



Date of Decision: 15 February 2019

File number: STR0036

PANEL MEMBERS:

[REDACTED]

APPLICANT:

[REDACTED]

REGULATORY AUTHORITY: NSW Department of Education

Decision

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

- Standard 4.1, exceeding theme 1 from 'no' to 'yes'
- Standard 5.2, exceeding theme 2 from 'no' to 'yes'.

No amendments to the ratings for Standards 4.1 and 5.2 resulted from these changes.

The Panel, by consensus, decided to confirm the ratings for all other Standards under review, with no additional Exceeding themes found to be present.

The overall rating for the service was confirmed as 'Meeting NQS'.

Issues under review

1. The approved provider (the provider) sought a review on the grounds that the regulatory authority did not appropriately apply the prescribed processes for determining a rating level (section 144(3)(b) *Education and Care Services National Law* (National Law)).
2. The approved provider sought a review of:
 - Quality Area 2:
 - Standard 2.1
 - Standard 2.2



- Quality Area 3:
 - Standard 3.1
 - Quality Area 4:
 - Standard 4.1
 - Standard 4.2
 - Quality Area 5:
 - Standard 5.1
 - Standard 5.2
 - Quality Area 7:
 - Standard 7.1
 - Standard 7.2
3. After the initial assessment, the service was rated as 'Meeting NQS', with the following breakdown of ratings:
- Quality Area 1: Meeting NQS (all standards rated as Meeting NQS)
 - Quality Area 2: Meeting NQS (all standards rated as Meeting NQS)
 - Quality Area 3: Meeting NQS (all standards rated as Meeting NQS)
 - Quality Area 4: Meeting NQS (all standards rated as Meeting NQS)
 - Quality Area 5: Meeting NQS (all standards rated as Meeting NQS)
 - Quality Area 6: Meeting NQS (all standards rated as Meeting NQS)
 - Quality Area 7: Meeting NQS (all standards rated as Meeting NQS)
4. The approved provider applied for first tier review on the basis that they believed they operated an exceeding service, and did not agree with the ratings awarded for each of the quality areas. The provider did not believe that all available evidence had been fully or adequately considered.

Regulatory authority's view

5. At first tier review, the regulatory authority amended the rating for standard 3.2 to Exceeding NQS, and a number of additional exceeding themes were found to be evidenced. The overall service rating remained at 'Meeting NQS'.

Applicant's view

6. In their application for second tier review, the approved provider stated that they had experienced inconsistencies in how the NSW regulatory authority undertook the assessment and rating visit, conducted the process for evaluating feedback to the draft report, and during the first tier review.



7. The approved provider maintains that they were not given the opportunity to demonstrate how they exceeded the NQS as the authorised officer's questioning was too broad, and the officer did not adequately understand the service's context and operations. The approved provider questioned whether the regulatory authority had considered the additional evidence they provided in the timeframe in which they reviewed the draft report.

Evidence before the panel

8. The Panel considered all the evidence submitted by the provider and the regulatory authority. This included:
 - the application for second tier review and its attachments
 - 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 provider's response to the regulatory authority's submissions.
9. The Panel was also provided with advice from ACECQA on the element under review.

The law

10. 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

11. [REDACTED] is a [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] approved places. The service is based in [REDACTED]
12. The assessment and rating visit took place on [REDACTED]
13. The provider received the draft report on 18 September 2018 and provided feedback to the draft report on 1 October 2018. The final report was sent to the provider on 8 October 2018.



14. The provider applied for first tier review on 20 October 2018. The regulatory authority made a decision on the review on 26 November 2018. The provider received the decision on 4 December 2018. The provider applied for second tier review on 18 December 2018.

Review of rating levels

15. The Panel considered each standard under review.

Standard 2.1

16. Standard 2.1 is that:
Each child's health and physical activity is supported and promoted.

Assessment and rating

Regulatory Authority's View

17. In the draft report for this standard, all elements are rated as met, and no exceeding themes were found to be present. The authorised officer's analysis stated:
Sleeping arrangements are suitable for the developmental stages and needs of the children. There are opportunities for sleep and rest through the program, both indoors and outdoors. Educators maintain effective hygiene practices with daily cleaning routines, meal times and toileting procedures. Children and families are becoming familiar with the new routine of washing hands on arrival and with continued promotion of this it will eventually become embedded practice. There has been some reflection on the nutrition policy following conversations with a recognised authority and discussion around children's clothing options, however deeper critical reflection would demonstrate an ongoing cycle of improvement in this standard. Continued collaboration with community professionals such as the dietician is encouraged.
18. The Authorised Officer made the following QIP notes for this standard:
Educators are encouraged to continue the same type of reflection they have done with the nutrition policy. This type of research, discussion and action demonstrates the purpose of critical reflection and how to significantly improve practice. Contributions from families and the community can also aid in the research stage with training, professional readings and ideas for continuous improvement.

Approved Provider's View



19. The approved provider submitted detailed feedback to the finding for this standard in the draft report, and submitted additional evidence. In their feedback, the approved provider maintained that they should be rated exceeding for this standard, and provided evidence and analysis in support of their claim that the three exceeding themes were present and in evidence at the time of the visit.

Outcome

20. Standard 2.1 was rated 'Meeting NQS'. No exceeding themes were found for this standard.

First Tier Review

Approved Provider's View

21. At first tier review, the approved provider submitted that their service should be rated as 'exceeding NQS' in this standard. In their application for review, they stated that they were not given the opportunity to demonstrate how they were exceeding in this standard.
22. The approved provider submitted in relation to exceeding theme 1:
- *The approved provider agrees with the authorised officer's analysis notes, 'sleeping arrangements are suitable for the developmental stages and needs of the children. There are opportunities for sleep and rest through the program, both indoors and outdoors.' The approved provider writes, "I feel this meets the theme 1, 2 and 3. It is embedded in our program, and regular reflection occurs with Educators. Parent's views and wishes are considered in regards to rest time practices. Rest time is incorporated into our current SIP for the [REDACTED] Room.*
 - *The approved provider argues that the authorised officer's analysis notes "Children and families are becoming familiar with the new routine of washing hands on arrival and with continued promotion of this it will eventually become embedded practice." Is being promoted continually. Emails have been sent to both staff and families each week. Emails are scheduled in the calendar.*
 - *The approved provider claims that the authorised officer's statement "Educators are encouraged to continue sharing information with families regarding nutrition, physical play and child safety." Is embedded practice. The approved provider states, "This occurs through weekly emails, brochures in communication pockets. Noticeboard that contains Munch and move information and*



Fundamental Movement skills. Kids and traffic posters and brochures.”

