



**Date of Decision:** [REDACTED] 2018  
**File number:** STR0033

---

**PANEL MEMBERS:**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**APPLICANT:**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**REGULATORY AUTHORITY:** NSW Department of Education

---

## Decision

The Ratings Review Panel (the Panel) by consensus decided to:

- Confirm the rating for standard 1.2 as 'Meeting NQS' on the basis that exceeding theme 2 was not demonstrated.
- Amend the rating for standard 5.1 to 'Exceeding NQS' on the basis that exceeding theme 2 was found to be demonstrated.
- Amend the rating for standard 5.2 to 'Exceeding NQS' on the basis that exceeding theme 3 was found to be demonstrated.

As a result, the panel's decisions:

- Confirmed the rating for Quality Area 1 as 'Meeting NQS'
  - Amended the rating for Quality Area 5 to 'Exceeding NQS'.
  - Amended the overall service rating to 'Exceeding NQS'.
- 

## Issues under review

1. The approved provider (the provider) sought a review on the grounds that the regulatory authority in making its determination, failed to take into account or give sufficient weight to facts existing at the time of the rating assessment (section 144(3)(b) *Education and Care Services National Law* (National Law)).
2. The approved provider has sought a review of
  - Quality Area 1, standard 1.2 – Exceeding theme 2
  - Quality Area 5, standard 5.1 – Exceeding theme 2
  - Quality Area 5, standard 5.2 – Exceeding theme 3.
3. After the initial assessment, the service was given an overall rating of 'Meeting the National Quality Standard' (NQS). All quality areas were rated at 'Meeting



the NQS', with a ratings breakdown as followed:

- Quality Area 1: 'Meeting NQS'
    - Meeting standard 1.1: exceeding themes 1 and 2 present
    - Meeting standard 1.2 exceeding theme 1 present
    - Exceeding Standard 1.3
  - Quality Area 2: 'Meeting NQS'
    - Meeting standard 2.1: exceeding theme 3 present
    - Meeting standard 2.2: exceeding themes 1 and 2 present
  - Quality Area 3: 'Meeting NQS'
    - Meeting standard 3.1: exceeding themes 1 and 2 present
    - Meeting standard 3.2: exceeding themes 1 and 2 present
  - Quality Area 4: 'Meeting NQS'
    - Meeting standard 4.1: exceeding theme 1 present
    - Meeting standard 4.2: exceeding theme 1 present
  - Quality Area 5: 'Meeting NQS'
    - Meeting standard 5.1: exceeding theme 1 present
    - Meeting standard 5.2: no exceeding themes present
  - Quality Area 6: 'Meeting NQS'
    - Meeting standard 6.1: exceeding themes 1 and 3 present
    - Exceeding standard 6.2
  - Quality Area 7: 'Meeting NQS'
    - Exceeding standard 7.1
    - Meeting standard 7.2: exceeding themes 1 and 2 present
4. The approved provider applied for a first tier review on the basis that they disagreed with the following ratings that they felt they should be rated as exceeding:
- Quality Area 1: standards 1.1 and 1.2
  - Quality Area 3: standards 3.1 and 3.2
  - Quality Area 4: standards 4.1 and 4.2
  - Quality Area 5: standards 5.1 and 5.2
  - Quality Area 6: standards 6.1
  - Quality Area 7: standards 7.2



### **Regulatory authority's view**

5. At first tier review, the regulatory authority confirmed the overall rating of 'Meeting NQS', and made the following amendments:
  - Quality area 1
    - Standard 1.1 was amended to 'Exceeding NQS'
    - Standard 1.2: exceeding theme 3 present
  - Quality Area 3: amended to 'Exceeding NQS'
    - Standard 3.1 was amended to 'Exceeding NQS'
  - Quality Area 4
    - Standard 4.1: exceeding theme 3 present
    - Standard 4.2: exceeding theme 3 present
  - Quality Area 5
    - Standard 5.1: exceeding theme 3 present
    - Standard 5.2: exceeding themes 1 and 2 present.
  - Quality Area 6: amended to 'Exceeding NQS'
    - Standard 6.1 was amended to 'Exceeding NQS'
  - Quality Area 7: amended to 'Exceeding NQS'
    - Standard 7.2: exceeding theme 2 present

### **Applicant's view**

6. In their application for second tier review, the approved provider submitted on their application form that they should be rated exceeding in Quality Area 1 and Quality Area 5.
7. On their application form, the approved provider specified that they disagree with the following decisions from the regulatory authority, and would like these decisions reviewed:
  - Standard 1.2 – exceeding theme 2
  - Standard 5.1 – exceeding theme 2
  - Standard 5.1 – exceeding theme 3, and
  - Standard 5.2 – exceeding theme 3.

