

**Senate Committee: Education and Employment**

**QUESTION ON NOTICE**

**Supplementary Budget Estimates 2016 - 2017**

**Outcome: Skills and Training**

**Department of Education and Training Question No. SQ16-001138**

Senator Cameron, Doug asked on 20 October 2016, Proof Hansard page 121

***VET FEE-HELP (IPART table)***

**Question**

Senator CAMERON: Dr Banerjee, can you provide an analysis of how you came to understand that the IPART table was an appropriate table to use and the methodology that underpins the IPART table that you looked at? What was the methodology that you looked at—I want to see that—and the average tuition fee? I would like to know how you analysed the average tuition fees in the context of poor or lower-income students could afford the courses? Could you provide your reasoning for both of those—how you analysed the veracity of the IPART table and how you analysed the veracity of the average tuition fee to come up with these figures?

Dr Banerjee: Yes. We can do that. I mentioned previously that the New South Wales IPART information was one data source. We drew on other data sources as well. I just used that as a typical data source.

Senator CAMERON: I am happy for you to take on notice to provide all of the information that was used to come up with the \$5,000, \$10,000 and \$15,000 loan caps. I want to know the databases that you used, the underpinning analysis that was done, how you analysed that and how you came to these figures—all the information you have that brought you to the figures of \$5,000, \$10,000 and \$15,000. I want an idea of how this was worked out.

Dr Banerjee: The methodology behind it?

Senator CAMERON: Yes.

Dr Banerjee: We are happy to provide that on notice.

**Answer**

Refer to SQ16-001126.