

ENTRY STRATEGIES TO AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES AND HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Deirdre M Cobbin, Allen R Barlow, J Paul Gostelow

Evaluative Studies Research Group, University of Technology, Sydney and University of Western Sydney, Nepean

Increasingly Australian universities are offering alternative methods of entry to their undergraduate programs for people who do not have the required HSC (or equivalent examination) score. In many instances, the institution has developed a preparatory program, or some other Access and Equity instrument that becomes the substitute prerequisite for tertiary entry.

In 1991, while examining the Access and Equity programs at the Universities of Western Sydney, Wollongong and Newcastle, it was apparent that even within the one institution, many staff were not aware of their institution's preparatory programs, or were misinformed about prerequisites or the undergraduate programs which accept this entry method. In many instances, this state of affairs existed despite repeated attempts by relevant staff to keep others informed.

A contributing factor is that while universities provide detailed outlines of their formal undergraduate and postgraduate offerings in handbooks, this is not generally the case with their Access and Equity programs. As a result, many academic and non-academic staff alike are unaware of the exact target and purpose of such programs offered by their own university. This internal lack of awareness of programs also contributes to problems in gaining uniform recognised guidelines across all faculties within any one institution.

While such programs do from time to time receive their share of media attention, what has not been available is a readily locatable reference that can be consulted when required. Even more desirable, in addition to these institution-wide entries, would be a single handbook detailing all relevant Access and Equity programs offered in Australia. This became the goal of a project undertaken by the Evaluative Studies Research Group, a cross institutional research group involving staff from the University of Technology, Sydney and the University of Western Sydney, Nepean.

Applications of a National Register

Apart from the obvious benefits for potential applicants, for teaching staff, and for counsellors when advising relevant students, such a centralised documentation would serve to bring the existence of Access and Equity programs to the attention of tertiary academic staff generally. This general awareness would provide the first real opportunity to compare and weigh up the merits of the various programs. This is necessary if any meaningful comparison of the 'accreditation potential' of various programs is to take place.

At present, it is highly likely that vast discrepancies exist in relation to the breadth of tertiary entry opportunity provided by different Access and Equity programs that have very similar content. Only when the content of programs can be examined and comparisons made across programs, can uniformity of entry potential even begin to be considered.

In addition, redundancy among offerings in the same geographic area could be reduced if institutions cooperated to offer different modes of presentation for similar programs, so that a wider potential target group could be addressed by the institutions together. For example, one institution might offer an external rather than an evening program; or each institution might address different specific target groups.

Thus the information collected for the publication of the National Register has the potential to become the basis for far wider research and evaluation undertakings such as:

identification of particular classifications of programs in relation to target group, mode of presentation, geographic region, program content and tertiary entry status.

expansion of such findings to determine why particular groups of students become targets for particular courses/content areas; and which groups warrant being targeted but currently, are not.

investigation of the causes of particular deficits identified within specific target groups. For example, one investigation that is already being developed, concerns programs that target Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. One third of the Access and Equity alternative entry programs offered in relation to higher education institutions in Australia specifically target Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. The content and teaching strategies involved vary widely and invite further investigation of the success of these students (for example, in terms of subsequent undergraduate entry and or performance).

Preparation of the Register

In compiling the Register, only preparatory programs offered by higher education institutions and TAFE based programs run in conjunction with such institutions, have been included. The programs of some non-higher education institutions have been included where preparing students for university entrance is part of their charter. For example, Tranby College in New South Wales offers possibly the most widely recognised tertiary entry program for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. Batchelor College in the Northern Territory specialises in the provision of education programs for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders from traditionally oriented communities and in fact strives to deliver programs

within traditional communities.

TAFE based programs and ELICOS programs have been excluded, apart from a random sample of seven examples of programs offered exclusively for overseas students, which were included to indicate the style of program offered to such students, however designation as 'Access and Equity' offerings does not appear particularly appropriate. The arguments are well known, among academic staff and more widely among sections of the community concerning the offering of programs exclusively to non Australian students, particularly in view of the guaranteed tertiary entry that commonly accompanies such programs. Some view this as discriminatory against Australian students while others regard it as 'the thin edge of the wedge' with full fee payment being extended gradually to become the norm for all students.

Irrespective of such debate, it was disappointing to find that among the small sample of institutions that offered high fee attracting preparatory programs for overseas students, two did not provide any form of Access and Equity program for local students. In addition, the former programs tend to enjoy wide recognition among other tertiary institutions which is not the case for the majority of preparatory programs for local target groups.