They propose that they have demonstrated themselves to be exceeding the NQS in these areas by the evidence collected during the assessment and



rating visit, and on the evidence referenced and attached in their application.

8. ACECQA clarified the proposed scope of the review specified by the application form with the applicant and confirmed that they did not disagree with the regulatory authority's finding on standard 5.1 – exceeding theme 3. This was on the basis that this exceeding theme had been found to be present at the first tier review.

### **Evidence before the panel**

9. The Panel considered all the evidence submitted by the provider and the regulatory authority. This includes:
  - the Assessment and Rating Instruments and the final Assessment and Rating Report
  - the service's feedback to the draft report
  - the application for first tier review and its attachments
  - the regulatory authority's findings at first tier review
  - the regulatory authority's submission to second tier review
  - the application for second tier review and its attachments
  - the provider's response to the regulatory authority's submissions.
10. The Panel was also provided with advice from ACECQA on the standards and exceeding themes under review.

### **The law**

11. Section 151 of the National Law states that following a review, the Ratings Review Panel may:
  - (a) confirm the rating levels determined by the Regulatory Authority; or
  - (b) amend the rating levels.

### **The facts**

12. [REDACTED] is a Centre-based service with 40 maximum approved places. The service is based in [REDACTED]
13. The assessment and rating visit took place on [REDACTED] 2018.
14. The provider received the draft report on [REDACTED] 2018 and provided feedback to the draft report on [REDACTED] 2018. The final report was sent to the provider on [REDACTED] 2018.
15. The provider applied for first tier review on [REDACTED] 2018. The regulatory authority made a decision on the review on [REDACTED] 2018. The provider



received the decision on [REDACTED] 2018. The provider applied for second tier review on [REDACTED] 2018.

## Review of rating levels

16. The Panel considered each standard under review.

### Standard 1.2

17. Standard 1.2 is that:

*Educators facilitate and extend each child's learning and development.*

18. Exceeding theme 2 is that:

*Practice is informed by critical reflection.*

19. The Panel noted that when considering whether exceeding theme 2 is present in relation to standard 1.2 the panel may expect to see evidence of the following:

- The service's educational practice approach to facilitating and extending children's learning and development:
  - reflects robust debate, discussion, and opportunities for input by all educators, and is informed by critical reflection and past incidents
  - is informed by current recognised guidance.
- Any change to the service's approach to facilitating and extending children's learning and development is understood by all and implemented appropriately.
- All educators and the educational leader regularly reflect, individually and with each other on:
  - their educational practice approach to facilitating and extending children's learning and development
  - alternate practice approaches to facilitating and extending children's learning and development
  - implementation of changes to strengthen their practice over time
  - social justice and equity implications of their educational practice to ensure that practice considers the circumstances and rights of every child at the service
  - opportunities to cultivate deep respect for, and knowledge of, the cultural diversity of the broader community in educational practice, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures
  - theoretical and philosophical influences on their practice, including the theoretical perspectives identified in the approved learning framework/s
  - how they draw on theoretical and philosophical influences and how they have influenced practice over time.



## Assessment and Rating

### *Regulatory Authority's view*

20. Evidence collected by the Regulatory Authority in relation to standard 1.2 appears at pp. 7-8 of " [REDACTED] Evidence Summary".
21. In the *Ratings Outcome Summary report* (item 51), the Regulatory Authority stated in relation to standard 1.2:

*Educators are deliberate and purposeful in their actions. Educators respond to children's ideas to extend their learning through open ended questions and interactions. Children's agency is promoted in the program and throughout daily routines. Reflection of intentional teaching, responsive teaching and child directed learning is undertaken on a broad view and does not consistently shape practices across the service. Meaningful engagement with family and/or community is yet to shape the practices in intentional teaching, responsive teaching and scaffolding.*

22. All elements were rated 'Met' for this standard.
23. The regulatory authority found that exceeding theme 1 was present for this standard.
24. The regulatory authority found that exceeding themes 2 and 3 were not present for this standard.

