fab day for anyone considering studying law, or if you're studying law, an opportunity to see what is available around the law school. Even if you're not a law student and not interested in being one, there will be information (and of course free food) relevant for everyone, for example Academic Skills and Learning and Teach for Australia.

2. Careers Panel

In conjunction with the LSS Careers Portfolio, we are running a panel discussion event on Wednesday 16 August. This will be exploring a variety of careers in the law, and some of the many ways that one can use a law degree. It will be in Fellows Road Theatre from 6-8pm, with snacks provided! Keep an eye out for the Facebook page, and please share with your law friends!

3. CoL Student Committee

This has been on a pause over the break, but will be resuming over the next month.

4. Handover and Elections

We are working on putting together a comprehensive handover document so that next years reps can keep going in the same vein and not lose time trying to figure out what can easily be passed on! We hope to have this ready for just after the mid-sem break, so we can give it to the incumbent reps before their term starts.

Regarding elections, we have only had a small number of people express interest in the role, but are trying to push it on our public Facebook page as well as Law Students @ ANU.

Discussion Item: 5.2 ASA Project

ANU Scholarships | Deep Green Paper Bases for Awarding of Scholarships

The University Strategic Plan 2017–21 and Academic Plan 2017–21 include the following key admissions, accommodation and scholarship reform initiative:

- Introduce Australia’s first university-wide integrated approach to admissions, accommodation and scholarships which recognises academic and co-curriculum achievements and matches financial support with need and which sets the highest national standards.

The initiative is being realised through the development of a new Admissions-Scholarships-Accommodation (ASA) model at ANU. The model brings together 3 disparate processes together to provide an improved student experience for domestic undergraduate students (phase 1), and will attract a more diverse range of students by inclusion of co-curricular achievements in the calculation of the entrance rank and matching financial support to need. A full review of business processes is running alongside investigation of a technological solution.

The schedule of co-curricular achievements will be much broader than the traditional definition, including areas such as part time work, volunteering, and non-formal caring responsibilities. The broader definition will allow balance between those applicants who have the means and opportunity to participate in activities of choice, and those who engage in their community despite restrictions of time, means and opportunity.

The ASA process will allow the University to package outcomes to the applicant that may include an offer of admission, scholarship and accommodation, subject to eligibility, much earlier in the year. This will enable the University to make offers to a more diverse range of prospective students and provide a more meaningful way of early engagement with them in the lead up to commencement of study.

Deep Green Paper: Scholarships

This paper identifies a range of factors that have been used either at ANU or at another university either nationally or internationally as bases for the awarding of scholarships. Each of these bases have been assessed against the University’s requirements, which are derived from wording of the strategic plan initiative. Further research has identified studies which assess the efficacy of some of these factors against the proposed awarding of scholarships framework.

The bases for the awarding of scholarships are presented strictly alphabetically, in groups. This has been done for ease of navigation.

The recommendations on the bases for the awarding of scholarships are generalised at this early stage, and being considered only in the context of what might be applied

across the university's programs, from the perspective of what scholarship assessment methods could be automated and rolled into the ASA phase 1 process. A number of current scholarships may contain processes not recommended for further investigation, however this paper is not recommending that these be discontinued or changed.

Feedback to this deep green paper will be taken into account, as well the results of further investigations into two admissions models requested by CAAC at its meeting of 20 July, to develop the green paper on scholarships.

Readers of the paper are asked to:

- **Check to see whether the University has excluded any major bases for the awarding of scholarships that ought to be considered as part of its scholarships reform project;**
- **Check the assessment of each of the basis for awarding of scholarships against the University's requirements;**
- **Check the University's interim assessment of each of the basis of the awarding of scholarships; and**
- **Notify the University if there is any additional published research on any of the bases of awarding of scholarships that should be taken into account.**

Consultation and Development Process

Feedback is open on this deep green paper through to 14 August.

While this paper is out for consultation, the co-chairs of the project's reference group, Sarah Hawkins and Ewan Evans, will be available to talk through any aspect of the paper, and to respond to general questions on the project. The co-chairs will also be available to visit College information sessions or College Education Committees, if desired. Please contact eo.dvca@anu.edu.au to ask any questions or determine an appropriate time.

Your local member of the project reference group is also able to discuss aspects as well. Reference Group membership is detailed below on page 3.

After the consideration of feedback to this deep green paper, and the further investigations on the admissions models following the CAAC of 20 July, the University will proceed to a green paper which considers a smaller range of bases for the awarding of scholarships, or a small number of models that combine bases for the awarding of scholarships that are determined to be worthy of further consideration. The Green Paper is expected to be released with the agenda for CAAC 4 on 5 September. Following the CAAC discussion, a white paper detailed the preferred model will be released on or around 12 September, for review, refinement and endorsement at CAAC 5 on 19 October.

The outcomes of this process will determine which scholarships are determined as able to be automated and incorporated into Phase 1 of the ASA Project. A number of current scholarships will not align with the bases that are recommended to proceed in

the green paper and white paper; these scholarships can still be continued however their delivery in Phase 1 of the project may be limited.