23. In relation to exceeding theme 2, the approved provider submitted:
- *The approved provider claims Theme 2 is exceeding and states “Staff and families are involved in the reviewing of Hygiene, Nappy Change, and Toileting Policies.”*
 - *Evidence supplied by the approved provider outlines, parents are invited to attend a meeting or take part in ongoing self-assessment of quality area 2, exclusion of ill children.*
 - *Email evidence dated 4 July 2018, outlines the service has liaised with another centre based service in relation to the review of the Munch and Move policy, Physical activity policy and Small screen recreation policy.*
 - *The approved provider shares meeting minutes via email with staff in relation to Quality area 2 children’s health and safety.*
24. In relation to exceeding theme 3, the approved provider submitted:
- *Each year, [REDACTED] visits the centre to educate the children on dental hygiene.*
 - *We also participate in the STEPS vision screener program for all children entering kindergarten the following year.*
 - *We have held two parent information nights with a Dietitian (parent of centre also) as a guest speaker.*
 - *We have constant collaboration with Speech Therapist, Dentist, Early Intervention, Paediatricians, Psychologists, Occupational Therapists, [REDACTED] Inclusion Support.*
 - *On our A & R day, we had a Speech Therapist visit the centre.*
25. The Approved Provider submitted a collection of documentary evidence to support these claims.

Regulatory Authority’s View

26. In making their decision, the panel considered the additional evidence provided by the provider, as well as the evidence and commentary submitted in response to the draft assessment and ratings report.
27. Regarding exceeding theme 1 the panel reported that:
The panel considered all evidence supplied by the approved provider and when considered with evidence recorded by the officer against this Standard, describe practices that support Theme 1 in this standard being amended to



'Yes.' In the panel's opinion, the additional information from the provider demonstrates that the services approach demonstrates high quality practice is usual at the service that supports children's health and safety.

28. Regarding Exceeding theme 2 the panel stated that:
The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 2 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted by the approved provider. The service is encouraged to consider the overview of Exceeding Theme 2 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, such as when practice is informed by critical reflection, educators consider, question, analyse and re-evaluate planning and decision-making for that standard. This supports a culture of ongoing self-assessment that helps identify continuous improvement and improved outcomes for children, families and educators.
29. Regarding Exceeding theme 3 the panel found that:
The panel considered all additional evidence supplied by the approved provider against this Standard, describe practices that support Theme 3 in this standard being amended to Yes.

Decision

30. The panel evaluated the evidence for all three exceeding themes, and amended the findings for themes 1 and 3 to 'yes'.
31. The rating for Standard 2.1 remained at 'Meeting NQS'.

Second Tier Review

Approved Provider's submission

32. At second tier review, the provider stated that they believe theme 2 should be rated as yes for this standard.
33. They cited the following pieces of assessor evidence in support of their argument:
- EV905496: educators have trialled different areas of the room to set beds out for rest time and to also meet the needs of children who engage in quiet activities during this time.
 - EV905497: an educator referred to the QIP when reflecting on the procedures for children and families to wash their hands on arrival.
 - EX905513: upon review of Quality Area 2, the management team approached each educator about how they are catering for each child's



individual clothing needs and preferences. Educators communicated how this happens spontaneously and can identify ways of how this is met.

34. The approved provider stated: *"I have previously noted that parent's views and wishes are considered in regards to rest time practices. Rest time is incorporated into our current Strategic Inclusion Plan (SIP) for the [REDACTED] Room. This is critical reflection"*
35. The following evidence was provided in relation to this standard:
- Physical activity email from [REDACTED]
 - Certificate from [REDACTED] nutrition course that all staff did
 - Email to all staff following self-assessment on QA2
 - An educator's reflection on QA2
 - Meeting minutes about a kids and traffic resource
 - Water play in winter
 - Strategic inclusion plan with rest time as a barrier
 - [REDACTED] room minutes with critical reflection about rest time.
 - Educator journal reflection
 - Rest time critical reflection.

Panel's Consideration

36. As themes 1 and 3 had previously been found to be evidenced for standard 2.1, the panel discussed whether theme 2 was in evidence for this standard.
37. The panel made some general comments stating that good practice was clearly evident, but that when reading the evidence against the National Quality Standard and the Exceeding guidance their initial impressions were that practice for this theme was at the 'meeting' level.
38. The panel identified examples of high-quality practice. They noted that the service was good at providing families with information and seeking feedback. The panel also discussed examples of critical reflection found in emails and self-assessment.
39. Overall, the panel considered that the evidence demonstrated stand-alone examples of high-quality practice, but that the evidence did not clearly demonstrate that there was a link between information gathered from families or reflections made and changes to practice.



40. The panel noted that the Guide to the NQS states that exceeding practice for this theme is characterised by the presence of robust debate and systematic reflection. While the service clearly has some strong practice in this area that reflects a strong meeting NQS rating, the evidence, on balance, did not demonstrate exceeding theme 2.

Decision

41. The panel decided that there was insufficient evidence to amend the regulatory authority's finding for Standard 2.1, theme 2. The rating for Standard 2.1 remains as 'Meeting NQS'.

Standard 2.2

42. Standard 2.2 is that:
Each child is protected.

Assessment and rating

Regulatory Authority's View

43. In the draft report for this standard, all elements were rated as met, and no exceeding themes were found to be present. The authorised officer's analysis states:
Effective supervision is maintained throughout the day and educators enhance the awareness of risks by reminding children about potential hazards, such as the wet walkway. Educators have developed practical ways of ensuring each child has participated in and is aware of the emergency evacuation drills and convey important information. Processes are in place to ensure educators are aware of their responsibilities as mandatory reporters. Collaboration with external fire and emergency services is limited at this stage and educators are yet to engage in critical thinking in this standard.
44. The Authorised Officer made the following QIP notes for this standard:
The expertise of external fire and emergency services can impact the review of policies and influence changes to procedures. Educators are encouraged to continue sharing information with families regarding nutrition, physical play and child safety.

Approved Provider's View

45. The approved provider provided feedback to the finding for this standard in the draft report, and submitted additional evidence. In their feedback, the approved provider maintained that they should be rated exceeding for this standard, and provided evidence and analysis in support of their claim that the



three exceeding themes were present and in evidence at the time of the assessment and rating visit.

Outcome

46. Standard 2.2 was rated as 'Meeting NQS', with no exceeding themes demonstrated.

First Tier Review

Approved Provider's View

47. The approved provider submitted that their service should be rated as 'exceeding NQS' in this standard.
48. Regarding Exceeding theme 1, the approved provider stated that:
- *We have had collaboration with Emergency Services. Staff are involved in critical thinking with evaluating each drill, reviewing all policies, discussing them all together at staff meetings.*
 - *Staff are made aware of their responsibilities as a mandatory reporter when we do staff performances. (Theme 1) All staff hold the current Child Protection qualifications.*
 - *The approved provider claims that the evidence point "The expertise of external fire and emergency services can impact the review of policies and influence changes to procedures." believes this rating should change to Exceeding.*
 - *We have had [REDACTED] do a WHS audit on the service, Approved Fire Gear attends the centre quarterly to service all fire equipment, and the local fire Service visits the centre to talk with both Educators and children.*
 - *Local Police officer visits the service each year.*
 - *Training has been sourced for staff on Fire Equipment to be done 2019.*
49. Regarding Exceeding theme 2, the approved provider submitted that:
- *The approved provider states that the authorised officers evidence "Collaboration with external fire and emergency services is limited at this stage and educators are yet to engage in critical thinking in this standard." The approved provider states this is incorrect. We have had collaboration with Emergency Services.*