### *Approved Provider's View*

25. In their feedback to the draft assessment and rating report, the approved provider proposed that "we believe that quality standard 1.2 is exceeding the NQS firstly by the comment of the assessor and the evidence we have referenced and attached".
26. In support of their application, the approved provider submitted the following statement:

*Critical reflection is part of each day and discussed by all educators. This is demonstrated through the educational program planning and documentation.*

*The educational leader facilitates robust discussion with educators at team meetings based on the critical reflection of past incidents e.g. fox killing the chickens and how this should be communicated with the children and families and how this incident would change educators approach to facilitating the children's learning in this space.*

*The educational leader drives the vision for the service, individual staff and children by sharing research and practice, role modelling*



*experiences with the children, building the confidence of individual team members and supporting educators to contribute and add new initiatives and ideas to the program for discussion and implementation.*

*The educational leader facilitates discussion at team meetings and shares fact sheets and information resources that are available in the room for the staff and children to refer to such as 'The Edible Balcony' – by Alex Mitchell (2011)*

*Quality Area 1 standard 1.3 highlight our strong use of critical reflection in our programming and across the service as educators. This critical reflection is embedded in our every practice across the service.*

*Standard 3.2 Confirmed QIP notes: Educators reflect on the environment and make changes based on the ages, interests and abilities of the children in the group.*

27. To support their statement, the approved provider submitted a body of evidence comprised of:
- Meeting minutes
  - Documentation regarding theoretical and philosophical influences
  - Critical reflection
  - Projects
  - Centre RAP
  - Inclusion support
  - Program
  - Sustainability and specialisation tour
28. The approved provider also submitted that a number of pieces of assessor evidence supported their claim that their service demonstrates exceeding practice in standard 1.2.

### First Tier Review

#### *Applicant's view*

29. The approved provider submitted in their application that "Quality Standard 1.2 is Exceeding the NQS by the evidence of the assessor and the evidence attached". They provided the overarching statement that they had submitted in response to the draft assessment and ratings report, and the same body of evidence for consideration.

#### *Regulatory Authority's view*

30. In making their decision (item 56), the panel noted the Authorised Officer's comment in the Final Report that: *Reflection of intentional teaching, responsive teaching and child directed learning is undertaken on a broad view and does not consistently shape practices across the service, and*



stated that *Examples of practice that supports this theme were not recorded under standard 1.2.*

31. At first tier review the panel was of the view that although information was submitted that demonstrates educator's reflections, there was not enough evidence to confirm that critical reflection is regularly implemented in a way that specifically supports standard 1.2 as outlined in the guide to the NQS.
32. As such, the panel concluded that theme 2 was not present. In a separate decision, the panel concluded that theme 3 was present.
33. The overall rating for standard 1.2 remained at meeting.

#### Second tier review

34. At second tier review the provider re-submitted the body of evidence provided at first tier review, and outlined above.
35. The approved provider submitted additional evidence covering:
  - Documentation of child and family voice influencing the program
  - Observations
36. The approved provider made no comments on the Regulatory Authority's submission on the basis that they had already seen all the documents submitted and had previously provided comment.

#### *Panel's consideration*

37. The panel considered the regulatory authority's finding and justification for decision for standard 1.2. Specifically, the panel highlighted comments in the first tier review findings that there was evidence showing reflective practice, but that it was quite broad and quite general.
38. Panel members agreed that there was evidence showing that educators discussed what was working well and what wasn't, but questioned whether the service was engaging in in-depth questioning and challenging of practice.
39. Panel members discussed consistency within the final report, and noted the approved provider's claims that there were some examples of evidence being considered as exceeding against one standard and meeting against another.
40. The panel considered reflection sheets and room diaries in detail. The panel felt that there were some strong examples of critical reflection, but that many entries were narrative and lacked details of how reflections informed practice, and how different perspectives contributed to the development and refining of



practice.