ASA Project Reference Group Members

Business Unit/College	Function	Name
Office of the Vice Chancellor	DVC(A) EO	Ewan Evans (Co-chair)
Division of Student Administration	Deputy Registrar, Admissions	Sarah Hawkins (Co-chair)
ANU College of Asia and the Pacific	Deputy Manager, CAP Student Centre	Penny Swan
ANU College of Arts and Social Sciences	Deputy Manager (Graduate), Student & Education Office	Alex Wood
ANU College of Business and Economics	Executive Officer to the Associate Dean (Education)	Louise Barclay
ANU College of Engineering and Computer Science	Marketing and Recruitment Officer	Paul Melloy (Alternate: Natalie Young)
ANU College of Law	Manager, Student Administration	Therese Douglass
ANU College of Medicine, Biology and Environment ANU College of Physical and Mathematical Sciences	Student Administration Manager	Libbie Dinn (Alternate: Caroline Chapman)
Information Technology Services	Solution Architect	Adam Reed
Division of Student Administration	Manager, Domestic Admissions	Cathy Meng
Division of Student Administration	Assistant Registrar, Students	Claire Shrewsbury
Student Recruitment	Manager, Student Recruitment	Julie Murdoch
Division of Student Administration	Deputy Manager, Student Administration and Records	Andrew Coulter
Tuckwell Scholarships	Director	Tim Mansfield

Division of Student Administration	Business Analyst, SBS	Fatima Hicks (Alternate Jonathan Peters) (Alternate: Rim El Kadi)
Division of Student Life	Senior Accommodation Officer	Cathy Firth
Division of Student Life	Deputy Director, Access and Inclusion	Tania Willis
Finance and Business Services	Senior Financial Accountant	Thin Thin Aung
Planning and Performance Management	Manager, Reporting and Analytics	Leone Nurbasari
Undergraduate Student Representative	ANUSA Vice-President	Eleanor Kay
Alumni Relations & Philanthropy	Associate Director, Alumni & Donor Relations	Maree Choenden-Dhongdue
Smith Family	National Manager, Higher Education	Michelle Adam

SUMMARY PAGE

Requirements	Academic Selection Rank / ATAR / Equity Selection Rank	ANU Award	Co-curricular	Curriculum Vitae	First in Family	Halls / Colleges of Residence	Interview	ICSEA	Legacy Status	Location, Remoteness, Distance
Recognises Academic Achievements	G	G	R	G	R	R	A	R	R	R
Recognises co-curriculum commitments and/or achievements	R	G	G	G	R	R	A	R	R	R
Recognises need	A	A	R	R	A	R	A	A	R	A
Enhances diversity, particularly equity	A	G	A	R	A	G	A	G	R	G
Scalable and sustainable	G	G	G	A	A	G	R	G	G	G
Are eligibility requirements objective and transparent	G	A	G	G	G	G	R	G	G	G
Simplicity of model	G	G	A	A	G	G	R	G	G	G
Evidence base of efficacy	A	R	G	R	G	R	R	A	R	A
Not expose the University to major risk	G	A	A	A	G	R	A	G	A	G
Meets privacy and disability legislation	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G

Initial Assessment	I n v e s t i g a t e f u r t h e r	I n v e s t i g a t e f u r t h e r	I n v e s t i g a t e f u r t h e r	D o n o t i n v e s t i g a t e f u r t h e r	I n v e s t i g a t e f u r t h e r	D o n o t i n v e s t i g a t e f u r t h e r	D o n o t i n v e s t i g a t e f u r t h e r	I n v e s t i g a t e f u r t h e r	D o n o t i n v e s t i g a t e f u r t h e r	I n v e s t i g a t e f u r t h e r
---------------------------	--	--	--	---	--	---	---	--	---	--

Key:

G	Appears to satisfy the requirements or meet the specified goal	A	May possibly meet the requirement or goal with additional work tightly defined criteria
---	--	---	---

Group 1: Ac-Cu

No	Requirements	Academic Selection Rank/ ATAR/Equity Selection Rank	ANU Award	Co-curricular	Curriculum Vitae
	Brief Description	<p>A scholarship would be awarded on an applicant's ATAR/Academic Selection Rank/Equity Selection Rank</p> <p>Academic Selection Rank is ATAR that is adjusted to include bonus points for academic subjects</p> <p>Equity Selection Rank is ATAR that is adjusted to include Educational Access Scheme points to recognise low SES status.</p>	<p>An award with associated scholarship given at the end of year 11 to a single student in the school, with the recipient determined by the school according to criteria specified by ANU.</p> <p>Criteria could be specified as a combination of academic achievement and engagement in the school or local community, or target low equity schools or include another equity component.</p>	A scholarship awarded on the basis of demonstrated evidence of engagement in school or community activities	Awarding of a scholarship on a student statement of attainment in academic and co-curriculum endeavours.
1	Recognises Academic Achievements	Yes, reflected in ATAR and the Academic Selection Rank although the Equity Selection Rank also recognises disadvantage.	Yes	No	Yes, with the University suggesting preferable format.
2	Recognises co-curriculum commitments and/ or achievements	No	Yes, criteria could include engagement in school or community activities, caring roles and non-academic relevant achievements.	Yes. Criteria should specify difference between students with means and opportunity to engage in co-curricular activities and those who do so despite time, means and opportunity restrictions.	Yes, with the University suggesting preferable format.
3	Recognises need	The Equity Selection Rank only recognises need through the addition of 5 bonus points.	Possible, if criteria includes a component	No	No