- *Staff are involved in critical thinking with evaluating each drill, reviewing all policies, discussing them all together at staff meetings. Theme 1, 2 and 3 are met, therefore rating should be changed to EXCEEDING.”*
 - *We have an Outdoor supervision plan, daily safety checks are carried out for both indoor and outdoor environments.*
 - *Emergency evacuations are evaluated each time, then discussed at a staff meeting.*
 - *All staff and families review Child Protection Policy each year.*
 - *Nominated Supervisor critically reflects compliance in her Journal each month.*
50. Regarding Exceeding theme 3, the approved provider submitted that:
- *Community is engaged with for example Speech Therapist, Dentist, Dietician, Visions STEPS screener, Early Intervention, Paediatricians, Psychologists, Occupational Therapists, [REDACTED] Inclusion Support, Emergency Services, Kids and Traffic.*
 - *Staff have participated in [REDACTED] training Children's Nutrition, Munch and Move training, and Kids and Traffic and all reflect on this, sharing with all colleagues.*
51. The Approved Provider submitted a collection of documentary evidence to support these claims.

Regulatory Authority's View

52. In making their decision, the panel considered the additional evidence provided by the provider, as well as the evidence and commentary provided in response to the draft assessment and ratings report.
53. Regarding Exceeding theme 1 the panel stated that:
The panel considered the feedback supplied and when considered with evidence recorded by the officer against this Standard, has concluded that the evidence describes practices that support Theme 1 in this standard being amended to Yes. In the panels opinion the evidence demonstrates the service's approach to protecting children from harm and hazards is embedded into service practice.
54. Regarding Exceeding theme 2 the panel reported that:
The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 2 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted by the approved provider.



The service is encouraged to consider the overview of Exceeding Theme 2 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, such as when practice is informed by critical reflection, educators consider, question, analyse and re-evaluate planning and decision-making for that standard. This supports a culture of ongoing self-assessment that helps identify continuous improvement and improved outcomes for children, families and educators.

55. Regarding Exceeding theme 3 the panel reported that:
The panel considered all additional evidence supplied by the approved provider against this Standard, describe practices that support Theme 3 in this standard being amended to Yes. The evidence provided lends itself to quality area 6.

Decision

56. The panel evaluated the evidence for all three exceeding themes, and amended the rating for theme 1 to 'yes', but found insufficient evidence to support a finding that themes 2 and 3 were present for this standard. The rating for Standard 2.2 remained at 'Meeting NQS'.

Second Tier Review

Approved Provider's submission

57. In applying for second tier review, the provider stated that they believe themes 2 and 3 are being met for this standard.
58. They cited the following pieces of assessor evidence in support of their claim:
- EV905522: supervision points have been identified and reflect the design of the building (THEME 2)
 - EV905527: A template is completed to evaluate different aspects of the emergency evacuation drills (THEME 2)
 - EV905516: Educators sign each year to acknowledge they have an understanding of the child protection policy (THEME 2)
 - EV905512: The fire brigade has provided feedback about the evacuation point and suggested other locations (THEME 3)
 - EV905514: When [REDACTED] conducted an audit of the service, the emergency floor plans and procedures were sighted (THEME 3).
59. In their application for second tier review, the approved provider stated:
We have had [REDACTED] do a WHS audit on the service, Approved Fire Gear attends the centre quarterly to service all fire equipment, and the local fire



service visits the centre to talk with both Educators and children. Local police officer visits the service each year. Training has been sourced for staff on fire equipment to be done 2019 (QIP). The nominated supervisor critically reflects about compliance in her journal each month.

Effective supervision is maintained throughout the day and educators enhance the awareness of risks by reminding children about potential hazards, such as the wet walkway. Educators have developed practical ways of ensuring each child has participated in and is aware of the emergency evacuation drills and convey important information. Processes are in place to ensure educators are aware of their responsibilities as mandatory reporters. This is all embedded into our program. We have an outdoor supervision plan, daily safety checks are carried out for both indoor and outdoor environments, emergency evacuations are evaluated each time, then discussed at a staff meeting. (theme 2). All staff and families review Child Protection Policy each year (Theme 2 and 3). Staff are involved in critical thinking with evaluating each drill, reviewing all policies, discussing them all together at staff meetings.

60. The following evidence was provided in relation to this standard:
- An acknowledgement from staff in regards to child protection that is signed annually
 - Emergency evaluation
 - Compliance reflections
 - Fire safety documentation
 - A supervision plan.

Panel's Consideration

61. As theme 1 had previously been found to be present for this standard, the panel discussed whether themes 2 and 3 were evidenced.
62. Regarding theme 2, the panel made a general comment that the evidence presented for this theme demonstrated some clear examples of strong, meeting-level practice, but not a clear sense of how reflection is systematic as part of service operations and how areas for improvement are identified and implemented, including through reflecting on safety-related incidents.
63. Regarding theme 3, the panel felt that again, there was clear evidence of engagement with families and the community, but not clear evidence that this meaningfully shaped service operations.



64. The panel discussed the example of engagement with the local fire and emergency services, and concluded that the service is partly on its way to demonstrating practice that is informed by meaningful engagement with the broader community.
65. The panel agreed that the service demonstrates strong practice at a 'meeting' level, but that, on balance, neither the robust debate and critical reflection nor the practice shaped by meaningful collaboration with families and communities that are required for a rating of 'exceeding' in these themes were in evidence.

Decision

66. The panel confirmed the regulatory authority's decision that exceeding themes 2 and 3 were not demonstrated for this standard. The rating for Standard 2.2 remains at 'Meeting NQS'.

Standard 3.1

67. Standard 3.1 is that:
The design of the facilities is appropriate for the operation of a service.

Assessment and rating

Regulatory Authority's View

68. In the draft report for this standard, all elements were rated as met, and no exceeding themes were found to be present. The authorised officer's analysis for this standard states:
Educators enhance the unique design of the building by arranging furniture and experiences that are suitable for the space, free flowing and aesthetically pleasing. Educators undertake cleaning tasks at routine times and tidy throughout the day. Children are now being encouraged to clean their spaces and take care of resources following observations taken by educators. This type of reflection leads to embedded practice for both educators and children and is encouraged to become regular practice. Consideration is yet to be given to the ways families and community can contribute the ongoing improvements for the premises.
69. The Authorised Officers made the following QIP notes for this Standard:
Educators are encouraged to consider theoretical influences on the design of the rooms and how these align with the Early Years Learning Framework. Regular reflections should include ways to further enhance children's learning,



educators' differing points of view, knowledge and skills. Use past incidents and previous programs as discussion points and ideas for continuous improvement. Resources have been included below to contribute to current projects and ideas for the outdoor environment.

Approved Provider's View

70. The approved provider provided feedback to the finding and evidence for this standard in the draft report, and submitted additional evidence. In their feedback, the approved provider maintained that they should be rated exceeding for this standard, and provided evidence and analysis in support of their claim that the three exceeding themes were present and in evidence at the time of the visit.