41. The panel concluded that there were some very strong stand-alone examples of critical reflection, but that the consistency and depth to support the service as being exceeding in this theme were not in evidence.
42. The Panel agreed that the rating for standard 1.2 remains as 'Meeting NQS'.

### **Decision**

The Ratings Review Panel (the Panel) by consensus decided to confirm the rating level for standard 1.2 on the basis that the evidence did not support a finding that theme 2 was demonstrated. As such, the rating for standard 1.2 will remain as 'Meeting NQS'.



### Standard 5.1

43. Standard 5.1 is that:  
Respectful and equitable relationships are maintained with each child.
44. Exceeding theme 2 is that:  
*Practice is informed by critical reflection.*
45. The Panel noted that when considering whether exceeding theme 2 is present in relation to standard 5.1 the panel may expect to see evidence of the following:
  - The service's approach to relationships between educators and children:
    - reflects robust debate, discussion, and opportunities for input by all educators, and is informed by critical reflection and past incidents
    - is informed by current recognised guidance.
  - Any change to the service's approach to relationships between educators and children is understood by all and implemented appropriately.
  - All educators:
    - systematically reflect on their interactions with children across the service and on opportunities to further enhance children's lifelong learning and sense of belonging within the service and the child's world
    - demonstrate self-awareness and are purposeful in the consideration of the theoretical perspectives that influence their pedagogy and the practice across the service.
  - The service team reflect together to:
    - consider the social justice and equity implications of educators' approaches to relationships with children to ensure interactions support the dignity, rights, cultures and best interests of all children, including children who identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples
    - challenge stereotypes and biases in promoting and maintaining a culture of inclusiveness
    - engage in robust debate and discussion in which personal, professional and organisational values that influence relationships between educators and children are identified and discussed.

### Assessment and rating

#### *Regulatory Authority's view*

46. Evidence collected by the Regulatory Authority in relation to standard 5.1 appears at pp. 26-29 of item 7 [REDACTED] Evidence Summary" (item 7).



47. In the *Ratings Outcome Summary report* (item 56), the regulatory authority stated in relation to standard 5.1 that:

*Interactions between educators and children are warm and responsive, with each child supported to feel secure and included. The dignity and rights of each child are supported and respected. Reflection of educator to child interactions and the dignity and rights of the child are completed on a broader scale and is yet to shape practice. There is minimal evidence to demonstrate that the practice is informed by meaningful engagement from families and/or community.*

48. All elements were rated as 'Met'.
49. The regulatory authority found that exceeding theme 1 was present for this standard.
50. The regulatory authority found that exceeding themes 2 and 3 were not present for this standard.

*Approved provider's view*

51. In their feedback to the draft assessment and rating report, the approved provider proposed that "the centre demonstrates standard 5.1 at an exceeding level by the evidence of the assessor and the evidence referenced and attached."
52. They provided the following overarching statement in relation to exceeding theme 2

*We believe that Quality standard 5.1 is Exceeding the NQS by the evidence of the Assessor and the evidence we have referenced and attached.*

*Critical reflection informs the practice of the educators at the service and how they approach building relationships with each child. This is captured through the discussions at team meetings including how children are settling and the secure attachments they are developing with educators.*

*Educators are responsive to the needs and developing strengths of children and mindful of their individual likes, dislikes and preferences. Current guidance is used to inform practice and educators attend regular training on guiding children's behaviour. Educators last attended **GCB** in 2017. This was critically reflected on and discussed at a team meeting.*

*The team reflects on social justice and the rights of the child in team meetings and discussions.*



*Quality Area 1 standard 1.3 highlight our strong use of critical reflection in our programming and across the service as educators. This critical reflection is embedded in our every practice across the service.*

53. To support their claim, the approved provider submitted:

- Reconciliation Action Plan
- Narragunnawali News
- Meeting minutes
- Guiding children's behaviour certificates
- Room meeting minutes
- Circle of security training certificates and reflections
- Diary entry and communications
- Program
- Professional development
- Observations
- Settling in Program
- Discussion with families about child's individual needs
- Discussion with families about settling in
- Orientation checklist
- Parent program contributions
- Parent contributions to environment
- Families visiting
- ■ Child wellbeing unit resources policies
- ■ Child wellbeing forms
- ■ Education support policies and procedures
- ■ Education support forms
- ■ Education support resources

54. The provider submitted that a number of pieces of evidence collected during the assessment and ratings visit demonstrated exceeding-level practice in this standard.