Data for the Register entries were collected between October 1991 and February 1992. The Higher Education Division of the Department of Education, Employment and Training (DEET) provided valuable assistance in the identification of all relevant institutions. Letters were sent to the Registrars (or equivalent) for all DEET funded higher education institutions (and Tranby College) and to Bond University. The letter outlined the project and requested the Registrar's assistance in obtaining the data. The letter was accompanied by a form listing the information required from the institution for each of its programs. The Registrar was requested to forward the material to relevant staff members in the institution for completion and return to the research group. Brochures and other information provided to prospective students of the programs were

also requested.

In view of the comparative isolation of many Access and Equity programs and their staff within an institution, a similar follow-up letter and request was posted to each institution's EO unit and where identified, to Aboriginal Liaison units.

By December it became obvious that incomplete information was being provided by a number of institutions. In many cases, staff simply were not aware of other programs within their institution, or who were the relevant staff. It was not uncommon for information to be provided for all programs apart from those for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander groups. This stemmed from the latter programs being the province of a different group of staff and it had been assumed that they had received a separate information

form and were responding individually. The onset of amalgamation increased confusion with information often failed to flow on to relevant program staff located on smaller 'merged' campuses.

However, gradually a valuable network of relevant contacts was established and throughout January and February these were contacted by FAX or telephone to check on accuracy and completeness of information provided and to assist in identification of additional contacts and programs at their institution. The content of each item that was included in the Register was verified by the relevant institutional contact.

The Register was published in April and launched by Professor Don Anderson at the Access and Equity Symposium at the University of Southern Queensland. Copies have been distributed to all institutions involved (Vice Chancellors, Registrars, and relevant program coordinators) and to sections of DEET. In addition, the Aboriginal Studies Association funded publication of one hundred copies for use by their Aboriginal groups. Subsequently, copies have been provided at cost of print and postage (\$8) to public and TAFE libraries throughout Australia.

The Second Edition:1993

In August this year, in response to the positive reception to the National Register, it was decided to survey the institutions again for a second edition to be published in December 1992. A major reason for this decision was that more programs will be identified for a second edition because of increased motivation of the institutional staff to provide relevant information. Many institutions were less than enthusiastic about responding to the first survey. Revelant here, was the discovery during collection of information for the Register, that several previous attempts by staff elsewhere to produce such a document had been abandoned because of lack of response by institutions. Providing information for yet another doomed survey was therefore, likely to be a waste of time and effort. Such experiences may well have contributed to the lack of interest shown by some institutions to our requests for information. However, in every case, institutions with nil returns were verified by telephone contact with institutional staff, who also were responsible for checking the proofs of their institution's entry in the Register.

The response of institutional staff to the current collection of entries for the second edition of the Register is proving to be quite different. It is apparent that motivation to provide information is significantly higher. Not only are entries being returned rapidly without several follow up letters, but in addition, several institutions with 'no program' entries previously, have now located relevant offerings. That is, simply publishing the Register has increased the awareness of a variety of staff in different institutions of the relevance of a program that they were offering and the present opportunity for publicising its existence.

In addition, programs change and change frequently. Since compiling the

Register, the Evaluative Studies Research Group has been contacted by several institutions informing them of a new program that will be offered from 1993. In addition, present programs may end or may change in relation to content, mode of presentation, cost, criteria, target group or guarantee of tertiary entry status.

Further, the information supplied by most institutions concerning extent of recognition of other institutions' programs was disappointingly inadequate.

Improving accuracy and completeness of such information is virtually impossible without an effective network of informed staff among various institutions to collate information obtained, in addition to a complete listing of the different programs available. The publication of the first edition of the National Register has contributed to an improved provision of these essentials.

Finally, distribution of the Register at the commencement of 1993 will provide current information to staff and potential students at a time when they can utilise it more fully. For the second edition, distribution will increase to include institutional staff who have indicated their interest in receiving the Register (eg Student Services Divisions).

Content of Register

1. Institution

It is perhaps surprising that even obtaining the correct name of some institutions was sometimes a matter of contention. However, with higher education institutions in the throes of amalgamation, there were a number of grey areas. Two institutions changed their status in the brief interval between providing information and returning manuscript proofs. Addresses of several institutions changed with apparently inadequate post office provisions with communications 'returned to sender' and address unknown. This instability is likely to continue in some institutions for several years. Therefore, to assist potential students, it is important to provide as much useful information as possible. In the second edition, a listing of the relationship between institutions and the addresses of individual campuses will be included.

