



**'Approved provider' and NSW Department of Education [2017]
ACECQARRPstr0023 (23 January 2017)**

APPLICANT:	'Approved provider'
REGULATORY AUTHORITY:	NSW Department of Education
Date of Decision:	23 January 2017
Application reference:	STR0023

Decision

The Ratings Review Panel (the Panel) has decided by consensus to confirm elements 5.1.1, 5.1.2 and 5.2.2 are assessed as not met. As a result, the Panel confirmed the rating levels for Standards 5.1 and 5.2, Quality Area 5 and the overall rating for the service are Working Towards NQS.

Issues under review

1. The approved provider sought a review of
 - o Quality Area 5, Standards 5.1 and 5.2, Elements 5.1.1, 5.1.2 and 5.2.2 on the grounds that the regulatory authority did not appropriately apply the prescribed processes for determining a rating level and failed to take into account or give sufficient weight to special circumstances or facts existing at the time of the rating assessment.
2. After the service's initial assessment, the service was rated as Meeting NQS overall. The service subsequently applied for a partial reassessment and re-rating. Following the reassessment, the service was rated as Working Towards NQS for Quality Areas 1, 5 and 6. The approved provider applied for first tier review of the re-rating on the basis that the authorised officer did not conduct a fair and transparent assessment and rating visit.
3. At first tier review, the regulatory authority amended the rating levels for Quality Areas 1 and 6 from Working Towards to Meeting NQS. Elements 5.1.1, 5.1.2 and 5.2.2 remained assessed as "not met" and the ratings for Standards 5.1 and 5.1 and Quality Area 5 remained as Working Towards NQS.



4. In applying for second tier review, the approved provider claimed the authorised officer failed to consider the service's rating assessment history, in particular that the service had been rated as Meeting in Quality Areas 1-6 and Exceeding in Quality Area 7 after an assessment and rating visit that had occurred approximately 6 months prior.
5. The provider raised concerns about the way in which the authorised officer conducted the reassessment and believes the evidence collected during the reassessment was "subjective and unfair". The provider is also concerned the regulatory authority took longer than the required 60 days to complete the first tier review.
6. The provider claimed information presented at first tier review relating to Quality Area 5 was not considered by the regulatory authority.

Evidence before the panel

7. The panel considered all the evidence provided by the applicant and the regulatory authority. This included:

Item	Document
1	Reassessment evidence summary
2	Draft reassessment outcome summary
3	Provider's feedback to draft report
4	Regulatory authority's assessment of service feedback
5	Final rating outcome summary
6	Provider's application for first tier review
7	Regulatory authority's decision at first tier review
8	Regulatory authority's feedback for region following first tier review
9	Provider's application for second tier review and evidence
10	Complaint regarding assessment and rating visit



11	Quality Improvement plan
12	Service context form

8. The panel was also provided with advice from ACECQA on the standards and quality area under review.

The Law

9. Section 151 states 'Following a review, the Ratings Review Panel may:
- (a) confirm the rating levels determined by the Regulatory Authority; or
 - (b) amend the rating levels.

Review of rating levels

Standard 5.1

10. Standard 5.1 is that:

Respectful and equitable relationships are developed and maintained with each child.

11. It is made up of three separate elements, two of which are under review.

Element 5.1.1

12. Element 5.1.1 requires that:

Interactions with each child are warm, responsive and build trusting relationships.

Element 5.1.2

13. Element 5.1.2 requires that:

Every child is able to engage with educators in meaningful, open interactions that support the acquisition of skills for life and learning.

Regulatory authority's view

Outcome summary

14. In the outcome summary from the reassessment, the regulatory authority states:
- Educators interact warmly with children and demonstrate relationships that are building.
 - Opportunities are often missed to meaningfully engage with children on arrival, through general play and some routine times.



- Some children wander between activities with little acknowledgement from educators unless they initiate the interaction.