### First Tier Review

#### *Applicant's view*

55. The approved provider submitted that the service demonstrates standard 5.1 at an exceeding level by the evidence of the assessor and the evidence referenced and attached.

56. The approved provider proposed that Practice is embedded due to the critical reflection that takes place:

*Educators consistently gain as much information as possible to build relationships with children. This is gathered from observations and*



*interactions as well as meaningful and ongoing discussions with families.*

*The learning environment is reflected upon to enhance the children's ability to engage in successful, purposeful play—and changes/modifications made where necessary.*

*Staff consistently discuss and share information regarding the children and their needs. If there is a concern regarding a child's behaviour educators will meet with the family to discuss the involvement of the Education Support Manager who will provide assistance and support with the family and educators to develop an Individual Behaviour Support Plan.*

*Involvement with outside agencies takes place to further support the child and the reflection on their planned learning outcomes.*

57. In addition, the Provider submitted that:

*Critical reflection informs the practice of the educators at the service and how they approach building relationships with each child. This is captured through the discussions at team meetings including how children are settling and the secure attachments they are developing with educators. Educators are responsive to the needs and developing strengths of children and mindful of their individual likes, dislikes and preferences.*

*Current guidance is used to inform practice and educators attend regular training on guiding children's behaviour. Educators last attended **GCB** in 2017. This was critically reflected on and discussed at a team meeting.*

*The team reflects on social justice and the rights of the child in team meetings and discussions.*

*Quality Area 1 standard 1.3 highlight our strong use of critical reflection in our programming and across the service as educators. This critical reflection is embedded in our every practice across the service.*

*Some children require support with separation in the morning. The staff have discussed these children and their needs and have developed a protocol for the mornings to support these children with separation. A staff member is always close by and familiar with who these children are. As observed, staff are close to the child to support the separation for the child and the parent.*

58. The approved provider submitted the same body of additional evidence as in their feedback to the draft assessment and ratings report.

#### *Regulatory Authority's view*

59. In considering the evidence collected during the Assessment and Rating visit, the panel noted the comment in the final report stating: "Reflection of educator to child interactions and the dignity and rights of the child are



*completed on a broader scale and is yet to shape practice”.*

60. The panel found that examples of practice that support theme 2 were not recorded under standard 5.1.
61. At the first tier review the panel found that educators do engage in reflection for this standard however, insufficient evidence was sighted to demonstrate that reflection reflects robust debate, discussion, and opportunities for input by all educators. Room meeting minutes submitted reflected more direction for the team from the room leader rather than documenting how these decisions were influenced by critical thinking and discussion.
62. The panel concluded that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate the presence of exceeding theme 2 for this standard.

#### Second Tier Review

63. The approved provider submitted the same evidence for consideration in relation to this standard at second tier review as at first review.
64. The approved provider made no comments on the Regulatory Authority's submission on the basis that they had already seen all the documents submitted and provided comment.

#### *Panel's consideration*

65. The panel briefly considered the view of the regulatory authority – that educator to child interactions and the dignity and rights of the child are completed on a broader scale and are yet to shape practice.
66. One panel member noted that there appeared to be direction from the room leader, rather than evidence of a range of perspectives being incorporated into discussion of practice.
67. The panel considered a range of evidence including circle of security training and reflections, the service's policies and subscription to Narragunnawali news and the [REDACTED] Reconciliation Action Plan. The panel also looked at learning plans, meeting minutes and diary notes.
68. In considering the evidence, the panel agreed that in some cases there were very clear links showing that critical reflection, training attended and discussion between educators, children and their families were informing practice. The panel noted examples of nappy change practice, and the service's approach to working with children and families to manage separation anxiety as evidence of this.
69. The panel commented that there was not a strong sense of direction in the service's approach to critical reflection in relation to this standard. It was discussed that while there is evidence of training and discussion, it is not clear



from the evidence why they are undertaking it. There was not a clear process evidenced of the service identifying areas or issues or gaps in need of work and seeking out training and outside perspectives to find solutions.