2. Name of program and contact person

'Contact person' provided some difficulties. Administrative contacts interpreted this as staff from Student Administration. Academic staff regarded it as the staff members involved in the teaching and or coordination of the program. Perhaps what is required in this area is information equivalent to that provided for UAC listings. Separate contact persons clearly indicated for contact in person, by telephone or by mail. Particularly in view the naivety of most potential applicants, of the bureaucracy of higher education institutions, clear provision of such

information is important.

3. Maximum enrolment

The size of programs ranged from ten students to one thousand students, or 'no maximum'. The variety of presentation modes and kinds of offerings contributed to this spread. For example, some institutions charge a modest course fee that helps make the program self supporting, so that provision of additional classes is limited only by the availability of classroom space and of suitable part time staff to teach the program. At the other extreme, the size of some programs is very restricted because of limited availability of specialised equipment or facilities, for example for disabled students.

4. Target groups and entry criteria

The diversity among target groups was another encouraging indication of the imaginative approaches that are being directed towards relevant Access and Equity issues. Targets ranged from totally open for twelve programs, to very narrow subgroupings within one target group, such as disadvantaged under 18 year olds who had not completed high school. Although specific target groups were generally indicated for a program, communication with program convenors often revealed a tolerant, flexible application of both entry criteria and target restrictions where deemed appropriate.

Many programs did not target only one specific group. For example, of the 37 entries that include Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders in their target group, 28 are directed exclusively to this group. The major groups addressed were the DEET defined target groups or external students:

- Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders
- disabled persons
- external students
- low socioeconomic/disadvantaged groups
- mature age students
- non English speaking background students
- rural/isolated students

women

Institutions tended to offer several programs, each addressing a different target group, generally one of which comprised Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. For example, the target group for the University of Central Queensland's Skills for Tertiary Education Preparation Studies program (STEPS) included non traditional users of higher education, that is, long term unemployed; single parents; women returning to the work force; Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders; migrants; disabled and educationally disadvantaged. The same university's LINK Tertiary Access program was designed specifically for Aborigines and Torres Strait

Islanders.

While it was unusual for one institution to offer separate programs for a number of specific target groups, this was the case for Edith Cowan University which addressed the DEET Access and Equity Target groupings with the following programs:

- Aboriginal University Orientation Course
- Bridging Course for Rural People
- Computer Bridging Program for People with Disabilities
- Providing Access to Degree Courses for People from Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Backgrounds
- Bridging Course in Mathematics
- Increasing Female Participation in Physical Science and Technology

Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders were the most frequent target group. They were included in the target groups for 37 of the 86 programs and were the exclusive target for 28 programs. The latter programs include the widest variety of styles of presentation, content areas and entry criteria found among all programs offered.

While some programs for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders were open, most were further subdivided to address the needs of specific subgroups. Some were specifically for people with particular educational deficits, skills, or training backgrounds, while others target selected age groups.

By comparison, the disabled were mentioned as a target group by five programs and were the exclusive target group for only one program - the Computer Bridging Program for People with Disabilities offered by Edith Cowan University.

Age was the second most common criterion for acceptance into a program. For example, 'mature age' was the sole criterion for 14 programs. Other programs were aimed specifically at the younger student. Feedback from staff associated with various programs indicated that opinion was divided about the benefits and limitations of having age restrictions. On one hand, mature age students were acknowledged as appreciating different teaching and learning strategies from the younger students, who do not always share the same motivation and commitment to study. On the other hand, some regarded the mix of ages as an effective way of encouraging greater group cohesiveness and mutual assistance with studies. In addition, the restrictions placed on minimum entry age for Category B students to mainstream programs was often an important consideration.

The diversity of program aims, content and target groups was reflected in the variety of entry restrictions and/or requirements. The range extended from open programs with no particular criteria, or perhaps a minimum age, up to very specific requirements including age, ethnicity, particular disadvantage, or specific prerequisite knowledge or particular deficit. Others specified particular sponsorship, community or work status.

Interviews were included in the selection procedure for a number of programs. For example, at James Cook University, criteria for two programs for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders included either non completion or inadequate result for Year 12 at high school. However, the applicant's potential to succeed in the course was also assessed by way of

an interview, an assessment of reading and writing skills and through a reference.