Evidence summary

15. The regulatory authority observed, sighted and discussed the following:
 - A sustainability toy goes home with children and families document how they are participating in areas of sustainable practice in their home or community, providing a connection between children's home and the service. The 0-2 room have a connection bear to facilitate the feeling of belonging.
 - In the R Room (indoor 3-6 years) most children are greeted by name on arrival, although not necessarily connected to a friend or experience, and often parents are not acknowledged. When children need assistance educators are quick to help once the child has indicated their need.
 - In the R Room (indoor 3-6 years) a child arrived during split group time. His father put his bag away and the child stood between the two groups, looking at both unsure of where to go. He was not greeted by educators nor called to join a group. One group had two educators.
 - In the S Room (cot room 0-2 years), a frame including a photo and information about each child sleeping in a cot is displayed to indicate their cot including their name, days of attendance and how they like to go to sleep.
 - In the S Room (cot room 0-2 years), family photos are hung on branches, positioned above child height so not easily seen by children.
 - Educators in all rooms tend to lead children or call them to an area saying "come, come!" and miss the opportunity to model full sentences.
 - In the R Room (indoor 3-6 years) a child who arrived is quiet, with tears in eyes and wanders between activities without joining for an extended period. Educators do not engage the child or connect him to an activity. When he followed an educator to an activity she encouraged him to play with playdough.
 - In the L Room (indoor 2-3 years), when an educator takes a child's temperature he stood in front of her and leaned on her legs as she sat on a chair, his temperature measured while he stood in front of her. The educator was warm in manner.
 - In the Meals Area (0-2 years), an educator was feeding several children in high chairs at lunch time makes eye contact and conversation with the children through the entire process, responding to the children's movements and attempts to connect. Educators at the table talk to children at appropriate moments, commenting on food sometimes and what children are doing. It was a positive atmosphere and educators showed their interest and knowledge of children through their interactions.
 - In the L Room (indoor 2-3 years), there are seventeen children and four educators in the group. There are several children who wander between activities with little connection and not actively engaged by educators.



- The 0-2 years and 2-3 years groups were sharing the yard. A toddler sat on the ground crying and several educators walked past before one stopped to check the child.
 - In the R Room (indoor 3-6 years), educators consistently sit with groups of children through free play sessions.
 - In the L Room (indoor 2-3 years), when a child arrived he was separated from his mother and as he was unsettled an educator sat with him and connected him to an activity. Her conversation with the mother showed knowledge about the child and previous conversations about his involvement.
 - A child enters with his father who kisses him at the door and leaves. Educators greet the child from where they are involved with "hello" and his name as he walked in, watched him briefly before returning their attention to their area of involvement, without assisting the child to put his bag away or enter the room. The child pulled his bag over to the table and sat to do a puzzle and educators did not engage with him.
 - Children initiate conversation and show affection with educators, going to educators for cuddles.
 - In the L Room (indoor 2-3 years), photos of children are framed and displayed on the wall under an explanation of belonging.
 - Outdoors, educators sit with children in group play situations talking about what they are doing but missing opportunities to take conversation deeper. At times some educators play with toys with children although there is little conversation.
 - In the L Room (indoor 2-3 years), several mirrors are attached to the sides of the shelves allowing children to consider their reflection.
 - In the R Room (indoor 3-6 years), after painting a child was bothered by the paint on his fingers. He was trying to wipe it off in the room with paper towel (the bathroom door was closed), and starting to get bothered when it wouldn't come off. This went unnoticed for some time until he was assisted by an adult.
16. The regulatory authority confirmed the following QIP notes were discussed and observed:
- Educator changes in each room are minimised and a familiar educator is always available on opening and closing to ensure the children feel safe and comfortable.
 - Educators working with infants are consistently responsive to each child's attempt at new words or activities such as standing and walking frequently repeat words or providing praise and support in their attempts to learn new skills.
 - Educators work to ensure children have a strong sense of belonging and add photos of the children into the room environments and play spaces, for example photos of children have been laminated and glued to small blocks of wood so the 'children' can be added to block buildings



First tier review

17. At first tier review, the regulatory authority stated that the evidence supplied by the provider was limited to demonstrate that interactions with each child are warm, responsive and build trusting relationships and that every child is able to engage with educators in meaningful, open interactions that support the acquisition of skills for life and learning.
18. The regulatory authority stated that the evidence recorded by the authorised officer in the evidence summary is consistent with a rating of Working Towards NQS.