70. However, the Panel agreed that on balance, theme 2 was demonstrated for standard 5.1 and that the rating for this standard should be amended to 'Exceeding NQS'.

### **Decision**

The Ratings Review Panel (the Panel) by consensus decided that on the basis of the evidence presented, exceeding theme 2 was present in relation to standard 5.1. As such, the panel amended the final rating for standard 5.1 to 'Exceeding NQS'.



## Standard 5.2

71. Standard 5.2 is that:  
*Each child is supported to build and maintain sensitive and responsive relationships.*
72. Exceeding theme 3 is that:  
*Practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community.*
73. The Panel noted that when considering whether exceeding theme 3 is present in relation to standard 5.2 the panel may expect to see evidence of the following:
- The service's approach to supporting children to build and maintain sensitive and responsive relationships:
    - reflects the unique geographical, cultural and community context of the service
    - welcomes, reflects and draws on the voices, priorities and strengths of the children and families at the service
    - contributes to a culture of inclusiveness and sense of belonging at the service
    - encourages all children to challenge stereotypes and biases, and develop a deep understanding and appreciation of the cultural diversity of the service and the broader community, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures.
  - All educators:
    - draw on their knowledge of each family's strengths and priorities, including behaviour guidance approaches in the home environment, to support children to build and maintain sensitive and responsive relationships
    - tailor their approaches to supporting children to build and maintain sensitive and responsive relationships in response to input from families and the community.

### Assessment and rating

#### *Regulatory Authority's view:*

74. Evidence collected by the Regulatory Authority in relation to standard 5.2 appears at pp. 30-31 of item 7 “
75. [REDACTED] Evidence Summary”.
76. In the Ratings Outcome Summary for standard 5.1, the regulatory authority stated that:

*Each child is encouraged and supported to work with and help others.*



*Educators support children to regulate their behaviour and to resolve conflicts, however there are missed opportunities to guide and discuss children's behaviour. Reflection of self regulation is completed on a broader scale, is not evident across the service and is yet to shape practice. Although there are opportunities for families to be involved in the planning for self regulation and collaborative learning, it is not evident across the service, meaningful engagement of families and/or the community is yet to shape practice.*

77. All elements in standard 5.2 were rated as 'Met'.

78. No exceeding themes were found to be present.

*Approved provider's view:*

79. In their response to the draft assessment and ratings report, the approved provider stated that: "we believe that quality standard 5.2 is exceeding the NQS by the evidence of the assessor and the evidence we have referenced and attached."

80. They submitted the following overarching statement in relation to exceeding theme 3:

*We believe that Quality standard 5.2 is exceeding the NQS by the evidence of the Assessor and the evidence we have referenced and attached.*

***We believe that the assessors statement made in the analysis is not reflective of the service or practice.***

*The services Education Support Manager assists educators in developing Individual Behaviour Support Plans when appropriate. This is done in collaboration with families and other professionals. Home languages are spoken within the centre and featured within visuals throughout the service.*

*The centre's philosophy is developed in consultation with families and guides the educators practice "We believe that an inclusive curriculum is sensitive and rich in diversity and assists in empowering children to challenge biases and develop empathy. We believe it is essential for early childhood professionals to encourage positive self-esteem to make young children feel valued and to care about themselves as well as others. Andrew et al (2001:72) explains that a young child's healthy self-esteem flows from their sense of identity, their needs, class or ability." Children are seen as able and capable contributors to this curriculum. Children are invited and encouraged to make curriculum decisions.*

*All toileting routines are completed in consultation with the child and with respect and sensitivity adopting the principles of **RIE (Resources for Infant Educators)** to ensure respectful encounters with infants.*

*Assessor evidence observation "Educator asks "Can I change your*



*nappy?" The child shakes her head. The educator sits with the child as she does a puzzle. The educator waits as child finishes the puzzle and asks the child again "Can I change your nappy?" The child stands up and they walk together to the nappy change area."*