The time, effort and resources that staff invest in such thorough selection procedures are likely to be reflected in achieving a better 'fit' between student and program and in turn a higher success rate for students. In view of the lack of self confidence in relation to educational matters so common among students who have experienced educational disadvantage or failure, it is essential to maximise their chances of succeeding at their preparatory studies. A study of the attrition rates for the preparatory program New Start, (now Unistart) at the University of Western Sydney, Nepean illustrates the importance of careful selection procedures (Cobbin, Barlow, Trampus & Tiernan, 1992). In the initial years of the program, selection procedures were personalised and included an interview. However, following devolution of selection to individual faculties only some required interview. Attrition rates increased significantly among students selected without interview compared with those who completed an interview. As a result, in 1992, interview has been reintroduced as an essential part of selection.

While programs for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders generally included some form of pre-entry interview, others specified particular sponsorship, community or work status. For example, Batchelor College required potential students to provide a reference that showed they were studying with the support of their community.

5. Program delivery

The ingenuity of staff has provided a diverse range of presentation modes to suit their equally diverse range of offerings. Indeed, the flexibility shown among and within individual programs reflects very positively on the staff concerned. Clearly they have attempted to suit their programs as far as possible to the needs of their students.

Most programs have employed standard full time or part time day or evening formats however some have utilised external or residential components. The highly innovative Batchelor College has managed to achieve study by its Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students within their own communities, using resident tutors and itinerant lecturers.

External programs have been offered around Australia by the University of Southern Queensland, Charles Sturt University, Deakin University, Muresk Institute of Agriculture, the University of Adelaide, Edith Cowan

University and the University of Central Queensland. They are particularly noteworthy because of the range of opportunities that they provide to a wide variety of target groups. For example Women into Science and Technology (WIST) offered by the University of Central Queensland is a self-paced, external program for rural and isolated women who do not have the required tertiary Science, Engineering or Health Science prerequisites. The University of Southern Queensland, renowned for its strong external educational programs generally, has two alternative entry programs offered externally. The Access And Equity Program, catering for 250 students, was designed for disadvantaged students generally, including physical disability, financial difficulty, ethnicity, location and Aboriginality. Duration is 12 weeks, commencing in either first or second semester, with tutorials held in designated regional study centres. The sole entry criterion for the Preparatory Studies program, also offered each semester and catering for up to 600 students, has been that age must be over 20 years.

Three of the external programs have been specifically for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. These comprise the Aboriginal University Orientation Course at Edith Cowan University, the Aboriginal Distance Education Preparatory Training (ADEPT) at Charles Sturt University, both of which combine Aboriginal studies with study skills and maths-related content, and the Special Mature Age Entry at University of Adelaide.

For some offerings, where the goal has been one of simple orientation to university, the program usually involved just a few days. Others, with extensive academic and study skills content, have extended over one to three semesters. Most have been placed prior to university entry, such as the Unistart at the University of Western Sydney, Nepean which involves one semester part time study prior to university enrolment, and the University of Newcastle's Open Foundation which involves either one semester full time or two semesters part time study prior to tertiary entry. Others extend to a 'slow track' year during actual tertiary studies. In addition there are a number of bridging programs, generally occurring during one or two months immediately prior to commencement of the university semester.

6. Program Content

Broadly, content can be divided into categories of remedial, personal development, preparatory/ academic and university orientation. In addition, programs for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders frequently included cultural studies units, in Aboriginal and Islander Studies or Australian Studies.

Remedial units have addressed such skills as study, computer use, literacy, numeracy and library. In addition a number of programs have

offered faculty specific elective preparatory units, for example, the Tertiary Bridging Certificate at The University of New England, the Certificate in General Studies at Northern Territory University and the Monash Orientation Scheme for Aborigines.

In some cases, programs have allowed students to undertake first year tertiary units which can be credited to their future course. While most were in programs for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, the Sophia College Program, a course which is only for recent school leavers who did not perform up to academic ability in Year 12 due to extenuating circumstances, has included among its content, six undergraduate subjects from the University of Southern Queensland's BA or BBus programs. Successful completion guarantees students entry to second year places at USQ.