Applicant's view

Second tier review

19. At second tier review, the provider submitted the following as evidence the service is meeting the two elements under review:
 - NAIDOC Story made by the children and educators in the R Room titled "The King and the Baby". The service believes for a story like this to be created a positive and trusting relationship between educators and children needs to be present.
 - Nominated supervisor meeting minutes discussing living philosophy and image of a child.
 - Staff feedback/ reflection question on children's relationship skills and social interactions, Centre manager provides reflection questions to staff in the staffroom so they can reflect on their practices. This piece of evidence is how the staff responded when reflecting on relationships with children.
 - Letters to families from educators in the room, farewelling them into the older room or off to school
 - Displays of children in room promoting a sense of belonging, at children's height
 - Living Philosophy, images of children capturing the service's philosophy 2015
 - Living Philosophy, images of children capturing the service's philosophy 2016
 - Image of a child 2016
 - Image of a child 2015
 - Centre Policy on interactions with children
 - Centre Policy on Inclusion, Multiculturalism, Anti-Bias and Aboriginal and Torres strait islander
 - Approved internal resource that links to 5.1.1 Interactions with each child are warm, responsive and build trusting relationships. The provider indicates there are samples of children being involved in experiences based on warm, responsive and trusting relationships. The provider states this in an important part of displaying what the service



- does and that this information was submitted at first tier review but not acknowledged by the regulatory authority.
- Approved internal resource that links to 5.1.2 every child is able to engage with educators in meaningful, open interactions that support the acquisition of skills for life and learning. The provider indicates there are samples of children being involved in experiences based on meaningful and open interactions. The provider states this in an important part of displaying what the service does and that this information was submitted at first tier review but not acknowledged by the regulatory authority.
 - Parent feedback on educators in the service, this is coming first hand from the parents and what they see daily when dropping off the children and picking up them up.
 - Parent feedback on how children have settled and praising their educators on a wonderful job they are doing and how their children feel comfortable with them now.
20. The provider submitted that the authorised officer who conducted the reassessment and re-rating listed more positive comments than negative comments in the evidence summary and that the positive comments are consistent with the positive comments made by the authorised officer who visited the service to conduct the initial assessment and rating 6 months prior.
21. The provider submitted that the negative comments made by the authorised officer in the reassessment and re-rating were given greater weight than they should have been.
22. The provider said it is difficult to understand how the service's rating can change so much in 6 months and submitted that the service has been continually building on its practices and used the comments from the initial assessment and rating visit to improve and extend on its practices. Further, there have been few changes in staffing between the two visits that would explain a drop in quality between the visits.

Response to draft outcome summary

23. In response to the draft reassessment outcome summary, the provider stated in relation to element 5.1.1:
- The service values relationships with children as the key area and ensures interactions are responsive and promote each child's sense of security and belonging.
 - Sense of belonging is actively promoted in the service through
 - Photos of the children – room photo galleries, 100 languages of children photos in foyer
 - Children's art work displayed in galleries in rooms and framed
 - Belonging tree in the preschool room
 - Presentation screens in the foyer



- Children's signing in and out area and sheets
 - Children's voice and input include in program through daily yarning circle
 - Image of child folder and presentation contains photos of the children at play and presents a positive image and sense of belonging
24. In response to the draft reassessment outcome summary, the provider stated in relation to element 5.1.2:
- The service believes that it operates at the meeting level – every child is able to engage with educators in meaningful, open interactions that support the acquisition of skills for life and learning.
 - Every child is consistently encouraged and supported to engage with educators in meaningful interactions that enhance the acquisition of skills for life and learning.
 - Approved internal resource requires every educator to have meaningful interactions with each child every day
 - Children invite educators into their play and will seek out educators and ask them to join in
 - Educators ensure skills for life through teaching these through song e.g. swish and swallow, sun screen and handwashing songs.
 - Skills for life are enhanced through our independence and self-help policy and routines such as serving food and making beds. We have sourced sheets that are easiest for children to make own beds with and families are asked to purchase these.
25. The provider also referred to evidence listed in other parts of the draft evidence summary it submitted are relevant to Quality Area 5, including:
- An educator engaged two interested children in the setting up of painting as she was doing it. 'Now what do we need to do next? Maybe put on aprons?' Her conversation was low key, relaxed and children were engaged in the process The educator prompted their involvement through engaging children's actions, 'Oh oh do you need hands to paint? Yes!' and helped the child pull their hands through the sleeves.
 - An educator sat with children on the floor and sang songs with puppets, inviting children to have a turn of the puppets. Those children that left were supported to be involved in other areas of interest.
 - The educator changes nappies and engages with the child in conversation through this process.
 - Educators speak warmly to children while changing their nappies, often primarily about the process.
 - Educators sit with groups of two or three children under two years and have individual play. One educator uses scarves to put over a child and then asks where he is, celebrating his 'discovery' and with both children laughing. Another educator sings action songs and engages



with children around their dolls. Educators are building discussion around the concepts.