			related to level of disadvantage or need.		
4	Enhances diversity, particularly equity	Overall, no for diversity, although the Equity Selection Rank may enhance equity.	Yes, as each school in Australia could potentially have a recipient.	Possibly, noting that the schedule of recognised activities needs to be broad enough to not privilege students who attend schools that require co-curricular activities to be undertaken.	Not necessarily. Some research has shown that provision of CVs leads to less favourable selection outcomes for women and for Non-English background applicants.
5	Scalable and sustainable	Yes. Adjustments are programmed in by UAC and automatically applied	Yes, as schools determine the scholarship recipients.	Yes, if a methodology for assessment is determined and applied.	No if the format is driven by applicants. However, if completed on a standard, online template, it could possibly be automated,
6	Are relative eligibility requirements objective and transparent	Yes, ANU publishes its bonus points schedule which is linked to the UAC Education Access Scheme	Possibly, if the criteria are clearly identified, noting that the application of the criteria would be at the discretion of the school. Auditing and review would need to be built into the process.	Yes if a schedule of recognised activities is applied.	Yes, in relation to academic and defined co-curricular activities.
7	Simplicity of model	Moderately simple, as ANU favours only one schedule of points.	Fairly simple, however all schools would need to be advised on scholarship conditions and eligibility.	Depends on the range of activities and how much information is captured using open fields.	If it can be completed on a standard template or via a system certified eportfolio. Depends on the range of activities and how much information is captured using open fields.
8	National or international evidence base of efficacy	There is no evidence that the award of a scholarship based on ATAR and Academic Selection Rank and Equity Selection Rank alone encourage attendance or	The Caltex Allrounder Award has been awarded to	Could be considered to be a good predictor of efficacy of scholarship	There is no evidence that a Curriculum Vitae alone can predict

		completion, however it has been shown that scholarships awarded on both academic and merit bases can do so.	75% of high schools across Australia over 31 years but there does not seem to be any evidence available related to efficacy.	awarded on this basis, as research shows that co-curricular involvement is linked to higher attendance and higher academic outcomes.	commitment or academic performance at University. It would be useful in conjunction with other factors determining the award of scholarships.
9	Not expose the University to major business or legal risk	Low risk if only a University-wide, published schedule is used.	Moderate risk as the determination of the recipients of the scholarships would be outside of the University's control.	Moderate risk if schedule is not broadly enough defined.	This would depend on the format of the CV, the information requested, and the degree to which an objective, automated and fair process can be applied.
10	Meets relevant privacy and disability legislation	Yes, points are applied against candidate record, which is protected through institutional agreements on data usage. Arrangement is not contra disability legislation.	Yes, can be managed under privacy legislation. Potential barriers to students with a disability will need to be considered in the criteria.	Yes, if the materials provided meet privacy legislative requirements. Acknowledgement of disability will need to be factored into assessment.	Yes, can be administered under privacy legislation and acknowledgment of disability can be factored into template.
	Further Research	Dr Nadine Zacharias, Professor Brenda Cherednichenko, Dr Juliana Ryan, Dr Kelly George, Ms Linda Gasparini, Ms Mary Kelly, Ms Smitha Mandre-Jackson, Ms Annette Cairnduff and Mr Danny Sun Moving beyond 'acts of faith' effective scholarships for equity students Submitted to the National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education. February 2016. Deakin University. https://www.ncsehe.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Moving-Beyond-Acts-of-Faith-Effective-Scholarships-for-Equity-Students.pdf	No research identified.	Student Involvement in Cocurricular activities and success on the Kansas Mathematics and Reading Assessments. Bill Weber. Thesis submitted towards Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership March 2008. <u>The relationship between extracurricular activities assessed during selection and during medical school</u>	No clear research identified.

				performance Urlings-Strop, L.C., Themmen, A.P.N. & Stegers-Jager, K.M. Adv in Health Sci Educ (2017) 22: 287. Cheryl Keen & Kelly Hall (2009) Engaging with Difference Matters: Longitudinal Student Outcomes of Co-Curricular Service-Learning Programs, The Journal of Higher Education, 80:1, 59-79 Huang, Y. & Chang, S. "Academic and Cocurricular Involvement: Their Relationship and the Best Combinations for Student Growth." Journal of College Student Development, vol. 45 no. 4, 2004, pp. 391-406.	
	Initial Assessment	Investigate further	Investigate further	Investigate further	Do not investigate further

Group 2: F-I

No	Requirements	First in Family	Halls/Colleges of Residence	Interview
	Brief Description	Scholarship awarded on a student being first of their immediate family (parent, sibling or grandparent) to attend University.	Scholarship awarded on the basis of where a student elects to stay while studying at ANU.	A meeting either in person or electronic means with a nominated person or committee to evaluate a person's eligibility for scholarship.

1	Recognises Academic Achievements	No	No	This depends on the c interview, which coul achievements.
2	Recognises co-curriculum commitments and/ or achievements	No	No	Possibly, if the interv questions on this topic
3	Recognises Need	Possibly, if low SES factors or membership of other disadvantage groups have restricted prior family attendance at University.	No	Possibly if interview structured accordingly
4	Enhances diversity, particularly equity	Possibly depending upon family circumstances.	Not on its own, no.	Possibly if interview structured accordingly interview experience some students.
5	Scalable and sustainable	Not necessarily; a Statutory Declaration would be required to establish proof of eligibility and lodged online with application to be reviewed by an assessor.	Yes	No. Interviews will in staff resources. Also some externally funded require interviews.
6	Are relative eligibility requirements objective and transparent	Yes although depends on any additional criteria.	Yes	No, although an inter may be utilised, asses subject to bias of inte show that interviews validity.
7	Simplicity of model	Moderately simply due to the single requirement to provide a statutory declaration and meet academic requirements.	Very simple	Not simple, involves organisation and adm
8	National or international evidence base of efficacy	There is evidence that with both financial assistance and pastoral support for First in Family students leads to enhanced academic and social outcomes.	No evidence of efficacy of this basis of a scholarship over others.	No evidence to show candidates for scholar attendance and compl
9	Not expose the University to major business or legal risk	Low risk, as long as authenticity of documentation is established.	Moderate to high risk as it then places a significant amount of pressure on whether a student is awarded their accommodation preference, to subsequently be eligible for a scholarship.	Moderate to high risk increasing if interview interviews are conduc and or if interviews a quality assurance pro

