

## **Senate Committee: Education and Employment**

### **QUESTION ON NOTICE Additional Estimates 2015 - 2016**

**Outcome: Agency: TEQSA**

**Department of Education and Training Question No. SQ16-000057**

Senator Carr, Kim asked on 10 February 2016, Proof Hansard page 64

#### ***TEQSA: applications***

#### **Question**

Senator KIM CARR: Again, isn't who is applying a matter of public interest? Presumably these are institutions seeking to attract students, so surely there is a public—

CHAIR: Professor Saunders has taken it notice to provide the ones that have not—

Senator KIM CARR: No, this is another line. I am asking: is there not a public interest in revealing who has applied?

Prof. Saunders: I would have to take that on notice and think about that more deeply.

Senator KIM CARR: We have noticed this in the VET sector, where one of the great powers of the Senate is

#### **Answer**

The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) has provided the following response.

TEQSA's current policy is not to publish the names of entities that apply unsuccessfully for initial registration, initial course accreditation and self-accrediting authority or withdraw their application before a decision is made.

This position was established following consultation with a wide range of stakeholders in 2013 on the public reporting of regulatory decisions. It is also reflected in the *Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (Register) Guidelines 2015*, which set out the information that TEQSA must include on the National Register of Higher Education Providers (National Register).

TEQSA takes into account a range of factors to guide its policy decisions about the extent of regulatory information it should report, including the need to balance public, provider and stakeholder interests and the protection of these interests from the perspective of the consumer.

TEQSA decided that publishing information about initial applications may unnecessarily prejudice a provider's ability to operate in the market in that unfair and incorrect implications may be drawn about the viability of a provider's operations or their ability to operate in a different sector. For example, an existing RTO may readily continue to meet the standards for the vocational education and training sector despite having failed to meet the standards for the higher education sector.