The Australian Council of State School Organisations would like to thank the Higher Education Standards panel for the opportunity to speak with the Admissions Transparency Implementation Working Group last Monday. We had great opportunity to give our voice to the great work undertaken and wish you well.

One of the parent concerns raised last year with the panel was the inconsistency of information provided for young people in selecting the university courses to most suit their needs. We are pleased that this is being addressed and extremely grateful that the Higher Education institutions are all on board.

1. Is the proposed approach likely to be effective in increasing transparency and public understanding of how contemporary admissions to higher education work?

This particular template of information covers a diverse range of material that would ensure a consistency of knowledge distribution for all institutions with a contact should the family have further enquiries.

The unpacking of terminology and the use of consistent language would serve well for understanding each of the university admissions requirement

2. How achievable are the proposed implementation timelines, including commitments to deliver a ‘best endeavours’ version of the proposed information sets to inform students applying to enter study in the 2018 academic year?

The timeline for completion is extremely tight – idealistically students and families, especially in our rural and remote schools would like this for the commencement of 2018, but it is a rather large task and it needs to be done effectively to ensure its integrity

3. If there would be difficulty in delivering the commitments proposed, what could be changed to make them achievable?

2018 could be a trial year – or an agreed terminology and format. It is important that evaluation is conducted and there is the ability to make amendments as the work is implemented

4. Do you have any comments on the proposed four broad groupings to describe the basis of admission for applicants to higher education? a. Recent secondary education b. Previous higher education study c. Previous vocational education and training (VET) study d. Work and life experience
Mature age students would probably like to see greater detail with regard the “work life and experience”. This could be in the form of examples.

5. Do you agree that the proposed approach to Australian Tertiary Admission Rank (ATAR) thresholds is reasonable (i.e. replacing the use of the terms “cut-off” and “clearly in” with functional terms describing the lowest ATAR made an offer in the relevant period?).

We believe this is very clear – the emphasis needs to be made on the fact that it is “last year’s data” and that there is no guarantee

What issues or difficulties, if any, might this raise? Young people falling within the ATAR range published not being successful - Or those who are struggling being despondent about not being able to achieve their goal. Careers advisors and / or Year advisors need to be aware of the alternate pathways

6. Do the proposed “information sets” meet the need identified by the Higher Education Standards Panel for comparability of the information available from different providers about the requirements to be admitted to study at each institution and each course that they deliver?

We believe that to be the case

Many thanks

Phillip Spratt
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