10	Meets relevant privacy and disability legislation	Yes, can be administered under privacy legislation. Acknowledgement of disability will need to be factored into application.	Yes, can be administered under privacy and disability legislation.	Interviews would have to be conducted in accordance with privacy accommodations made with a disability.
	Further research	<p>Dr Nadine Zacharias, Professor Brenda Cherednichenko, Dr Juliana Ryan, Dr Kelly George, Ms Linda Gasparini, Ms Mary Kelly, Ms Smitha Mandre-Jackson, Ms Annette Cairnduff and Mr Danny Sun. Moving beyond 'acts of faith' effective scholarships for equity students</p> <p>Submitted to the National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education, February 2016. Deakin University</p> <p>https://www.ncsehe.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Moving-Beyond-Acts-of-Faith-Effective-Scholarships-for-Equity-Students.pdf</p>		<p>Burmeister, J. M., Kiehl, J. R. A. and Musher-Eaton, L. S. (2013), Weight bias in college admissions. Obesity, 21(12), 1618-1622. doi:10.1038/s11464-012-1211-2</p> <p>Patterson, F., Knight, G. P., Nicholson, S., Cousa, J. (2016), 'How effective are interventions for obesity? A systematic review' Medical Care, vol 50, no. 1, pp. 36-42.</p> <p>Simonsohn, U., and F. D. L. (2013), 'Bracketing in Judgment: The Case of MBA Admission Interviews.' Psychology of Women Quarterly, no. 2 (February 2013)</p>
	Initial Assessment	Investigate further	Do not investigate further	Do not investigate further

Group 3: Le – Me

No	Requirements	Legacy Status	Location/Remoteness/Distance	Member of Disadvantaged Group/FTB/	Member of an Underrepresented Group
	Brief Description	A person's status as the direct descendant of an alumnus or alumna as the basis for a scholarship.	Scholarships awarded on the basis of distance from university and/or level of remoteness. These could be awarded in addition to Commonwealth Relocation Loans.	Awarding scholarships to specified groups of students who fall into named disadvantaged groups such as Family Tax Benefit, first in family as well as carers, asylum seekers, refugees and care leavers. These categories are subject to change. Primary focus should be financial disadvantage, with other memberships feeding in.	Awarding scholarships to particular groups of students who may be underrepresented at ANU. This group may not have an inherent disadvantage and may be simply underrepresented, for example mature age students.

1	Recognises Academic Achievements	Not on this measure alone.	No	No	No
2	Recognises co-curriculum commitments and/ or achievements	Not on this measure alone.	No	May recognises co-curriculum commitments	No
3	Recognises Need	No	Potentially, noting that SES status is not correlated with the distance from ANU, however some correlation exists with remoteness.	Yes	Not necessarily
4	Enhances diversity, particularly equity	No, unless a legacy cap is set.	Geographic diversity, yes.	Yes	Yes
6	Scalable and sustainable	Yes, as long as alumni information is easily available.	Yes, a strategitforward set of criteria could be developed and applied.	If the groups are strictly defined and coded.	If the groups are strictly defined and coded.
6	Are relative eligibility requirements objective and transparent	Yes, alumni records will substantiate eligibility. However scholarships awarded on this basis alone may discriminate against disadvantaged groups.	Yes	Possibly, if the groups are well defined.	Possibly, if the groups are well defined, noting that membership of an underrepresented group may be fluid.
7	Simplicity of model	Yes, if this is managed by automated process.	Simple.	Possibly, can be difficult to automate the process.	Possibly, can be difficult to automate the process.
8	National or international evidence base of efficacy	No evidence found to show that legacy scholarships impact on attendance or completion.	No evidence that awarding a scholarship on this basis alone enhances success in completion. May enhance attendance.	Studies show that scholarships awarded on both merit (as defined by entry to the University) and need are more effective than those awarded just on need. Research also shows that benefits of financial aid rises substantially when accompanied by mentoring particularly in regard to	Studies show that scholarships awarded on both merit (as defined by entry to the University) and need are more effective than those awarded

				persistence.	just on need. Research also shows that benefits of financial aid rises substantially when accompanied by mentoring particularly in regard to persistence.
9	Not expose the University to major business or legal risk	Possibly, if it was claimed that this basis discriminates against disadvantaged groups.	Low risk if the criteria is clearly defined and publicly available.	Low risk if the criteria is clearly defined and publicly available.	Possible if the group is already seen as advantaged, even though they are underrepresented at ANU.
10	Meets relevant privacy and disability legislation	Yes, this could be managed via application process. Selection will include disabled legacy applicants.	Yes.	Yes, can be administered under privacy legislation and acknowledgement of disability can be factored into application.	Yes, can be administered under privacy legislation and acknowledgement of disability can be factored into application.
	Further research	Ladewski, Kathryn. "Preserving a Racial Hierarchy: A Legal Analysis of the Disparate Racial Impact of Legacy Preferences in University Admissions Policies Were Originally Created To Keep Jewish Students Out Of Elite		Wilson, Z.S., Iyengar, S.S., Pang, SS. et al. Increasing Access for Economically Disadvantaged Students: The NSF/CSEM & S-STEM Programs at Louisiana State University. J Sci Educ Technol (2012) 21: 581. doi:10.1007/s10956-011-9348-6 Dr Nadine Zacharias, Professor Brenda Cherednichenko, Dr Juliana Ryan, Dr Kelly George, Ms Linda Gasparini, Ms Mary Kelly, Ms Smitha Mandre-Jackson, Ms Annette Cairnduff and Mr Danny Sun Moving beyond 'acts of faith' effective scholarships for equity students Submitted to the National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education. February 2016. Deakin University. https://www.ncsehe.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Moving-Beyond-Acts-of-	