*Through the [REDACTED] Parent portal, when the policies are due for review families have the ability to contribute, feedback and comment on facilitating change to the [REDACTED] Interactions with Children Policy. The [REDACTED] Parent portal was shown and discussed with the assessor.*

*As discussed with and shown to the assessor, there are many opportunities for families to raise the concerns and priorities with the service.*

*Communication with families on how to raise concerns begins at enrolment with the discussion of the 'Standard Terms of Enrolment'. In addition to this families receive the [REDACTED] parent brochure 'How to raise your concern' in the enrolment pack.*

*In the foyer the families have access to the Profile, photo and contact information of the [REDACTED] Practice Manager and [REDACTED] Education Support Manager for the service who they can contact to raise concerns and/or get support when needed.*

*As discussed with and shown to the assessor, Family surveys are conducted by [REDACTED] with families on enrolment, mid-year and when families exit from the service. These surveys support ongoing feedback and improvement and families can decide to add contact information for follow up contact by the services practice manager. These survey results are shared with the centre director and discussed with the PM and the team.*

*Regular communication, interactions, conversation and discussion with families on a daily basis by educators provides a further opportunity for families to raise concerns in relation to children's safety.*

*Discussion about incident reports for children open the door for communication on safety practices and process at the service for families to give feedback on as well.*

81. In support of their claim, the Approved Provider submitted:

- Staff meeting minutes
- Program
- Room meeting
- Guiding Children's behaviour
- Observations
- Circle of security training certificates
- Parent communications
- Akuna room communications
- Inclusion support plans
- Enrolment
- Individual learning summaries



82. In their evidence summary, the approved provider also submitted the following confirmed QIP notes from other standards as evidence of exceeding practice in standard 5.2:

QIP Note	Noted in assessor's evidence against standard:
"Room and program reflections are documented on a sheet next to the program and has been a developing work in progress that is evolving through ongoing discussion, evaluation and reflection by all educators and the Educational Leader".	1.3
"All the children are reflected in the documentation".	1.3
"Daily reflection/journal is available"	1.3
"Educators reflect on the environment and make changes based on the ages, interests and abilities of the children in the group".	3.2

83. The approved provider also drew attention to the commentary in the final report that states: "Educators support children to regulate their behaviour and to resolve conflicts, however there are missed opportunities to guide and discuss children's behaviour".

In response to this, the approved provider has written:

*"The service would like to challenge the analysis the assessor has made for this standard, based on the comments made by the assessor within the analysis itself. If educators are 'supporting children to regulate behaviour and resolve conflicts' how were opportunities to guide and discuss behaviour missed by these educators? There was no evidence supplied by the assessor to support this analysis of missed practice."*

84. The provider submitted that a number of pieces of evidence collected during the assessment and ratings visit, and stated that these pieces of evidence demonstrated exceeding-level practice in this standard.

#### First Tier Review

##### *Applicant's view*

85. The approved provider stated that the centre demonstrates standard 5.2 at an exceeding level by the evidence of the assessor and the evidence



referenced and attached.

86. The approved provider submitted that:
- Staff work with families and other professionals to support each child's emotional and social learning.
  - Home languages are spoken within the centre and featured within visuals throughout the service.
  - The centre's philosophy is developed in consultation with families and guides the educator's practice "We believe that an inclusive curriculum is sensitive and rich in diversity and assists in empowering children to challenge biases and develop empathy. We believe it is essential for early childhood professionals to encourage positive self-esteem to make young children feel valued and to care about themselves as well as others. Andrew et al (2001:72) explains that a young child's healthy self-esteem flows from their sense of identity, their needs, class or ability." Children are seen as able and capable contributors to this curriculum. Children are invited and encouraged to make curriculum decisions.
  - Through the [REDACTED] parent portal, when policies are due for review families have the ability to contribute, feedback and comment on facilitating change to the [REDACTED] Interactions with Children Policy. The [REDACTED] parent portal was shown and discussed with the assessor.
  - In the foyer families have access to the Profile, photo and contact information of the [REDACTED] Practice Manager and [REDACTED] Education Support Manager for the service who they can contact to raise concerns and/or get support when needed.
  - As discussed with and shown to the assessor, Family surveys are conducted by [REDACTED] with families on enrolment, mid-year and when families exit from the service. These surveys support ongoing feedback and improvement and families can decide to add contact information for follow up contact by the services practice manager. These survey results are shared with the centre director and discussed with the PM and the team.
  - Regular communication, interactions, conversation and discussion with families on a daily basis by educators provides a further opportunity for families to raise concerns in relation to children's safety.
  - Discussion about incident reports for children open the door for communication on safety practices and process at the service for families to give feedback on as well.
87. The approved provider submitted the same body of evidence as provided in feedback to the draft assessment and ratings report.

