

Common reasons that applicants were not successful in Round 1 of the Commonwealth Scholarships Program for South Australia

Successful applicants are selected through a competitive, merit based selection process against selection criteria and other considerations as set out at Section 6 of the Program Guidelines. Scholarships are awarded to eligible applicants to undertake an Approved Program of Study in line with the Program objectives.

In accordance with the Program Guidelines, unsuccessful applicants may submit a new application in Round 2. Unsuccessful applicants should include new or more information to address any weaknesses that may have prevented their previous application from being successful.

The Scholar Application Form (accessible via an online portal or easy access form through <http://commonwealth-scholarships-sa.com.au/>) provides guidance on what constitutes a strong response for Criterion 1 and Criterion 2. Please consider this guidance when applying for Round 2.

As per Section 7.7 of the Program Guidelines unsuccessful applicants may ask for feedback on their application by contacting the Commonwealth Scholarships Program for South Australia Team on 8364 8581 or emailing SAScholarships@scopeglobal.com

The following generic feedback based on Round 1 applications may also assist applicants in preparing their applications.

Reasons why applicants were deemed ineligible

The most common reasons were:

1. Applicant did not provide evidence of Australian citizenship/Permanent residence, for example:
 - a. a copy of their Citizenship / Dual Citizenship Certificate; or
 - b. a copy of their passport; or
 - c. a copy of their birth certificate; or
 - d. a copy of their Visa label or a Visa Entitlement Verification Online (VEVO) check.
2. Applicant did not provide evidence of enrolment/acceptance/application into a proposed program of study.
 - a. Applicant did not provide evidence such as:
 - i. a copy of an Admission Letter or Confirmation of Enrolment from an education or training provider into an intended or current Program of Study; or
 - ii. a copy of a Provisional Offer from an education or training provider for an intended program of study; or
 - iii. a copy of a proof of application to a provider for an intended program of study.
 - b. Applicant provided an incomplete offer letter i.e. the letter did not include the proposed program of study/the start date of the course/did not indicate the education or training provider.
 - c. Applicant stated an intention to enrol in a program of study, but had not applied at the time of application.
3. Applicant did not meet the age requirement of being 15-64 years of age at commencement of study.
4. Applicant living in South Australia did not provide evidence of current residency.

5. Scholarships are aimed at new students commencing an Approved Program of Study, however, consideration will be given to applicants currently undertaking their first year of study or training. In some cases, the applicant was either not in their first year of study or training or was not commencing in 2018 (for example, documentation showed the applicant began study prior to 2017, or deferred past 2018).
 - a. In some cases, the applicant was enrolled in a single program of study that included an Honours component as part of the degree (i.e. not a stand-alone Honours degree) but had commenced prior to 2017. The start date of the program is used to determine eligibility.
 - b. Applicant was enrolled in a combined Bachelor/Master's Degree program, with the Bachelor component commencing prior to 2017. As the proposed program of study is considered a single degree (i.e. a single parchment is received at graduation) the start date of the Bachelor's degree is used to determine eligibility.

Reasons why programs of study were deemed ineligible or the proposed provider was not supported

The most common reasons were:

1. Applicants applying to study in a field relevant to a business with innovative practices were not currently employed or did not provide written confirmation from their employer that their program of study was directly related to the innovative practices of the business.
2. Applicants applied under Stream 3 for an occupation assessed at the national level only, rather than the Skill Shortage List for South Australia.
3. Applicants applied for programs of study that did not align with the relevant ANZSCO codes under the Skill Shortage List for South Australia.

Reasons why eligible candidates were not successful in responding to the selection criteria

Selection criterion 1 is about how the applicant's proposed program of study provides a pathway to employment in one or more of South Australia's priority industries. Considerations sought for selection criterion 1 include:

- Detail on how the program of study links to the stream for which the applicant is applying
- Outline of the anticipated educational, skills and occupational outcomes of the study
- Articulation of how the proposed program of study provides a pathway to employment relevant to a priority industry

Selection criterion 2 is about an applicant's commitment to completing their study or training and internship and how a scholarship will assist the applicant. Considerations sought for selection criteria question 2:

- Identification of a clear pathway and intent to support the applicant's career goals relevant to a priority industry
- Outline of previous study or training experience (where relevant)
- Indication of the applicant's pursuit of continuous learning
- Indication of the applicant's commitment to undertaking an internship
- Clear outline of the applicant's motivation for applying for the scholarship and how the scholarship supports their goals

The most common reasons why candidates were not successful were:

1. The applicant provided a generic response that indicated multiple potential career pathways, but did not specifically link a pathway to employment relevant to a priority industry;
2. The applicant's response was copied from a course website and was not tailored to address the selection criteria
3. The applicant did not sufficiently address the selection criteria and in some instances only wrote one or two sentences under each criterion which only indicated their program of study and why they needed the scholarship

Industry advice on skills needs

1. In some cases, advice from industry professionals and national industry experts from priority industries did not confirm the proposed program of study or occupational or skills outcome directly related to the skills required for jobs needed in those industries.