		Colleges Gutiérrez, A & Unzueta, M (2012) 'Are admissions decisions based on family ties fairer than those that consider race? Social dominance orientation and attitudes toward legacy vs. affirmative action policies', Journal of Experimental Social Psychology		Faith-Effective-Scholarships-for-Equity-Students.pdf	
	Initial Assessment	Do not Investigate further	Investigate Further.	Investigate Further	Do not investigate further.

Group 4: P - Sc

No		Personal Statement	Portfolio	References	School Rank
	Brief Description	A written or audio-visual statement by a scholarship applicant that either outlines their character and achievements, or which responds to questions about attainments, motivations for and or aptitude for study at an institution	A scholarship decision made on a collection of work such as visual, musical, or maker achievements, which can also include a CV.	Deciding a scholarship on the content of a given number of references that speak to an individual's academic and/or personal qualities.	Awarding a scholarship on the basis of academic rank within a school cohort, which typically reflects grades, level, and number of subjects, and can include vocational results.
1	Recognises Academic Achievements	Depends on what the statement asks the applicant to talk about, noting that it is a self-reporting exercise.	This depends on the nature of the portfolio. Typically it will assess achievements in one area rather than across a spectrum.	Yes but, this is subjective.	Yes, relative to the cohort within a school, rather than system wide.
2	Recognises co-curriculum commitments and/ or achievements	Depends on what the statement asks the applicant to talk about, noting that it is a self-reporting exercise.	It can, particularly if a maker profile is adopted.	Yes, but this is subjective.	No.
3	Recognises Need	Depends on what the statement asks the applicant to talk about, noting that it is a self-reporting exercise	No	No	Possibly, if combined with other measures.
4	Enhances diversity, particularly equity	No. There is no evidence that a personal statement alone enhances diversity or equity. Possibly discriminated against disadvantaged and lower SES students who have had little	Diversity in academic attainment, but not necessarily equity.	No. There is a strong correlation between socio-economic advantage and the quality of the references, and the professional and academic standing of the people who provide the	Yes, as applicant group potentially comes from all schools. May not adequately capture students with a disability who may be underrepresented in the top tier.

		experience in making a personal statement.		references.	
5	Scalable and sustainable	No, unless machine readable, this could be a highly labour intensive process.	No, collection and assessment of portfolios would be extremely labour intensive at scale.	No, as each reference needs to be reviewed individually.	Yes, can be automated, and offers generated either on final year outcomes or on predicted outcome. There may be some level of discomfort around this in schools who are not familiar with ranking processes.
6	Are relative eligibility requirements objective and transparent	Only if applicants respond to specific scholarship criteria in the statement. Assessment could be seen as subjective.	In some disciplines yes, where it would be a necessary component of assessment for a scholarship.	No, there is an element of subjectiveness in both providing and interpreting references.	Yes, if the methodology for ranking and de-identified data on school of origin is available. Differences in grading between Australian educational systems need to be considered.
7	Simplicity of model	No, it introduces a significant, resource intensive layer in scholarship selection.	No, this introduces a significant, resource intensive layer in selection.	No, this introduces a significant, resource intensive layer into the considerations.	Can be automated.
8	National or international evidence base of efficacy	No. There is no evidence that the use of a personal statement to award a scholarship guarantees attendance and completion of a university program.	No.	Evidence suggests that references are weakly correlated with multiple aspects of performance, however there is no evidence that references can predict persistence at tertiary studies when a scholarship is awarded on this basis.	Research shows that persistence in higher education is substantially influenced by non-academic factors and that high school grades are not necessarily good predictors.
9	Not expose the University to major business or legal risk	Moderate to high risk, with risk rating increasing if personal statement assessment is not structured and quality assurance processes applied.	High risk due to subjective determinations.	Moderate to high risk, with risk higher where subjective determinations are more prominent.	Moderate, noting that school ranking at the end of year 11 would be used, not those for the end of year 12.

10	Meets relevant privacy and disability legislation	Yes, can be administered under privacy legislation and acknowledgment of disability can be factored into template.	Unlikely to meet privacy requirements without significant development of appropriate security measures. Unlikely to meet disability legislation	Yes, can be managed under privacy legislation. Potential barriers to obtaining references for students with particular disabilities will need to be considered.	Yes, can be managed under privacy legislation. Potential barriers to students with a disability will need to be considered.
	Further research	Medical school personal statements: a measure of motivation or proxy for cultural privilege. Wright, S. <i>Adv in Health Sci Educ</i> (2015) 20: 627	No relevant evidence identified.	Kuncel, N. R., Kochevar, R. J. and Ones, D. S. (2014), A Meta-analysis of Letters of Recommendation in College and Graduate Admissions: Reasons for hope. <i>Int J Select Assess</i> , 22: 101–107	Braun, S & Dwenger, N (2009) Success in the university admission process in Germany: regional provenance matters. <i>High Educ</i> (2009) 58:71–80 McFarlin et al (2014) The Texas Ten Percent Plan's Impact on College Enrollment. <i>EducationNext</i> 14(3) Camara, Wayne J.; Echternacht, Gary (July 2000): The SAT[®] I and High School Grades: Utility in Predicting Success in College. Wayne J.; Echternacht, Gary. <i>Information Analysis, College Entrance Examination Board New York.</i> July 2000. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED446592
	Initial Assessment	Do not investigate further	Do not investigate further	Do not investigate further	Investigate further