Outcome

71. Standard 3.1 was rated as 'Meeting NQS', with no exceeding themes demonstrated.

First Tier Review

Approved Provider's View

72. The approved provider submitted that their service should be rated as 'exceeding NQS' in this standard.
73. Regarding Exceeding theme 1, the approved provider stated that:
- *The service has met the requirements to display an "Our Service Values Inclusion" sticker that acknowledges that the service has undergone reflection and planning to develop a Strategic Inclusion Plan (SIP).*
 - *The centre philosophy promotes equity and inclusion. We have developed a Strategic Inclusion Plan. We have access to [REDACTED] inclusion Support, Early Links, and [REDACTED]*
 - *The quality improvement plan states "Cleaning of the centre is outsourced to [REDACTED] who attends after hours five days a week to clean the centre. Educators will clean environments including bathroom throughout the day, and regular cleaning of toys and equipment is documented. Cleaning of carpets, windows, lounges are scheduled throughout the year.*
74. Regarding Exceeding theme 2, the approved provider submitted that:



- *Evidence submitted with the approved providers application states "Parents are often asked about which equipment to purchase and will be asked for yard improvements (QIP)."*
 - *All educators review policies. It is regular practice.*
 - *Meeting minutes submitted with the approved providers application states a discussion was held in relation to changing some shelving around.*
 - *Email evidence was submitted as part of their application that invites families to contribute to the review of quality area 3 questionnaire.*
 - *On the 7 August 2018, families were invited to attend a meeting in relation to Area 3: Physical environment.*
 - *Evidence submitted with the approved provider's application includes [REDACTED] reflections.*
75. Regarding Exceeding theme 3, the approved provider submitted that:
- [REDACTED] Inclusion Support have been consulted in regards to our environments (SIP).
76. The Approved Provider submitted a collection of documentary evidence to support these claims.

Regulatory Authority's View

77. In making their decision, the panel considered the additional evidence provided by the provider, as well as the evidence and commentary provided in response to the draft assessment and ratings report.
78. Regarding Exceeding theme 1 the panel stated that:
The panel considered all evidence supplied by the approved provider and when considered with evidence recorded by the officer against this Standard, describe practices that support Theme 1 in this standard being amended to 'Yes.' In the panel's opinion, the additional information from the provider demonstrates that the services approach demonstrates high quality practice is usual at the service in relation to the physical environment.
79. Regarding Exceeding theme 2 the panel reported that:
The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 2 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority. The service is encouraged to consider the overview of Exceeding Theme 2 in the Guide to the National



Quality Standard, such as when practice is informed by critical reflection, educators consider, question, analyse and re-evaluate planning and decision-making for that standard. This supports a culture of ongoing self-assessment that helps identify continuous improvement and improved outcomes for children, families and educators.

80. Regarding Exceeding theme 3 the panel reported that:
The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 3 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority. It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 3 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the [REDACTED] however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of Exceeding.

Decision

81. The panel evaluated the evidence for all three exceeding themes, and amended the findings for theme 1 to 'yes', but found insufficient evidence for themes 2 and 3. The rating for Standard 3.1 remained at 'Meeting NQS'.

Second Tier Review

Approved Provider's submission

82. The approved provider submitted that they believe themes 2 and 3 are being met for this standard.
83. They argued that the following pieces of assessor evidence support this claim
- EV905531: a cubby house is used when effective supervision can be maintained. (THEME 2)
 - EV905537: educators complete a daily checklist to ensure indoor and outdoor environments are clean and safe. (THEME 2)
 - EV905562" families have been asked to provide ideas or knowledge about the best types of plants to grow in the rooms. (THEME 3)
 - EV905566: Educators asked for feedback from families about whether sustainability should be part of the philosophy and it was agreed that it should be considered. (THEME 2 & 3)
84. The approved provider stated:
All educators review policies. All families were sent an email in regards to Quality Area 3. A family member participated in the self-assessment of this



area. Parents are often asked about which equipment to purchase and will be asked for yard improvements (QIP). [REDACTED] Inclusion Support have been consulted in regards to our environments (SIP). Families have been asked for advice on gardens, plants. Community Grants applied for.

85. The approved provider submitted the following evidence:
- Reflections from 5 staff after visiting [REDACTED]
 - Email to families inviting them to participate in self assessing QA3
 - A response from a parent
 - [REDACTED] School Environment Grant
 - A daily safety checklist
 - A poster where families were asked for input on equipment to purchase.

Panel's Consideration

86. The service had previously been found to have met exceeding theme 1, so the panel discussed whether exceeding themes 2 and 3 were in evidence.
87. The panel made a general note that they saw a pattern in the evidence they were reviewing, that there were some strong examples of good practice, but not a clear sense of practice that is above-and-beyond what is expected for a meeting-level service, as per the exceeding guidance in the Guide to the NQF.
88. The Panel considered that the service provided some evidence of engaging with families, for example asking families about types of pot plants for the service, but that the evidence provided was limited and did not go beyond what would be expected to meet the NQS.
89. The Panel also noted that the service stated that they collaborated with children in this standard, but was unable to see strong evidence of this. It was noted, for example, that the service asked children to be involved in the cleaning of resources, but that they were not involved in making decisions about what resources they would like to see in the space.
90. The panel also noted engagement with [REDACTED] and emails out to parents relating to reflection and feedback of named standards.

Decision

91. The panel confirmed the Regulatory Authority's decision. Exceeding themes 2 and 3 remain as 'no' for Standard 3.1. The rating for Standard 3.1 is confirmed as 'Meeting NQS'.



Standard 4.1

92. Standard 4.1 is that:

Staffing Arrangements enhance children's learning and development.

Assessment and rating

Regulatory Authority's View

93. In the draft report for this standard, all elements were rated as met, and no exceeding themes were found to be present. The authorised officer's analysis states:

The qualifications and skills of educators are suitable for the operation of the service. Long term employees and regular casuals offers continuity for children and families. Families and the community are yet to make a significant impact on staffing arrangements, and reflection on the role of the educator and how staffing arrangements impact children's learning are yet to be considered.

94. The Authorised Officer provided the following QIP notes for this Quality Area:
Management and educators are encouraged to consider how the arrangement of educators impact children's wellbeing and quality of care. Draw on the voices of parents and contemplate how their ideas can be used to inform the roster. Consider external agencies, professional readings and training to significantly contribute to providing a highly professional work environment.

Approved Provider's View

95. The approved provider did not provide feedback to the finding for this standard in the draft report.

Outcome

96. Standard 4.1 was rated as 'Meeting NQS', with no exceeding themes demonstrated.

First Tier Review

Approved Provider's View

97. The approved provider submitted that their service should be rated as 'exceeding NQS' in this standard.



98. Regarding Exceeding theme 1, the approved provider stated that:
- *Evidence submitted with the approved provider's application, congratulates ██████ on her successful completion of her diploma.*
99. Regarding Exceeding theme 2, the approved provider submitted that:
- *Evidence submitted with the approved provider's application, workplace review completed by ██████ workplace relations specialists.*
 - *The review looks at employment practise review and identified issues and ways to move forward as set out in the Corrective Action Plan.*
 - *The centre has access to a HR company, Employsure to ensure all staffing policies and procedures are being met.*
100. Regarding Exceeding theme 3, the approved provider submitted that:
The services quality improvement plan states "The centre has access to a HR company."

