

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: 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 the most recent ACCASP annual report, it had been determined that: *In principle, the 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. The Committee suggests that the terms "Scholarships" and "Prizes" be used, and the term "Award" avoided, to enable a clear distinction to be made.* 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 medal, ensure funding is in place to cover provision of this medal for the minimum recommended award duration (10 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. If the New Award Proposal form has been submitted prior to the award being approved by the relevant board, the future meeting date at which the proposal will be tabled should be indicated here. If everything else is in order with the award, ACCASP may provisionally approve it pending the programme board decision.

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., 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, where relevant, 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 ACCASP annual report (February 2018) outlined the most common reasons why awards are not approved and require resubmission. Most commonly, further information is required in relation to:

- *Exact criteria for the award and procedures to be followed in the event of a tie*
- *Involvement in 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 – may be missing, or it may be unclear whether the award has been approved or is pending approval. 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.*

In almost all cases, these issues are resolved and approval granted at the next ACCASP meeting following the provision of feedback.