Group 6: Su-Z

No		School Recommendation	Subject Performance
	Brief Description	Scholarship based on a recommendation from the school, on criteria specified by the University.	Academic profile of the scholarship recipient
1	Recognises Academic Achievements	Yes, if detailed in the required criteria.	Yes, in the specification
2	Recognises co-curriculum commitments and/ or achievements	Yes, if detailed in the required criteria.	No.
3	Recognises Need	Only if need is included in University set criteria.	No
4	Enhances diversity, particularly equity	Possibly, depending on criteria.	No. There is no strong correlation with SES.
5	Scalable and sustainable	Yes, as schools determine the scholarship recipients.	Yes, can be automated
6	Are relative eligibility requirements objective and transparent	Not completely. Subjective matters may come into play for some students.	Yes, if the method of selection is available
7	Simplicity of model	Complex in requiring ongoing engagement with schools to ensure criteria are appropriately applied.	Moderately complex secondary subject
8	National or international evidence base of efficacy	Data has been tabled to CAAC demonstrating diversification of admission and performance of students once admitted.	No published evidence of performance or efficacy
9	Not expose the University to major business or legal risk	Depending on a student's relationship with their school the university could be exposed to lawsuits as a joint defendant with a candidate's school.	Moderate, as the university is not the primary subject of the scholarship
10	Meets relevant privacy and disability legislation	Yes, can be managed appropriately.	Yes, can be managed with a disability
	Further research	No peer reviewed at this stage.	No peer reviewed
	Initial Assessment	Do not investigate further	Do not investigate further

Item # Scholarships Strategy

Purpose

To define the scope of scholarships work in the ASA project.

Recommendations

1. That the findings from conversations with Colleges and central service divisions be noted;
2. That Colleges consider and provide feedback on the Deep Green Scholarships Paper by 14 August.
3. Note that the following scholarship items are in scope to be delivered by the ASA Project for 2019 release:
 - a. Domestic undergraduate school leaver scholarships only, with processes identified as able to be automated (Tier 0 and Tier 1 only)
 - b. A central automated process for scholarships in instances where the scholarships are awarded based on a defined set of criteria, for example, an applicant from a financial disadvantaged background.

- c. Enable the capture of and access to undergraduate admission scholarship data in central repositories, including available balances.
 - d. Map out the scholarship lifecycle as a business process, indicating which areas have responsibility for each element of the lifecycle.
 - e. To increase reporting capability and oversight of scholarships, ensure timely integration with a number of key internal systems, including but not limited to, Student Administration System, Razors Edge, Insight and the finance system.
 - f. NMS and NUS funds be repurposed to align with the new admissions model, once decided;
 - g. To ensure appropriate information availability for students, all domestic undergraduate school leaver scholarships have a consistent application deadline and can be applied for through the ASA portal, whether or not they have a manual consideration process.
 - h. A revised scholarships policy and procedure, capturing strategic intent aligned with the outcomes of discussions arising from the scholarships deep green paper, to inform internal and external conversations on the establishment of scholarships.
4. Note that out of scope for implementation by the ASA Project but implemented in parallel by the University for 2019 release, the University:
- a. As per the recommendations of the Scholarships Working Party, consider implementing a University Scholarship Oversight and Selection Committee to manage consideration of scholarships and exceptions, where possible, removing subjectivity and duplication and allowing academic time to be spent on research and teaching.
 - b. That College Scholarship Committee staff who still wish to be involved in scholarships are provided with the opportunity to mentor scholarship recipients
 - c. Consolidate scholarship funds and availability where possible, to seek to optimise benefits to the most disadvantaged students; commence through a full mapping of used and unused funds against the framework provided by the Scholarships Working Party.
 - d. Consolidate scholarship funds from donors, moving from multiple, small funds to one main fund, where possible and that future scholarship discussions with potential donors are framed from the recommendations arising from the Deep Green Paper.
 - e. Alongside consolidation, implement changes to the conditions of award for unused scholarships ensuring funds are able to be allocated to students rather than not awarded.
 - f. Should ensure integration of scholarship data repositories through the data integration project.
5. That non-school leaver, international, and postgraduate scholarships are out of scope for the project, but may be a valid cohort for scholarship considerations.
6. That Colleges consider scholarships marked as Tier 2 to determine whether they will revise the application and evaluation processes to allow them to be considered as Tier 1, and advise any such scholarships for inclusion into the automated ASA process and timing to eo.dvca@anu.edu.au by 30 September 2017.
7. That administration for scholarships that remain as Tier 2 or Tier 3 continue to reflect current practice and are not considered for automation.

ACTION REQUIRED

For discussion For decision For information For College Response

Executive Summary of Issues

This document details the discussions and outcomes of the stakeholder consultations held with ANU Colleges and Central Service Divisions. The purpose of the stakeholder consultations was to:

- Validate and baseline the list of in scope scholarships available within ANU Colleges and Central Service Divisions;
- Understand at a high level the business processes for the management of scholarships;
- Capture the issues and opportunities for improvements identified by stakeholders; and
- Provide scope recommendations for phase 1 of the Admissions, Scholarships and Accommodation project.

