

Economics Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Industry Portfolio
Budget Estimates Hearing 2014-15
2-3 June 2014

AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: Australian Skills Quality Authority

TOPIC: Training Provider Audits

REFERENCE: Question on Notice (Hansard, 2 June 2014, page 56)

QUESTION No.: BI-28

Senator KIM CARR: For instance, would those seeking to offer advanced diplomas have to be registered with TEQSA?

Dr Orr: No. Well, there are advanced diplomas offered in the VET sector and I understand that they have been offered in the higher education sector as well. But there are 87 of those providers that are registered to deliver in the higher education sector as well as in the VET sector.

Senator KIM CARR: Of those 87, how many of them have been audited according to your provisions as outlined in your statement? Were they part of the sample where only 80 per cent were compliant?

Dr Orr: We might have to take that question on notice and get that number for you; I do not have that number today.

Senator KIM CARR: Could you tell me specifically how many of those 87 that you have audited were not compliant but were registered on TEQSA?

Prof. Lavarch: We would have to take that on notice.

Senator KIM CARR: Could I have the names of those institutions? Presumably you publish the names of training organisations that are not compliant.

Dr Orr: Yes, we do.

Senator KIM CARR: There would be no confidentiality issue?

Dr Orr: We publish the names of the providers who have been subject to an administrative sanction by ASQA—a suspension or a cancellation of all or part of their registered scope.

Senator KIM CARR: And you would publish those that have been deregistered too, wouldn't you?

Dr Orr: Yes.

Prof. Lavarch: That is correct.

Senator KIM CARR: Once they are deregistered from your agency are they automatically deregistered from TEQSA, or is there a separate process?

Dr Orr: No, we have a memorandum of understanding with TEQSA; we are working collaboratively in the dual-sector provider area. We do share information with TEQSA about the behaviour of providers who are what we call dual-sector providers. So there is an open line of communication there between us.

Senator KIM CARR: So once you take action it is automatic on TEQSA?

Dr Orr: No, because the requirements and the standards are different across the two sectors.

Senator KIM CARR: How are they different?

Dr Orr: The standards for registered training organisations are based on, I guess, the nature of VET as a competency-based area of training, and the standards in the higher education area are more focused on the academic standards for people who are studying in higher education.

Senator KIM CARR: So your standards are higher, are they?

Dr Orr: We would like to think so.

Prof. Lavarch: The standards are certainly slightly different.

Dr Orr: They are certainly different.

Senator KIM CARR: Have there been any sanctions taken against any provider that has been in receipt of government support—in receipt of any government moneys?

Dr Orr: Yes, there have been.

Senator KIM CARR: Which ones are they?

Prof. Lavarch: Again, we would have to take that on notice in terms of giving you individual names. Certainly we have taken regulatory against some providers that were in receipt of government funding, and that might be state government funding—in fact, it probably would be state government funding.

Senator KIM CARR: Could I get a list of those, please? What action was taken in regard to each of those colleges? What was the nature of the breach and what action did you take to rectify it, including deregistration? What happens to the money that they have received? Are they asked to repay it?

Dr Orr: That is a matter for the state and territory funding agencies who contract with the providers to provide that training.

Senator KIM CARR: Are there any have been in receipt of Commonwealth moneys?

Prof. Lavarch: We would have to check. I am not conscious of that off the top of my head, but we will take it notice.

ANSWER

Dual Sector providers and audits

ASQA has audited 49 of the 87 dual sector providers. Of these, 9 providers have finalised non-compliant audits recorded against them. A finalised non-compliant audit does not however mean that a provider is published on ASQA's public decision table as there are still further decision processes to be gone through following the non-compliant audit. In addition to this, where a non-compliant audit does lead to ASQA making an adverse regulatory decision against a provider, this information will only be published after that provider has exhausted their rights of reconsideration and/or appeal.