Regulatory Authority's View

101. In making their decision, the panel considered the additional evidence provided by the provider, as well as the evidence and commentary provided in response to the draft assessment and ratings report.
102. Regarding Exceeding theme 1 the panel stated that:
The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 1 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority. It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 1 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the ██████, however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of Exceeding.
103. Regarding Exceeding theme 2 the panel reported that:
The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 2 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority. . It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 2 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the ██████, however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of



Exceeding.

104. Regarding Exceeding theme 3 the panel reported that:

The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 3 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority. It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 3 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the [REDACTED] however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of Exceeding.

Decision

105. The panel evaluated the evidence for all three exceeding themes, and made no amendments to the original findings. The rating for Standard 4.1 remained at 'Meeting NQS' with no exceeding themes demonstrated.

Second Tier Review

Approved Provider's submission

106. The approved provider believes that all three exceeding themes are present in this standard.

107. The approved provider submitted no additional evidence or commentary, but advised during a phone conversation that they would like the panel to re-evaluate existing evidence in relation to this standard.

Panel's Consideration

108. As no Exceeding Themes have been found for this standard, the panel discussed themes 1, 2 and 3.

109. The panel discussed theme 1 and noted that the observed approaches of educators was a strength and that purposeful consideration was clearly given to the organisation of educators. The panel found that there was evidence that there was a focus on providing continuity of educators, that the service worked purposefully with relief educators and used release time effectively. The panel also noted a system of rewarding staff for time served. The panel noted that the nominated supervisor has 1:1 meetings with educators. The panel felt that it was clear that these practices had a positive, observed impact on the service and contributed to the delivery of high-quality education and care.



110. Regarding theme 2, the panel did not find evidence to support that reflective debate or critical reflection drove the service's approach to the organisation of educators.
111. Regarding theme 3, the panel did not see clear or sufficient evidence of how opportunities for collaboration with family and community partners are built into the service's approach to organisation and continuity of educators.
112. The panel highlighted email exchanges as one-off examples of good practice for both themes 2&3, but did not see systemic reflective practice or ongoing meaningful engagement with families that shapes practice in relation to this theme.
113. The panel noted that the service reflected on their unique context – being a 30 place service, for example, but there was no clear evidence showing how their practice was shaped by their context.

Decision

114. The panel amended exceeding theme 1 from 'no' to 'yes'. The panel confirmed exceeding themes 2 and 3 as 'no'. The overall rating for standard 4.1 was confirmed as 'Meeting NQS'.

Standard 4.2

115. Standard 2.2 is that:

Management, educators and staff are collaborative, respectful and ethical.

Assessment and rating

Regulatory Authority's View

116. In the draft report for this standard, all elements were rated as met, and no exceeding themes were found to be present. The authorised officer's analysis states:
Educators are supportive of each other and offer opportunities for mentoring when the need arises. There is effective communication between the educators working in job share arrangements and this imparts children's sense of belonging. Professional readings and training opportunities contribute to maintaining a professional work environment. Practice is yet to be embedded in this standard with limited engagement with families and community and opportunities for critical reflection.
117. The Authorised officer provided the following QIP notes for this Standard:
Management and educators are encouraged to consider how the arrangement



of educators impact children's wellbeing and quality of care. Draw on the voices of parents and contemplate how their ideas can be used to inform the roster. Consider external agencies, professional readings and training to significantly contribute to providing a highly professional work environment.

Approved Provider's View

118. The approved provider did not provide feedback to the finding for this standard in the draft report.

Outcome

119. Standard 4.2 was rated as 'Meeting NQS', with no exceeding themes demonstrated.

First Tier Review

Approved Provider's View

120. The approved provider submitted that their service should be rated as 'exceeding NQS' in this standard.

121. Regarding Exceeding theme 1, the approved provider stated that:

- *The quality improvement outlines the following "Professional magazines such as Rattler /Inclusion Matters are available to staff. Nominated Supervisor regularly emails staff with any new information, online newsletters such as ACECQA and Sunsmart."*
- *Evidence submitted with the approved provider's application outlines "Educators participated in a project that focused on educator's skill, strengths and teamwork when designing and constructing a scarecrow."*

122. Regarding Exceeding theme 2, the approved provider submitted that:

- *The quality improvement plan outlines "Staff are able to participate in 2 professional development courses a year. Educators are encouraged to reflect and share their findings from these courses at a staff meeting."*
- *Email evidence was submitted as part of their application that invites families to contribute to the review of quality area 4 questionnaire.*
- *On the 27 July 2018, families were invited to attend a meeting in relation to Area 4 Staffing arrangement.*
- *All staff have access to the Code of Ethics, and this is reviewed annually when we meet for Performance Review.*



- *All Educators have an Educator Reflective Journal, as well as Nominated Supervisor. Nominated Supervisor and Educator regularly meet to discuss any reflective questions within these journals.*

123. Regarding Exceeding theme 3, the approved provider submitted that:

- *One Educator is a participant in the [REDACTED] Yarnin Circle, facilitating inclusion.*

Regulatory Authority's View

124. In making their decision, the panel considered the additional evidence provided by the provider, as well as the evidence and commentary provided in response to the draft assessment and ratings report.

125. Regarding Exceeding theme 1 the panel stated that:

The panel considered all additional evidence supplied by the approved provider against this Standard, describe practices that support Theme 1 in this standard being amended to Yes.

126. Regarding Exceeding theme 2 the panel reported that:

The panel considered all evidence supplied by the approved provider and when considered with evidence recorded by the officer against this Standard, describe practices that support Theme 2 in this standard being amended to 'Yes.' In the panel's opinion, the additional information from the provider demonstrates that the services approach demonstrates high quality practice is usual at the service in relation Practice is informed by critical reflection.

127. Regarding Exceeding theme 3 the panel reported that:

The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 3 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority. It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 3 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the [REDACTED], however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of Exceeding.

Decision

128. The panel evaluated the evidence for all three exceeding themes, and amended the finding for theme 2 to 'yes', but found insufficient evidence to



support a higher rating for themes 1 and 3. The rating for Standard 4.2 remained at 'Meeting NQS'.

Second Tier Review

Approved Provider's submission

129. The approved provider believes that exceeding themes 1 and 3 are present in this standard.
130. The approved provider provided no additional evidence or commentary, but advised during a phone conversation that they would like the panel to re-evaluate existing evidence in relation to this standard.

Panel's Consideration

131. The service had previously been found to demonstrate exceeding theme 2, so the panel considered whether exceeding themes 1 and 3 were demonstrated.
132. Regarding theme 1 the panel felt that there were some examples of good practice, and some practice that aligned with the exceeding guidance provided in the Guide to the NQF. The panel agreed, however, that the evidence did not demonstrate that high-quality practice was fully embedded in service operations for this standard.
133. In relation to this theme the panel noted that the evidence demonstrated that the provider worked actively to recognise expertise amongst staff, and noted an example of a trainee being provided with support and encouragement.
134. Regarding theme 3 the panel felt that there were some strong examples of high-quality practice at the meeting level for this Standard. The panel referred to the exceeding guidance for this theme and concluded that, on balance, the evidence did not demonstrate the indicators as set out in the guidance.