7. Cost Structure

Charging fees for Access and Equity programs is becoming increasingly contentious as available resources for tertiary institutions diminish. Often the growing number of students involved in preparatory programs requires an increasing diversion of university resources, including staff time away from those areas and students that many staff regard as their prime concern - that is, students who are enrolled in the mainstream programs of the university. In many cases, cost to the student for preparatory programs is nil or minimal while, by contrast, mainstream students must now pay for their tertiary education. Especially in view of the Commonwealth Government's dwindling financial assistance to Access and Equity endeavours, 'user pays' or at least 'contributes' may be the equitable path to follow, perhaps by charging a moderate fee to help cover costs and thus extend the scope and size of programs. Many will argue that charging a basic fee does not erect a prohibitive barrier for the educationally and often financially disadvantaged. For example, the University of Newcastle has always charged modest fees for its highly successful and long established Open Foundation Program, which continues to enjoy a large and growing enrolment (Collins and Penglase, 1991).

Among the programs included in the Register, fees ranged from nil to the decidedly not so modest (more than \$9000 per year). Foundation for Tertiary Studies offered by Avondale College was located at the higher end of the scale. Program fees amounted to \$4730 for one semester or \$9318 for two, although the target group specified by the College was Aborigines and other people unable to secure an adequate tertiary entrance qualification in the usual way.

Examples of the many programs that attracted no fees are Gateway at the University of Wollongong (15 weeks part time), Agricultural Bridging Course at Muresk Institute of Agriculture (12 months), all Batchelor College and Tranby College courses and most courses previously mentioned for Edith Cowan University.

The Sophia College Program at first appeared expensive, with a tuition fee

of \$3500 and an educational materials fee of \$750. However, as previously noted, content included six undergraduate subjects from the University of Southern Queensland's BA or BBus programs and successful completion guaranteed students entry to second year places at USQ. Since the program does not attract HECS fees, there are quite substantial savings for those who subsequently undertake tertiary studies

For many courses, while there were no fees, students were required to pay union, amenities or guild fees. Increasingly programs are attracting such fees since the preparatory students make of the students' facilities and in particular, extensive use of study resources such as the library facilities.

8. Program recognition within and among tertiary institutions

For fifty one of the programs, successful completion either guaranteed university entry or made students eligible for admission to one or more tertiary degree courses. In some cases, acceptance involved interview with relevant university staff or required completion of the program at a specified performance level).

The nature of some programs does not suit them to provision of automatic entry to university. For example, bridging programs with very specific content (such as English or Mathematics), could not alone meet the requirements for tertiary entry. However, completion of several similar programs, with different content areas, could provide tertiary entry status.

Discussions with staff associated with a number of programs, revealed considerable uncertainty about future acceptance of their students into tertiary mainstream courses, because of the changing climate within their institution to Access and Equity programs. The commitment of some institutions, or of individual faculties to Access and Equity programs must be regarded with some cynicism. Faculties whose degree courses are in great demand and have a tradition of selecting the best from an excess of Category A applicants, are not renowned for their generosity to alternative entry students. However other faculties, who have difficulty maintaining student numbers, in the past have appeared to be warmly accepting of such students. This apparent commitment of some has waned as the current excess of Category A students swells their student numbers. Staff associated with a number of preparatory programs have expressed their concern that it will become increasingly difficult to obtain a guarantee of a university placement for students who complete their alternative entry program.

Also involved here is the general 'cooling' of the Commonwealth Government towards Access and Equity issues and an increasing concern with accountability and efficiency since few educational institutions can afford to run against prevailing political forces. In addition there is significant community pressure to high school leavers who want to undertake

tertiary studies. This is further strengthened by the present high youth unemployment throughout Australia.

Formal recognition of other institutions' programs appears to be quite limited, for a variety of reasons. Formal recognition requires formal representation by the institution offering the program to other institutions. In many cases, this representation simply has not occurred. This is particularly likely to be the case for programs which have been developed in the past few years. Often staff have their time taken up maintaining program recognition by their own institution's faculties. However, some of the longer established programs enjoy wide acceptance, for example Open Foundation offered by the University of Newcastle, is widely recognised across Australia as an alternative mode of university entry.

Most programs for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, if completed successfully, will satisfy the tertiary entry requirements of at least one University, although this may depend upon interview and additional, related criteria being met. All Batchelor College enabling courses are either TAFE or higher education accredited. Tranby's Tertiary Educational Program has TAFE accreditation and is also formally accepted by the Universities of Sydney, New England, New South Wales, Macquarie University, and the University of Technology, Sydney. In Queensland, there is formal recognition of various programs among James Cook University, the University of Central Queensland, the University of Southern Queensland and the

Queensland University of Technology. Most of these programs target Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders.