There is currently one dual sector provider listed on ASQA public decision website (<http://www.asqa.gov.au/about/regulatory-decisions/asqa-decisions.html>):

- Provider Number: 4566
Decision Type: Suspension
Legal Name: Cambridge International College (Vic) Pty Ltd

Sanctions against providers in receipt of Government funding

Providers that receive public funding are required to provide data to the National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER). Of the 2094 providers detailed in the NCVER's *Australian vocational education and training statistics: Students and courses 2013 - publicly funded training providers* document, some 76 had had an adverse regulatory decision made against them by ASQA. These adverse decisions were:

Adverse Decision Type	No.
Notices of intention to Cancel/Suspend registration	55
Decision to cancel registration	9
Decisions to suspend registration	19
Decisions to reject a renewal application	35
Total Decisions	118*

* A provider can have more than one decision made against it.

An adverse decision does not mean that a provider is automatically published on ASQA's public decision table; information is only published after a provider has exhausted their rights of reconsideration and/or appeal. The details of those providers listed in the NCVER's *Australian vocational education and training statistics: Students and courses 2013 - publicly funded training providers*, that have had an adverse decision made against them by ASQA and are published on the ASQA public decision website (<http://www.asqa.gov.au/about/regulatory-decisions/asqa-decisions.html>) are:

Provider Number: 1886 Decision Type: Suspension Legal Name: Dovaston Consulting Group Pty Ltd	Provider Number: 3923 Decision Type: Other Sanction/s Legal Name: Macquarie Commercial College Ltd
Provider Number: 4589 Decision Type: Cancellation Legal Name: Australian Training College Pty Ltd	Provider Number: 4833 Decision Type: Renewal rejection Legal Name: Studio Hairdressing and Beauty Services Pty Ltd
Provider Number: 6779 Decision Type: Renewal rejection Legal Name: Austraining (NSW) Pty Ltd	Provider Number: 21625 Decision Type: Other Sanction/s Legal Name: Australian National Institute Pty Ltd
Provider Number: 21807 Decision Type: Condition/s Legal Name: Austwide Institute of Training Pty Ltd	Provider Number: 21967 Decision Type: Other Sanction/s Legal Name: Sher-E-Punjab Pty. Ltd
Provider Number: 30868 Decision Type: Suspension Legal Name: National Security Training Academy Pty Ltd	Provider Number: 31308 Decision Type: Cancellation Legal Name: MGGM Trading Pty Ltd
Provider Number: 31705 Decision Type: Renewal rejection Legal Name: Wright Solution QLD Pty Ltd trustee for JR & TK Wright Family Trust	Provider Number: 32247 Decision Type: Cancellation Legal Name: Bradford Employment Services and Training Pty Ltd
Provider Number: 40153 Decision Type: Condition/s, Suspend, Cancel Legal Name: Grow SA Ltd	Provider Number: 40231 Decision Type: Cancellation Legal Name: E Word Development Pty Ltd
Provider Number: 40241 Decision Type: Renewal rejection Legal Name: National Risk Solutions Pty Ltd	Provider Number: 40252 Decision Type: Renewal rejection Legal Name: New Deal Pty Ltd
Provider Number: 60175 Decision Type: Cancellation Legal Name: Bishop, Kelli Jane	Provider Number: 88167 Decision Type: Suspension Legal Name: Mantra Training & Development Pty Ltd
Provider Number: 88168 Decision Type: Suspension Legal Name: Best Practice Project Management Pty Ltd	Provider Number: 90009 Decision Type: Suspension Legal Name: TAFE NSW - Western Institute
Provider Number: 90225 Decision Type: Suspension Legal Name: Australian Electrotechnology Industry Training Centre Ltd, The	Provider Number: 91215 Decision Type: Condition/s Legal Name: Academy of Training Pty Ltd
Provider Number: 91344 Decision Type: Renewal rejection Legal Name: Sydney Technical Institute Pty Ltd	