- An educator asks a child 'can you show me how to do that?' at the play dough table, she then follows his instructions and makes positive comments about the process and the ball she made from dough. She asked 'what else can you teach me?'
- An educator participated in a throwing game with a child with enthusiasm
- Educators engage in the key interest groups around the environment, and show a general awareness of the involvement of children while engaging with a group.
- Children help to feed the chickens. They are let out into the 3-5 yards while children are playing for short periods of time. They are used as a separation technique for all ages. The fish are also used to help separate then one child in the pre-school rooms has feeding the fish as part of his morning separation routine.
- Family photos are hung on branches, positioned above child height so not easily seen by the children – this is in the 0-2 room and they are also photos and a family tree at child height in the book area.
- Children are encouraged to get their sheets and attempt to make their beds. Educators help as needed. Children can choose where they would like to sleep
- The yarning circle group time starts with the whole group together in a circle. Children are encouraged to stay but not if they are able to do something else. The children are then separated into two groups of 6-8 children.
- In all rooms children are encouraged to scrape their bowls into one container and put their bowls and cutlery into the other, including the babies. Babies are then given a wipe for their face and hands and support to put it in the right bowl.
- An educator called a five minute warning for away from one end of the room instead of going to groups and addressing smaller groups. Educators sing a pack away song to get children engaged with the process. This is only a small room and usually the educator would move to the groups.
- Children serve themselves breakfast, including cereal and milk. If they need assistance the educator helps.
- An educator sits at the dough table. She engages with children from time to time while she writes observations, although conversations are not in depth. Another educator joins and makes comments to children to draw out their conversation.
- Children are supported to wash hands and put the paper towel in the bin by the educators.
- Children are given wipes and supported to wipe their hands independently before lunch.



- Educators sing songs for children to swish and swallow in each room at meal times. Educators talk to children about food specifics when situations arise, for example around allergies. They talk spontaneously about the asthma puffer when giving it to a child. These are not planned discussions.

First tier review

26. The information submitted by the provider at first tier review was consistent with the information outlined above under the second tier review heading.

Panel's discussion

27. The Panel noted element 5.1.1 requires interactions to be warm, responsive and to build trusting relationships for “each child”.
28. The Panel considered there were numerous instances of comments in the evidence summary that showed interactions were warm and responsive for “some children” rather than “all children”. The Panel noted that in the 2-3 years’ room in particular, inconsistent practice was mentioned several times in the authorised officer’s evidence summary. The Panel considered there were a number of examples collected by the authorised officer that did not align with the requirements of this element that each child experiences warm and responsive interactions.
29. The Panel discussed whether “each child” is able to engage with educators in meaningful, open interactions that support the acquisition of skills for life and learning, which is required by element 5.1.2. The Panel noted there were examples sighted of educators being non-responsive and that therefore this element was not met for “each child” or all educators.
30. The Panel noted that in the absence of specific evidence to refute the authorised officer’s observations, it would need to make assumptions about the quality of the service’s practices which it could not do.
31. The Panel commented that it could see the service works hard, that there did appear to be good practice and it could appreciate how disappointed the service would be with the change in rating from the first assessment to the reassessment. However, the Panel noted the assessment and rating is a point in time decision and it was required to make a judgment about the level of quality at the time of the assessment and rating.
32. The Panel also discussed that the provider could have responded more directly to the concerns raised by the regulatory authority when it submitted evidence for the Panel to review. The Panel noted the provider had emphasised the authorised officer’s actions and alleged comments rather than



respond to the specific pieces of evidence the authorised officer had collected. In the absence of any further information to explain or provide a different view on the authorised officer's observations, the Panel was of the view that the evidence was compelling and showed the service had not met the elements.

33. The Panel noted the service had been assessed as meeting the elements at its first assessment and rating, but considered that at the point in time the service was reassessed, it was not meeting elements 5.1.1 and 5.1.2.
34. The Panel discussed that the service could reflect on the comments in the evidence summary and consider how in future it responds to those issues from a quality improvement perspective.

Standard 5.2

35. Standard 5.2 is that:
Each child is supported to build and maintain sensitive and responsive relationships with other children and adults.
36. It is made up of three separate elements, one of which is under review.

