Senate Committee: Education and Employment

QUESTION ON NOTICE Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018

Outcome: Skills and Training

Department of Education and Training Question No SQ17-000595

Senator Griff, Stirling asked on 31 May 2017, Proof Hansard page 66.

South Australian (VET FEE-HELP)

Question

Senator GRIFF: What is the main reason for rejection?

Mr Hart: There are a number of criteria. I would have to give you a breakdown in terms of the criteria that the unsuccessful candidates did not meet, because it could be more than one criteria that ruled providers out. Obviously, financial performance was a key one. If providers did not make that, they generally were not successful. There are instances where provider did not meet two or three. I would have to take that on notice and give you a breakdown against each of the criteria for those who were unsuccessful.

Senator GRIFF: If you could do that for the total and then for South Australia as well.

Answer

Table of the 146 unsuccessful providers by VET Student Loans provider suitability requirements.

| | Provider VSL Suitability Requirement | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | Financial Performance | Management and Governance | Quality VET | Student Outcomes | Workplace Relevance | | |
| Unsuccessful providers who failed each requirement* | 83 | 96 | 86 | 63 | 61 | | |

^{*} Note – the figures above do not reconcile to the 146 unsuccessful providers as 113 of these providers were unsuccessful against two or more of the requirements.

Table of the 11 unsuccessful South Australian providers by VET Student Loans provider suitability requirements.

| | Provider VSL Suitability Requirement | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | Financial Performance | Management and Governance | Quality VET | Student Outcomes | Workplace Relevance | | |
| Unsuccessful South Australian providers who failed each requirement* | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | | |

^{*} Note – the figures above do not reconcile to the 11 unsuccessful South Australian providers as 5 of these providers were unsuccessful against two or more of the requirements.