This document supports the Scholarships deep green paper which will be circulated to the wider ANU community for consultation.

Alignment with ANU Strategic Plan 2016-2020 and ANU Academic Plan

3.2 of the ANU Strategic Plan indicates that “We will create and modify our practice, policies and culture so that admission, retention, and success for students and staff is based on ability and endeavour, whatever their backgrounds or identities.” The appropriate allocation of scholarships realises this goal. A13 of the Academic Plan indicates we will “introduce Australia’s first university-wide integrated approach to admissions, accommodation and scholarships which recognises academic and co-curriculum achievements and matches financial support with need and which sets the highest national standards.”

Background

Findings

Current domestic undergraduate scholarships

Through the stakeholder meetings and a review of the Central and College websites, the scholarships available for domestic undergraduates available upon admission are recorded in the attached spreadsheet (Appendix A). A summary of the information is below:

- Across the University (both College and Central) there are a total of 47 scholarship types available for domestic undergraduates available upon admission, with some scholarship types being awarded to multiple applicants.
- There are approximately 92 individual scholarships on offer amongst Colleges, totalling almost \$470,000 pa. *(Please note that this figure does not include scholarships on offer that cover part/full cost of tuition or on-campus accommodation costs).*
- Across the University (both College and Central) there are approximately 2 scholarships on offer to cover on-campus accommodation costs.
- Across the University (both College and Central) there are approximately 2 scholarships on offer to cover part or full tuition fees for the duration of the program.
- Colleges scholarship eligibility was mixed between specific course criteria and needs based, for example rural background.
- The following table details the number of Central scholarships offered and accepted in 2017:

Scholarship	Amount	Offer	Offer \$	Accepted	Accepted \$
National University Scholarship (ATAR 99.90 - 99.95)	\$12,500.00	83	\$1,037,500.00	24	\$300,000.00
National Merit Scholarship (ATAR: 99.75 - 99.85)	\$6,500.00	56	\$364,000.00	28	\$182,000.00
National Indigenous University Scholarship (ATAR 95.00 - 99.95)	\$12,500.00	8	\$100,000.00	2	\$25,000.00
National Indigenous Merit Scholarship	\$6,500.00	12	\$78,000.00	2	\$13,000.00

(ATAR 90.00 - 94.95)					
ANU Region Scholarship	\$6,500.00	8	\$52,000.00	6	\$39,000.00
Total Amounts		167	\$1,631,500.00	62	\$559,000.00

Notes: The costs displayed are for the first year only.

Issues

The following issues were identified from discussions with the above Stakeholders for not only scholarships offered to domestic undergraduate students on admission but all types of scholarships and grants across the University. Most of the issues were previously captured in the Scholarships Working Party paper:

- A majority of the areas advised that not all scholarship funds were being fully used and in some cases not awarded at all. This is a result of:
 - Limited marketing and promotion of scholarships resulting in a lack of scholarship applications. This indicated that students were not aware of the scholarships available or applicable to them.
 - Conditions of Award for each scholarship were out of date and in some cases the eligibility criteria was too restrictive.
- Overwhelmingly there was a lack of information on the finances, particularly not knowing how much money was available for which scholarship. As a result some scholarships are being funded from recurrent funding where endowment funds were available.
- There was an unclear delineation of responsibilities not only between Colleges and the Central Service Divisions but within Colleges themselves. Most Colleges were working to streamline and centralise processes within the Colleges which has seen some positive improvements.
- All areas indicated that it was difficult to have a full oversight of scholarships in their area as there is no central source of truth to record and map scholarships, particularly between systems. This makes reporting, both locally and centrally, difficult and ad hoc. Apart from drawing data manually from different sources into a spreadsheet, there is no way to automatically report on recipients of scholarships, name of scholarship, the funding source, the remaining funds to be paid the recipient and the remaining funds within the total scholarship fund. One particular College advised that they are currently relying on a student to inform them that a payment has not been made or is overdue to know that the recipient has been awarded a scholarship.
- Several College areas advised that they have multiple selection committees to assess and award scholarships where the process is not always transparent. Some Colleges have commenced streamlining their processes by implementing a central selection committee with clear and transparent processes for all scholarships in their area.
- The majority of scholarships are managed manually with spreadsheet stored locally decreasing visibility and understanding of scholarships as a whole across the University.
- A number of Colleges noted that there were issues and delays in updating scholarship information on the central scholarships website. There was frustration from not only the students that they were not able to obtain up to date information, but frustration from the donors that current information was not displayed. Also information on scholarships is often repeated on local websites and at times inconsistent with the central scholarships website.
- The process of adding the scholarship details in the Student Administration System to the student's record so that it appears on their transcript is manual and at times, it was reported, that it did not occur.
- AR&P advised that they were now documenting the funds purpose statement at a high level and not down to the level of specifics of who will be awarded the funds. This is to ensure that the scholarship will stand the test of time. For example, a scholarship fund that is set up to apply to a very specific course may not stay relevant over time, particularly if the course is discontinued. This causes issues when the University needs to amend the fund purpose statement as the donor may have passed on or is uncontactable. At times the change needs to go through parliament before it can be used again.
- All areas raised the concern on the current timing of awarding scholarships as there is a disconnect between students receiving their admission offer and a possible scholarship offer. Most areas indicated that the University was not converting offers into enrolments because of this disconnect. All areas welcomed a change to this process and were very supportive of having a packaged offer.

