

## School / College Award Title

**Brief background to the award:** This should include justification for the creation of the award and background information as to why it is being established. If the award is named for a sponsor, benefactor or in tribute to a particular individual, there should be some detail about their connection to the programme/subject/school/unit, or to UCD, as well as a brief one-line description of who they are, e.g., 'major international engineering firm'; 'Professor of Economics at UCD for over 20 years', etc. If abbreviations or acronyms are used for the name of a company/sponsor of an award, these should be delineated where they are not widely known.

**Eligibility criteria:** In line with the ACCASP Terms of Reference, ACCASP "Approve and periodically review criteria, conditions and regulations associated with all university merit-based scholarships and prizes." Awards, scholarships, and prizes which are not merit-based should be managed locally by the College/School. Eligibility criteria should be defined in specific, measurable terms. 'Highest stage GPA' or 'highest thesis grade' is preferable to terms like 'best essay', 'best student', 'academic merit'. If the award is linked to a student's performance in a particular module, the module title and code should be noted. Eligibility criteria should also state what should happen in the event of a tie, in clear and unambiguous language.

**Value:** The monetary value of the award, if applicable. If there are multiple prizes or amounts awarded, this should be specified, e.g., if there are first, second and third-place awardees for a prize, with each receiving a different amount. In principle, the ACCASP committee suggests that awards of a monetary value of less than €200 should not be deemed University Awards and should be dealt with locally in Schools/Colleges. However, it is recognised that even awards that are not of substantive monetary value, such as medals, are significant achievements and students may wish them to be recorded on transcripts. If the scholarship is in the form of a fee remission or concession, rather than a sum of money, this should be clearly indicated in the award description.

**Funding details:** This row should specify whether the funding for the award is being provided at school or college level, or by a third-party sponsor; and the duration for which funding is currently guaranteed. If the proposed award is a prize/medal, or an award, ensure funding is in place to cover provision of this medal for the minimum recommended minimum duration (10 years). If the proposed award is a scholarship/bursary ensure that funding is in place to cover provision of this scholarship/bursary for the recommended minimum duration (5 years).

**Local Approval Committee & Date:** This section should note the board and meeting date at which the new award proposal was approved - rather than the board/meeting date which will determine and approve the winner(s) of the award. All new awards require approval from the respective programme board (undergraduate) or college graduate school board (postgraduate) associated with the programme for which it is being awarded.

**Any other information:** If the student must apply for a scholarship or award, details of the application procedure or website link for further information should be included, along with

any relevant deadlines and school/unit contact details.

Any terms and conditions governing the award, beyond what has been noted in the eligibility criteria, should go here – e.g., for graduate scholarships of more than 1 year's duration might note that renewal of the scholarship is subject to a report of satisfactory progress from the supervisor at the end of the first year.

If there is another committee or panel involved in the selection/evaluation of students, this should be named and the composition outlined: e.g., 'candidates will be evaluated by a panel consisting of two members of academic staff, one representative from the sponsor, and the Head of Teaching & Learning for the School.'

The most common reasons why awards are not approved and require resubmission are:

- A lack of detail regarding the criteria for the award and procedures to be followed in the event of a tie, especially in instances where a tie seems probable. Schools may be asked to review the previous three to five years to judge the future likelihood of a tie in a particular programme.
- Due to the composition of the selection committee, where an interview or other qualitative process is specified (representatives of corporate or other donors may be included, but panels should be Chaired by and have a majority of UCD representatives)
- Programme Board/College/School approval details and dates are not provided on the submission form, or the details of the board/meeting date which will determine and approve the winner(s) of the award are included here, instead of the board/meeting date at which the new proposal was approved.
- That the duration of the award needs to be specified, along with the maximum number of students between which an award is to be divided
- Due to a lack of clarity in relation to the eligibility criteria. The eligibility criteria need to be described in specific, measurable terms. Where eligibility is linked with a specific module(s) the module code(s) and title(s) must be noted.

**August 2022**