

Compliance with PQS requirements

Web Site:-

- Update audit outcomes to last addition to scope. Use copy submitted with PQS application - (See below)
- Remove reference to AHC50410 replace with AHC50416
- Remove reference to AHC30710 replace with AHC30716

Summary of VET Quality Framework audit information

The Certificate 3 Guarantee program (an initiative of the Queensland Government and administered by Queensland VET Investment), provides public funding paid directly to Pre-qualified Suppliers for eligible participants to gain their first Certificate III qualification.

The VET Quality Framework includes the national set of standards which assures nationally consistent, high-quality training and assessment services for the clients of Australia's vocational education and training system. These standards are administered by the Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA).

One of ASQA's charter is to audit registered training organisations to ensure they comply with the requirements of the Standards for Registered Training Organisations and are achieving quality training and assessment outcomes.

As part of its obligation as a Pre-Qualified Supplier for the Certificate 3 Guarantee program, the Brisbane College of Horticulture is required to publish audit information in relation to its compliance VET Quality Framework. This summary follows

Audit date: 23/4/2105

Qualifications audited	
Code	Title
BSB30115	Certificate III in Business
BSB60215	Advanced Diploma of Business

Was a non compliance identified	If yes what was the type of non compliance	Summary of non-compliance	Actions taken to rectify the non-compliance	Has the non-compliance been rectified
Yes	Significant	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The volume of learning was not clearly articulated in the TAS for both qualifications 2. The TAS documents included reference to CRICOS registration which had yet to be registered 3. The learning and assessment resources did not meet the requirements of the NTP as elements of the required knowledge were not explicitly identified. 4. Trainer could not provide documented confirmation of current industry skills 5. The marketing material reflected both domestic and international students 6. The marketing material did not include the organisation's registration code. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The training and assessment strategies were revised to clearly identify the components that make up the difference between the amount of training and the total volume of learning. 2. The training and assessment strategies were revised to refer specifically to domestic students only. 3. The learning and assessment resources were revised to reflect the explicit knowledge component 4. The trainer provided a variety of testimonials confirming their engagement with commercial enterprises, providing ongoing and regular business management services. 5. The marketing materials were revised to reflect domestic students only. 6. The RTO's code was included in the materials 	In all cases the areas of non - compliance were rectified.

Explanatory notes on the types:

Minor: minimal or no serious adverse impact on students and/or persons affected by the outcomes of the training and assessment services provided

Significant: serious or potentially serious adverse impact on students and/or persons affected by the outcomes of the training and assessment services provided.