Decision

135. The panel confirmed the regulatory authority's ratings for this standard. The overall rating for standard 4.2 remains as 'Meeting NQS'.

Standard 5.1



136. Standard 2.2 is that:

Respectful and equitable relationships are maintained with each child.

Assessment and rating

Regulatory Authority's View

137. In the draft report for this standard, all elements were rated as met, and no exceeding themes were found to be present. The authorised officer's analysis states:

Input from families is valued in this standard when reflecting on the 'Interactions with Children' policy. This type of engagement is encouraged for continuously reflecting on and shaping practice. Educator and child interactions are respectful in regard to children's rights, culture and sense of belonging. Continued engagement with the community and drawing on the expertise of families will shape exceeding practices in this standard.

138. The Authorised Officer made the following QIP notes for Quality Area *Educators are encouraged to consider the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child when documenting reflections in their journals. Reflect on how children's rights are promoted at all times, how children's ideas and opinions reflected through the program and what the role of the educator is in supporting their rights. Continue to promote opportunities for collaborative learning and involve children in discussion about respecting each other's points of view, their feelings and rights. Consider how the strengths of families and parenting opinions are significantly impacting the way educators respond to children and cater for their sense of belonging.*

Approved Provider's View

139. The approved provider provided feedback to the finding for this standard in the draft report, and submitted additional evidence. In their feedback, the approved provider maintained that they should be rated exceeding for this standard, and provided evidence and analysis in support of their claim that the three exceeding themes were present and in evidence at the time of the visit.

Outcome

140. Standard 5.1 was rated as 'Meeting NQS', with no exceeding themes demonstrated.

First Tier Review

Approved Provider's View



141. The approved provider submitted that their service should be rated as 'exceeding NQS' in this standard.
142. Regarding Exceeding theme 1, the approved provider stated that:
- *Families have the opportunity to reflect and provide input into Area 5. We are a small service with wonderful, respectful relationships with children and their families.*
 - *All families are greeted by their name.*
 - *We have a 'Getting to know you sheet' that families can write their child's interests and areas of concern on.*
 - *Educators provide a feedback sheet highlighting how they will use families input and forwards plans to ensure an interest is provided on their first few days to enable child to settle.*
 - *The centre has a SIP with regular engagement from [REDACTED] consultant.*
 - *Children are supported through the ways that the staffing, grouping arrangements and the environments are organised so that the children feel secure and relaxed and like they belong at the service.*
 - *Routines are predictable and are broken up with ample time to maximise opportunities for meaningful conversations between educators and children.*
 - *Parent's opinions are always valued and respected. Meetings are held, daily conversations, phone calls.*
 - *All children have a sense of belonging at our service.*
143. Regarding Exceeding theme 2, the approved provider submitted that:
- *Educators seek and value family input and consider this input to assist them to continuously reflect on the 'Interactions with Children' policy and their practices.*
 - *All educators have their own copy of the Rights of a child in their journal. The children have been involved in developing Room Expectations. Staff reflect in their journals, in the diary, and on the program.*
 - *Children's voices are evident everywhere at our centre. Collaborative learning takes place through small group experiences.*
144. Regarding Exceeding theme 3, the approved provider submitted that:
- *An educator attends the Yarnin Circle Network group.*



145. The Approved Provider submitted a collection of documentary evidence to support these claims.

Regulatory Authority's View

146. In making their decision, the panel considered the additional evidence provided by the provider, as well as the evidence and commentary provided in response to the draft assessment and ratings report.
147. Regarding Exceeding theme 1 the panel stated that:
The panel considered all evidence supplied by the approved provider and when considered with evidence recorded by the officer against this Standard, describe practices that support Theme 1 in this standard being amended to 'Yes.' In the panel's opinion, the additional information from the provider demonstrates that the services approach demonstrates high quality practice is usual at the service that supports relationships with children.
148. Regarding Exceeding theme 2 the panel reported that:
The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 2 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority, feedback and the quality improvement plan. It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 2 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the [REDACTED] however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of Exceeding.
149. Regarding Exceeding theme 3 the panel reported that:
The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 3 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority feedback and the quality improvement plan. It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 3 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the [REDACTED] however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of Exceeding.

Decision

150. The panel evaluated the evidence for all three exceeding themes, and amended the findings for theme 1 to 'yes', but found insufficient evidence to support a higher rating for themes 2 and 3. The rating for Standard 5.1 remained as 'Meeting NQS'.



Second Tier Review

Approved Provider's submission

151. The approved provider has stated that they believe themes 2 and 3 are being met for standard 5.1.
152. They cited the following pieces of assessor evidence in support of their application:
- EV091655: children and educators sing an Acknowledgement to Country each day. (THEME 3)
 - EV905594: a child was excited to hear that the educators had displayed a word in her home language to reflect her culture. (Theme 3)
 - EV905597: An educator utilises picture cards to explain the routine of arrival and to settle the child into an activity. (THEME 2)
153. In their application for second tier review, the approved provider stated:
All educators have their own copy of the rights of a child in their journal. The children have been involved in developing room expectations. Staff reflect in their journals, in the diary and on the program. Children's voices are evident everywhere at our centre. Collaborative learning takes place through small group experiences. Parents' opinions are always valued and respected. Meetings are held, daily conversation, phone calls, behaviour guidance plans developed to ensure we aim for an inclusive environment. All children have a sense of belonging at our service. We are a small service with wonderful, respectful, strong relationships with children and their families. Families are consulted regularly.
154. *Families had the opportunity to provide into Area 5. All families are greeted by their name. We have a 'Getting to know you sheet' that families can write their child's interests and areas of concern on. Educators provide a feedback sheet highlighting how they will use families input and forward plan to ensure an interest is provided on their first few days to enable children to settle.*
155. *The centre has a SIP with regular engagement from [REDACTED] consultant. An educator attends the Yarnin Circle Network group.*



Panel's Consideration

156. As the service had previously been found to be demonstrating exceeding theme 1, the panel's discussion focussed on whether themes 2 & 3 were present.
157. The panel noted that exceeding practice for these themes in this standard is characterised by well-informed decisions, continuous planning, the integration of critical perspectives into reflections, and working to improve equity and challenge stereotypes.
158. The panel noted the service's policy around interactions with children and their approach to the rights of the child, and the process for incorporating children's ideas into the program. The panel agreed that there were some stand-alone examples of good practice provided, but on balance, did not consider there to be evidence of practice at an exceeding level for either theme.
159. The panel commented that the service was quite good at collecting the thoughts and ideas of families, but that it was not clear how they were used to meaningfully influence practice.

Decision

160. The panel confirmed the regulatory authority's decision for Standard 5.1 that Exceeding themes 2 & 3 be assessed as no. The rating for Standard 5.1 is confirmed as 'Meeting NQS'.