Staff from several institutions were able to provide examples of informal recognition, in relation to their program graduates who were transferring to or entering other tertiary institutions. This was done on the merits of each individual case. In addition, it appeared that where this had occurred (for example, for graduates from New Opportunities in Tertiary Education at Queensland University of Technology, Gateway at the University of Wollongong, SKATE at University of Technology, Sydney), the relevant program Director had personally supported and assisted the student's application.

Comment

The survey undertaken for the compilation of the National Register of Preparatory Programs has highlighted on the one hand, much overlap, and on the other, many gaps in the provision of these programs.

The presentation of these data represents a first step in the practical evaluation of existing programs. Such an evaluation will facilitate more effective program planning leading to a more efficient use of resources aimed at achieving Access and Equity goals.

What is clear from this initial survey is the general lack of communication

and indeed awareness of service providers between institutions. Those delivering these programs seem also to be hindered by a lack of broad awareness within their own institutions.

Educators are currently adopting a number of strategies in delivering programs as evidenced from the variety of approaches to entry criteria, duration and content. This variety may, however be hampering broader recognition. Broader recognition is desirable if it serves to enhance the ability of these programs to be useful instruments of Access and Equity policy.

The challenge that confronts educators working to expand the effectiveness of Access and Equity programs lies in achieving broader formal recognition of programs while building on the individually tailored characteristics of their current offerings.

References

Cobbin DM, Barlow AR, Trampus DU Tiernan J (1992) Performance of New Start Graduates in Mainstream Undergraduate Programs. Proceedings of the Access and Equity Symposium. Toowoomba, USQ.

Collins J, Penglase B (1991) Offering a Second Chance - Who Accepts? Characteristics of Entrants to the University of Newcastle Open Foundation Course. Australian Journal of Adult and Community Education. 31:3, 189-195.

8. Program recognition within and among tertiary institutions

There is wide variation in what satisfactory completion/graduation from the preparatory course will enable the student to do. A number of programs either guarantee entry or make students eligible to apply for admission to one or more tertiary degree courses. In some cases, acceptance may involve interview with relevant university staff These include

Preliminary Studies (School of Music)
University Preparatory Scheme (University of Canberra)

g8

Centre Foundation Program (University of Canberra)
Certificate in Pre-Tertiary Studies ACT Institute of TAFE/University of Canberra)

Foundation for Tertiary studies (Avondale College)

ADEPT (Charles Sturt University)

Aboriginal Bridging Course (University of Newcastle)

Open Foundation (University of Newcastle)

Tertiary bridging certificate (University of New England)

University Preparation Program and Mathematics Preparation Program (U NSW)

Headway (UWS, Hawkesbury)

Bridging Course (UWS, Macarthur)

Aboriginal Tertiary preparation program (UWS, Nepean)

Unistart (UWS, Nepean)

Gateway (University of Wollongong)

Certificate in General Studies, and in general technical Studies and higher
education Preparatory program (Northern Territory University)

Certificate of tertiary Access to University (Logan College of TAFE/Griffith
University)

AISWEP, AICWEP, AITEP and AINEP (James Cook University of North
Queensland)

NOTE (Queensland University of Technology)

WIST (University of Central Queensland)

Special Entry for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Students also UQ

LINK Special Entry Program (University of Queensland)

Access and equity Program

Early Bird,

and Sophia College program all USQ

Flinders University Foundation Course

Orientation semester

Also Special mature age entry (University of Adelaide)

Applied Science and engineering bridging program

(2 of them) University of South Australia

Headstart (Dakin University) Monash orientation scheme for Aborigines

First year technology Summer school Monash University

Introductory preparatory course Koorie studies Monash

Arts preparatory program (Swinburne)

Victorian certificate of education (Melbourne)

preparation for tertiary studies VUT

Bachelor of nursing prelim (VUT)

Gateway to Nursing (BVUT)

Aboriginal bridging Course (Curtin)

English language Bridging Course (Curtin)

Agricultural Bridging Course (Muresk)

Aboriginal University orientation Course (Edith Cowan)

Bridging Course in Mathematics (Edith Cowan)

Computer bridging Program for people with disabilities (Edith Cowan)

Aboriginal Orientation Course (University of Western Australia)

Alternative entry strategies to Australian universities and higher
education institutions:

Cobbin, Barlow & Gostelow