- Scholarship funds not being used due to a lack of oversight and therefore the University is potentially missing out on attracting prospective students who could benefit from the scholarship funds.
- During the consultations it was identified that there were multiple processes and systems for students to apply for scholarships across the University. For example, some were via an online form, while others were a paper based form and some via email. This is contributing to the confusion and understanding of scholarships as a whole.
- A number of Colleges advised that there is a lot of duplication in the scholarship process, both from an applicant and ANU perspective, for example:
 - Students will apply for multiple scholarships and have to repeat the application details for each application,
 - In order to complete assessment of a student, information has to be retrieved from multiple sources and at times required Colleges to repeat assessment that has already been carried out by the ANU Admissions team.

Improvements

From the consultations, the following improvements were identified by stakeholders though were not prioritised:

- One application for admission and scholarship with clearly defined timelines.
- Ensuring that the applicant has comprehensive information to understand:
 - What scholarships they are eligible for at the time they submit their application for admission; and
 - If they will qualify for a scholarship at the time they accept their offer of admission.
- More scholarships automatically awarded based on eligibility criteria, for example, applicants from low socio-economic backgrounds.
- A secure central source of truth to record scholarship and funding information, particularly, the scholarship name, funding source, recipient and the remaining funds to be paid to the recipient and the remaining funds within the total scholarship fund. This should also include the ability to easily report donor impact.
- A more standardised process for the management of scholarships across the University, including mandatory reviews of Conditions of Award, for example, biannually.
- Automatically recording of awarding of scholarships in the Student Administrative System to ensure that the scholarship appears on the student's transcript.
- The ability for the student to view the remaining balance of the scholarship.
- Consolidating scholarships, where possible, and encouraging less restrictive Conditions of Award.
- Clarification and agreement on the definitions of a scholarship, award and prize.

Conclusions

Following the stakeholder consultations, it was evident that there were significant issues and inconsistencies in the scholarships process and management of funds within Colleges and Central Service Divisions. The scholarships process within each of these areas appears highly manual with a high number of paper based forms and significant duplication of processes. The majority of the areas indicated that information is stored in multiple locations on Excel spreadsheets, making it difficult to locate information or to have full oversight of scholarships in their area or across the University. A major problem with the lack of oversight is that there are scholarship funds not being used and therefore the University is potentially missing out on attracting prospective students who could benefit from the scholarship funds.

While the issues surrounding the management of scholarships are already well known, there is overwhelming support from the stakeholders to implement improvements. A number of Colleges and Central Service divisions indicated that they have already commenced process improvements by streamlining their internal scholarships processes and consolidating scholarship funds. It was apparent that the changes are having some positive impacts on the administration of scholarships.

While there are still a high number of issues to be resolved, Stakeholders are able to understand how the issues will be assisted by the Admissions, Scholarships and Accommodation (ASA) project. For example Stakeholders can see that the project will deliver the ability for the University to consolidate scholarships into a single application process and improve integration with scholarship data.

Overwhelmingly Stakeholders indicated they were very committed to the outcomes of the ASA project and could see how the outcomes would benefit both the University and the applicant.

Consultation and discussion record

The following table details the stakeholder consultations held with ANU Colleges and Central Service Divisions.

Area	Stakeholder(s)	Date
STAR, DSA	Andrew Coulter, Deputy Manager Lori Dent, Manager	Tuesday 6th June 2:00pm – 2:30pm
CASS	Alex Wood, Deputy Manager, Student Education Office Deborah Veness, Manager and Senior Educational Developer Student & Education Office	Thursday 15 th June 10:30am – 11:30am
CAP	Suzy Andrew, Manager, Education Services Jennah Robichaud, Deputy Manager, Student Mobility & Support Services	Monday 19 th June 12:00pm – 1:00pm
CBE	Marina Naumoska, Student Engagement Coordinator Administration Janelle Ireland, Manager, Student Engagement	Tuesday 20 th June 10:00am – 10:30am
CMBE CPMS	Caroline Chapman, Senior Officer, Student Administration – Coursework Sue Cossetto, Sub Dean (Student Experience)	Tuesday 20 th June 1:30pm – 2:00pm
Law	Bea Hogan, Executive Assistant to the Dean of Law	Wednesday 21 st June 2:00pm – 2:30pm
AR&P	Tracey Guest, Endowment Officer, Advancement Services	Thursday 22 nd June 2:30pm – 3:00pm
CECS	Natalie Young, Student Administration	Tuesday 27 th June 3:00pm – 3:30pm
A&I, DSL	Tania Willis, Deputy Director	Wednesday 28 th June 2:30pm – 3:00pm
Tjabal Centre	Robyn Dass, Senior Project Officer Jayde Williams, Recruitment and Community Engagement Coordinator Cathleen Nansen, Academic and Student Support Coordinator	Monday 3 rd July 10:00am – 10:30am

Sponsor

Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Authors

Business Analysts, ITS

Attachments

Appendix A: Current undergraduate ANU scholarships, with proposed tiers

Attendance List

Executive

- James Connally
- Eleanor Kay

College Reps

- CASS
 - Ria P
- JCOS
 - No
- CAP
 - No
- COL
 - Ellie Dowding
- CBE
 - Bobby Clarke
 - James Yang
- CEC
 - Ashley Wang
 - Emma Boyd

Gen Reps

- Howard Maclean
- Harry Needham
- Lewis Pope
- Tanika Sibal
- Fred Hanlin
- Arjun