Element 5.2.2

37. Element 5.2.2 requires that:
Each child is supported to manage their own behaviour, respond appropriately to the behaviour of others and communicate effectively to resolve conflicts.

Regulatory authority's view

Outcome summary

38. In the outcome summary, the regulatory authority states:
 - Children are generally supported to build and maintain relationships with their peers and other adults, although educators do not engage children in being an active part of resolution of conflict or confrontational situations to build necessary skills for independent conflict resolution.

Evidence summary

39. The regulatory authority observed, sighted and discussed the following:
 - In the R Room (group time 3-6 years), an educator counted backwards from five to one as a behaviour guidance tool. An educator says "Ch ch ch" to try to minimise loud talking and get children to listen as they are distracted at group time. The educator continues group time when a variety of children are not engaged.



- In the S Room (indoor 0-2 years), as the young toddler tried to take a trolley off a peer an educator gently asked "Z. Z. Are you helping?" The educator brought over an additional trolley as solution.
- In the bathroom (0-2 years), an educator engages with a child through nappy change in a positive conversation. When the child reached down into his nappy she said "Don't touch that, yukky yukky!"
- In the Meals Area (0-2 years), when a child was tired and did not want to wipe his hands for lunch an educator made it into a fun game. The child participated then the educator gave him the wipe to do it himself.
- An older toddler is trying to 'pat' children to sleep (enthusiastically). An educator asked her positively and gently what she was doing and took her to another area where she could lie down. An opportunity was missed to sit with her and scaffold the skill.
- In the R Room (indoor 3-6 years), children participate in quiet play at rest time. Many children are in the reading area. When a child becomes restless an educator asks the child to leave as she had to speak to him three times. She demonstrated behaviour, for example "When someone else is reading a book we need to wait until they are finished." But when children become more unsettled no other options were provided.
- An educator called loudly from her position in the sandpit to a child she saw across the yard to bring the sand back to the sandpit. After calling the child's name a number of times with no response another educator moved to the child to communicate with them.
- Children's artwork is displayed in one area carefully. Some are framed and with others a similarity is drawn to the artist of the month.
- An educator stated to a child "M that's very silly we don't go down the slide that way. We go feet first and not with the ball. Good job."
- In the 3-6 year room, last year educators planned a discussion with children about what they have a right to do and experience rather than what not to do.
- Educators led children in a discussion around identifying appropriate behaviours for inside which is printed and framed. When educators see these behaviours they comment and suggest they might like to help their peers.
- An educator models language at the breakfast table "You need to say 'Can you please pass the milk?' She models sharing skills "Pass that to D so he can have some please." She draws attention to when children help each other and encourages children to thank each other.
- When a child threw some equipment an educator said to the child "Go and pick them up please that's not nice. Pick them up. Good job!" She used a pleasant tone although the request was direct in nature.
- Two children are playing at the home corner oven, one is taking things off the other. The child goes to the educator close by, who calls to the other child to share and give the toy back. When not successful the child then goes to another educator who pulls out more of the resource



they were fighting over. There was no discussion to support or skill children to resolve the issue independently.

- When two children are in conflict situation an educator distracts one child to another area, missing the opportunity to engage the child in the resolution of the issue.
- Children help to pack away from indoor free play in a way that shows it is an ongoing part of routine.
- When a toddler knocked over a peer's construction the educator there said "T that's not very nice. You need to say sorry and you need to help put it back together". The child walked away and the educator called him back several times, not following through with the request to help reset the activity as the child resisted.
- Information on the UN Rights of the Child is available to parents. When talking with families, educators promote children's right to choose through the program, for example in relation to school readiness activities.
- Children's art is not displayed extensively around the service as educators place importance on the journey rather than the product, and send their art home to be appreciated.

40. The regulatory authority confirmed the following QIP notes were discussed and observed:

- Educators discuss and develop behaviour management techniques during team meetings and weekly reflection.

First tier review

41. At first tier review, the regulatory authority stated that the evidence supplied by the provider was limited and did not demonstrate that each child is supported to manage their own behaviour, respond appropriately to the behaviour of others and communicate effectively to resolve conflicts.
42. The regulatory authority stated that the evidence recorded by the authorised officer in the evidence summary is consistent with a rating of Working Towards NQS.