Standard 5.2

161. Standard 5.2 is that:
Each child is supported to build and maintain sensitive and responsive relationships.

Assessment and rating

Regulatory Authority's View

162. In the draft report for this standard, all elements were rated as met, and no exceeding themes were found to be present. The authorised officer's analysis states:
Educators encourage group learning experiences and are intentional in their planning for these. Educator reflections also demonstrate an understanding for the need for peer scaffolding. There are moments throughout the day when educators intervene and support children to resolve conflicts which is guided by the self-regulation training. Educators draw on the knowledge of parents



and support agencies to help guide behaviour and develop behaviour management plans. These opportunities should also be used to shape policies and procedures and as opportunities to reflect on the philosophy.

163. The Authorised Officer made the following QIP notes in relation to Quality Area 5:

Educators are encouraged to consider the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child when documenting reflections in their journals. Reflect on how children's rights are promoted at all times, how children's ideas and opinions reflected through the program and what the role of the educator is in supporting their rights. Continue to promote opportunities for collaborative learning and involve children in discussion about respecting each other's points of view, their feelings and rights. Consider how the strengths of families and parenting opinions are significantly impacting the way educators respond to children and cater for their sense of belonging.

Approved Provider's View

164. The approved provider provided feedback to the finding for this standard in the draft report, and submitted additional evidence. In their feedback, the approved provider maintained that they should be rated exceeding for this standard, and provided evidence and analysis in support of their claim that the three exceeding themes were present and in evidence at the time of the visit.

Outcome

165. Standard 5.2 was rated as 'Meeting NQS', only exceeding theme 3 demonstrated. Themes 2 & 3 were rated as 'no'.

First Tier Review

Approved Provider's View

166. The approved provider submitted that their service should be rated as 'exceeding NQS' in this standard.

167. Regarding Exceeding theme 1, the approved provider stated that:

- *Email evidence dated 10 October 2018 was submitted as part of their application outlining collaborative partnerships with the family and professionals.*
- *Staff participated in [REDACTED] Self-regulation training.*



- *By providing small groups, open ended resources, intentional questioning. This rating should be changed to exceeding.*

168. Regarding Exceeding theme 2, the approved provider submitted that:

- *Critical reflection occurs in journals, staff meetings, verbal conversations, parent meetings.*

169. The Approved Provider submitted a collection of documentary evidence to support these claims.

Regulatory Authority's View

170. In making their decision, the panel considered the additional evidence provided by the provider, as well as the evidence and commentary provided in response to the draft assessment and ratings report.

171. Regarding Exceeding theme 1 the panel stated that:

The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 1 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority, feedback and the quality improvement plan. It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 2 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the [REDACTED] however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of Exceeding.

172. Regarding Exceeding theme 2 the panel reported that:

The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 2 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority, feedback and the quality improvement plan. It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 2 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the [REDACTED] however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of Exceeding.

Decision

173. The panel evaluated the evidence for exceeding themes 1 & 2, and made no amendments. The rating for Standard 5.2 remained at 'Meeting NQS'.

Second Tier Review

Approved Provider's submission



174. The approved provider believes that exceeding themes 1 and 2 are present at their service.

175. They have argued that the following pieces of assessor evidence supports their claim:

- EV0919834: A planning book is used to document and forward plan group learning experiences. (THEME 2)
- EV905601: All educators have participated in an online training module on self-regulation. (THEME 2)
- EV905603: A dispute arises with the turn taking at the trains, an educator intervenes and discusses a solution. (THEME 1)
- EV905604: An educator is using the knowledge gained from self-regulation training to guide some children's behaviour (THEMES 1 & 2)
- EV905600: Behaviour management plans have been developed in consultation with families for some children. Progress notes are documented throughout the year. (THEMES 1 & 2)

176. The approved provider stated:

Educator reflections demonstrate an understanding for the need for peer scaffolding. This is embedded by providing small groups, open ended resources, intentional questioning. Staff participated in [REDACTED] self regulation training. Critical reflection occurs in journals, staff meetings, verbal conversations, parent meetings. Parents and supported agencies ([REDACTED] inclusion, Yarnin Circle, OT, Speech Therapist, Paediatrician, Psychologist) are consulted, and can review policies/procedures and philosophy. We are a small service and able to communicate with parents each day. Regular conversations are held in regards to children's behaviour.

177. The provider submitted the following pieces of evidence in relation to this standard:

- Photo of an Educator's journal with a copy of UN rights of a child
- An educator's reflection of UN rights of a child
- Educator's reflection on sense of agency
- Educator's reflection about shared learning
- Educator notes on inclusion
- Diary entry of parent conversation
- Copy of a behaviour guidance plan
- Meeting minutes QA5
- Educator reflections on individual children
- Educator reflections on learning



- QA5 educator reflections
- Email invite to families for QA 5 review
- Parent email providing feedback for QA5
- Two completed getting to know you sheets by parents along with educator reply and planning
- Diary entry parent conversation
- Parent meeting notes
- Educator reflections
- Self-regulation reflection
- Educator journal notes.

Panel's Consideration

178. As the service had already been found to demonstrate exceeding theme 3, the panel discussed whether themes 1 and 2 were in evidence.
179. The panel acknowledged that the service was demonstrating a lot of high-quality practice. The Panel also noted, however, that the exceeding themes are designed to expect more than what's required to meet the NQS. There is a lot of strength evidenced in meeting what are already very high standards.
180. Regarding theme 1, the panel members noted that there were observations of educators supporting children to regulate behaviour, but not strong evidence that this was embedded for example, through a connection with policy or procedure or guidance strategy.
181. Regarding theme 2 the panel noted that educators had completed training together as a group and that this had led to change in reflections about individual children. The panel also noted the numerous reflections in journals, staff journals and communications with parents in a way that appeared to inform the service's approach to supporting children to build and maintain sensitive and responsive relationships. The panel agreed that this theme was demonstrated.

Decision

182. The panel confirmed exceeding theme 1 as no. The panel amended exceeding theme 2 from 'no' to 'yes'. The overall rating for Standard 5.2 remained as 'Meeting NQS'.

Standard 7.1

183. Standard 7.1 is that:
Governance supports the operation of a quality service.



Assessment and rating

Regulatory Authority's View

184. In the draft report for this standard, all elements were rated as met, and no exceeding themes were found to be present. The authorised officer's analysis states:

The approved provider, administrative staff and educators work cohesively to support the operation of the service and provide quality outcomes for children. There are some opportunities for families to contribute to the review of policies and the philosophy, and some community engagement to seek expertise and advice. Evidence suggesting significant changes have been made based on family feedback is yet to be demonstrated. The children have been involved in some reflection about the service and deeper reflection, along with every educator would lead to embedded practice in this standard.

185. The Authorised Officer made the following QIP notes:

Family feedback is considered in this standard; however educators are encouraged to think about how this feedback has made significant changes to the operation of the service or for consideration on the quality improvement plan. Also consider external agencies that support the providers in their role and led to embedded practice. The role of the educational leader is suitable for programming planning however this role can also be used to teach others about theorists, provide professional readings and identify opportunities for professional development. Also, draw on contributions from other services, network meetings and consultations to shape practice.