*Regulatory Authority's view*



88. When considering the evidence collected by the authorised officer, the panel noted the comment in the analysis notes that “*Although there are opportunities for families to be involved in the planning for self-regulation and collaborative learning, it is not evident across the service, meaningful engagement of families and/or the community is yet to shape practice.*” The decision notice for the first tier review stated that examples of practice that support theme 3 were not recorded under standard 5.2.
89. In forming their opinion, the panel considered the information collected on the day of the visit alongside additional submissions from the approved provider. The panel decided that the information submitted by the approved provider did not adequately support the achievement of this theme when looking at guidance notes in the Guide to the NQS document. Information submitted is general and does not directly showcase how the service achieves this theme within this standard.
90. Exceeding theme 3 was found not to be present.
91. Exceeding themes 1 and 2 were found to be present.

#### Second Tier review

92. At second tier review the provider re-submitted the evidence and commentary provided at first tier review for the consideration of the panel.
93. The approved provider submitted the following additional evidence for review as a part of this standard:

#### Policies

- Cultural and Linguistic Diversity Policy
- Curriculum (Pedagogy) Development Policy
- Enrolment and Orientation Policy
- Educational Leader Policy
- Interactions with children policy
- Inclusion Policy
- Educator’s Guide – learning to read, write and count

#### Forms

- Enrolment checklist
- Family Centred Program Parent Questionnaire
- Extra-curricular experience form
- Individual behaviour support plan
- Getting to know your child
- Menu



94. The approved provider made no comments on the Regulatory Authority's submission on the basis that they had already seen all the documents submitted and provided comment.

*Panel's consideration*

95. The panel agreed that there was clearly some very strong work with some children to support their relationships with each other. However, the panel would need to consider whether this was driven by relationships with families and the community and whether practice went above and beyond a "Meeting" level.
96. The panel noted that a lot of empty templates and policies were provided, but that this evidence was not useful unless there was a clear sense of how these documents were used to support practice.
97. The panel agreed there were strong examples of the service gathering information and communicating with families to support the children's interactions. The panel considered diary entries and individual learning plans in this discussion.
98. The panel noted that engagement with families was consistently evident around sleep and rest practices and toilet training. The panel agreed that the evidence showed the service communicated regularly and meaningfully with families to gather information about the children attending and their preferences, routines and needs.
99. The panel discussed several, more complex examples of the service supporting children to develop social skills in partnership with families. It was agreed there was some strong evidence of exceeding-level practice. The panel also noted evidence of the service engaging with families and the local library to ensure that language and cultural practice was incorporated into the children's lives at the service.
100. The panel discussed collaborative projects with the local community, and discussed whether this supported relationships between children at an exceeding level. The panel discussed whether the evidence clearly linked the projects with what the service was doing to support relationships between children and agreed that this was unclear.
101. In making their decision, the panel considered the wording of exceeding theme 3, notably the requirement that *practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community*.
102. The panel concluded that the evidence had demonstrated theme 3 in relation to Standard 5.3 on the basis that it was demonstrated that meaningful engagement with families shaped practice.
103. The Panel agreed that as theme 3 was demonstrated for standard 5.2 and that the rating for this standard should be amended to 'Exceeding NQS'.



## **Decision**

The Ratings Review Panel (the Panel) by consensus decided that on the basis of the evidence presented, that exceeding theme 3 was present in relation to standard 5.1. As such, the panel amended the final rating for standard 5.1 to 'Exceeding NQS'.