Applicant's view

Second tier review

43. At second tier review, the provider submitted the following as evidence of the service meeting the element:
 - An approved internal resource that links to 5.2.2 Each child is supported to manage their own behaviour, respond appropriately to the behaviour of others and communicate to resolve conflict. The provider notes the attachment shows samples of children guiding their own



behaviours and communicating with others on different occasions across all three age groups. The provider believes the regulatory authority did not take this attachment into account during the reassessment or during the first tier review and based their judgement on an incident seen by the authorised officer on the day of the reassessment and re-rating.

44. The provider also refers to the following evidence that was collected by the authorised officer who visited the service to conduct the service's initial assessment and rating in December 2015. This evidence includes:
- The children listened to each other respectfully and the educator thanked each child for participating.
 - The rules for the room are displayed in a frame in the parent hub.
 - Respectful language is used by educators when they guide children's behaviour such as asking a child to listen to other children when they are speaking.
 - Children are supported by the service to build personal relationships with other children attending the service during family group times in the morning and afternoon.
 - Children are encouraged to participate on group projects. Project information is displayed on Perspex boards on walls in each room such as snowflakes, the moon, and dinosaurs.
 - Educators responded patiently and with gentleness to a new child settling into the service who was distressed on arrival.

Response to draft outcome summary

45. In response to the draft reassessment outcome summary, the provider stated in relation to element 5.2.2:
- The service believes that it operates at the meeting level – each child is supported to manage their own behaviour, respond appropriately to the behaviour of others, and communicate effectively to resolve conflicts.
 - Educators consistently encourage and support children to manage their own behaviour and respond appropriately to the behaviour of others at a developmentally appropriate level.
 - The preschool children were involved in developing the room rules for the R room and were encouraged to think in positive terms rather than using don't or no
 - Children are supported and encouraged to assist children who may have been 'hurt' by them through saying sorry, helping with an icepack or giving back the toy in question.
 - Children are encouraged to share and educators are conscious of ensuring that equipment / resources that are of 'high interest' are sufficient for play, e.g., more trains were made available in the toddler room due to high interest and some scuffles.



46. The provider also referred to the following attachments:
- R Room Weekly Reflections – includes reflections on guiding children's behaviour to assist them to self-regulate and development of room rules, also addresses gender bias
 - Living philosophy 2016 – demonstrates inclusion of all children and positive relationships
 - Living philosophy 2015 demonstrates inclusion of all children and positive relationships
 - Image of the Child 2016
 - Image of the Child 2015
 - Interactions with Children Policy
 - Inclusion Policy
 - Daily Reflections slides.

First tier review

47. The information submitted by the provider at first tier review was consistent with the information described above under the second tier review heading.

Panel's discussion

48. The Panel discussed whether each child is supported to manage their own behaviour, respond appropriately to the behaviour of others and communicate effectively to resolve conflicts.
49. The Panel noted some of the conflict resolution approaches used by educators at the service. For example, if there is a conflict over resources, educators resolve the conflict by getting an additional resource. Also, educators minimise conflict by moving a child to another space to avoid conflict. The Panel noted that these examples indicated the service manages conflict through conflict avoidance and minimisation strategies, and that for younger children this could be appropriate.
50. However, the Panel also noted that there was no evidence that the educators were analysing children's behaviour to reflect on whether the behaviour exhibited was patterned behaviour or a one off occurrence. The Panel noted there was no evidence about what the educators do after behaviour issues are noticed. The Panel noted it expected that if conflict resolution was not addressed directly at the time, it would expect educators to have reflected on or discussed what to do about the behaviour afterwards.
51. The Panel noted the service's behaviour policy did not appear to have been followed. The Panel considered that although the conflict minimisation strategies used by educators could be appropriate for younger children, they would only meet the element if there was evidence the issues were being



followed up on. The Panel noted it did not have evidence issues had been followed up and could not assume they had been.

52. For these reasons, the Panel formed the view that the evidence did not confirm that each child is being supported to manage their own behaviour, respond appropriately to the behaviour of others and communicate effectively to resolve conflicts.

Other issues

53. The Panel considered the provider's concerns about how the authorised officer carried out the assessment and rating visit and considered if the authorised officer's conduct had had any impact on the evidence before it. The Panel agreed the role of the authorised officer is as an observer and it would not expect the authorised officer to get involved or engage in the program.
54. The Panel noted the reassessment was a point in time assessment and that the service could take on the feedback, add to its quality improvement plan and reflect on how to improve in this quality area.