Approved Provider's View

186. The approved provider provided feedback to the finding for this standard in the draft report, and submitted additional evidence. In their feedback, the approved provider maintained that they should be rated exceeding for this standard, and provided evidence and analysis in support of their claim that the three exceeding themes were present and in evidence at the time of the visit.

Outcome

187. Standard 7.1 was rated as 'Meeting NQS', with no exceeding themes demonstrated.

First Tier Review

Approved Provider's View



188. The approved provider submitted that their service should be rated as 'exceeding NQS' in this standard.
189. Regarding Exceeding theme 1, the approved provider stated that:
- *Evidence submitted as part of the approved provider's application includes an attachment – No date- How is my practice informed by our philosophy.*
 - *Evidence submitted as part of the approved provider's application includes an attachment Email Dated 7 August 2018 – areas of improvement self- assessment for QA 7.*
190. Regarding Exceeding theme 2, the approved provider submitted no additional feedback or evidence.
191. Regarding Exceeding theme 3, the approved provider submitted that:
Evidence submitted as part of the approved provider's application includes an attachment – exceeding guidance for Standard 7.1 Governance with notes included, for example staff support each other. Everyone included in meetings. Families invited to contribute to QIP.
192. The Approved Provider submitted documentary evidence to support these claims.

Regulatory Authority's View

193. In making their decision, the panel considered the additional evidence provided by the provider, as well as the evidence and commentary provided in response to the draft assessment and ratings report.
194. Regarding Exceeding theme 1 the panel stated that:
The panel considered all evidence supplied by the approved provider and when considered with evidence recorded by the officer against this Standard, describe practices that support Theme 1 in this standard being amended to 'Yes.' In the panel's opinion, the additional information from the provider demonstrates that the services approach demonstrates high quality practice is usual at the service that supports collaborative partnerships with families and communities.
195. Regarding Exceeding theme 2 the panel reported that:
The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 2 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The



panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority, feedback and the quality improvement plan. It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 2 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the [REDACTED] however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of Exceeding.

196. Regarding Exceeding theme 3 the panel reported that:

The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 3 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority. It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 3 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the [REDACTED] however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of Exceeding.

Decision

197. The panel evaluated the evidence for all three exceeding themes, and amended the findings for theme 1 to 'yes', but found insufficient evidence for themes 2 and 3. The rating for Standard 7.1 remained at 'Meeting NQS'.

Second Tier Review

Approved Provider's submission

198. The approved provider claims that themes 2 and 3 are being met.

199. They argue that the following pieces of assessor evidence support their claim:

- EV905658: posing questions are presented to families to break down areas of philosophy for review.
- EV905665: Any major changes to policies are displayed for families to comment on.
- EV905649: A selection of policies are available in the staff room for educators to review and provide feedback on.
- EV905664: children were asked, "what should we tell the visitors about [REDACTED] The children expressed their favourite things about preschool and these responses are now included in the information book and on the website. (THEME 2).

200. The approved provider commented:

All families are given the opportunity to provide feedback on both philosophy



and policies. Parents who attend a parent evening were able to contribute to the philosophy about sustainability. Policies that are up for review are emailed to families. Families are surveyed about different operational aspects. E.g. When we change service hours. We have involved an external agency [REDACTED] to oversee all staffing and HR matters, including staff policies and handbook. They did an audit on workplace practice and work health and safety. Rating should be changed to EXCEEDING (Theme 1, 2, 3). We do have parent participation, and as we are a small service, I consider the feedback we receive is a good snapshot of our families. We do engage with the local community. All educators are involved in reviewing of centre philosophy and policies. They are required to sign once read, contribute where appropriate. Children's voices are extremely evident throughout the program.

201. The approved provider submitted the following evidence for review for both Standards 7.1 and 7.2:

- Parent feedback on centre philosophy
- Parent survey on centre hours. From this survey we then changed our hours to cater for the family's needs.
- E mail to families about policy review
- Email inviting parents to QIP review. This email has an RSVP from a parent.
- Email to parent about QIP review with reflective questions for them.
- Excerpt from parent information book with children's philosophy.
- Certificate of attendance to a workshop "understanding the revised NQS.
- Invite for educators to attend [REDACTED]

Panel's Consideration

202. As the service had previously been found to have met exceeding theme 1, the panel focussed their discussions on theme 2 and theme 3.

203. Regarding theme 2, the panel members agreed the evidence showed that children had been somewhat involved in reflection and that there is a regular review of systems, policies and procedures. The panel noted, however, that there was no strong evidence of critical reflection on the statement of philosophy as a group, nor links to how this process drives continuous improvement. The panel agreed that some quality reflection did seem to be happening, but that it was unclear how reflections, group discussion and debate were driving practice – there was no clear evidence of a reflective cycle.



204. Regarding theme 3 the panel considered that the service was quite good at collecting parent input. The panel noted that policies and procedures were provided to parents for feedback and that the service, for example, used a rock system to collect parent feedback. Again, the panel felt that while there was some evidence of high-quality practice in this area, the link showing how feedback and engagement with families and community shaped practice was not clear enough to support this Exceeding theme as being met.

Decision

205. The panel confirmed the Regulatory Authority's findings for exceeding themes 2 & 3 as no. The rating for Standard 7.1 remains at 'Meeting NQS'.

Standard 7.2

206. Standard 7.2 is that:

Effective leadership builds and promotes a positive organisational culture and professional learning community.

Assessment and rating

Regulatory Authority's View

207. In the draft report for this standard, all elements were rated as met, and no exceeding themes were found to be present. The authorised officer's analysis states:

There is an effective self-assessment and improvement plan in place which can be contributed to by families and educators. The interactive quality improvement plan allows educators to track their progress and communicate with all stakeholders. The educational leader role is suitable for overseeing the program and encouraging educators to be reflective of their practice. Educators are discovering ways of using their professional development plan as workable documents and incorporating daily reflections of their role as an educator. Continued reflection and consideration of community influences will lead to embedded practice in this standard.

208. The Authorised Officer made the following QIP notes in relation to this Quality Area:

Family feedback is considered in this standard; however educators are encouraged to think about how this feedback has made significant changes to the operation of the service or for consideration on the quality improvement plan. Also consider external agencies that support the providers in their role and led to embedded practice. The role of the educational leader is suitable



for programming planning however this role can also be used to teach others about theorists, provide professional readings and identify opportunities for professional development. Also, draw on contributions from other services, network meetings and consultations to shape practice.

Approved Provider's View

209. The approved provider provided feedback to the finding for this standard in the draft report, and submitted additional evidence. In their feedback, the approved provider maintained that they should be rated exceeding for this standard, and provided evidence and analysis in support of their claim that the three exceeding themes were present and in evidence at the time of the visit.

Outcome

210. Standard 7.2 was rated as 'Meeting NQS', with no exceeding themes demonstrated.

First Tier Review

Approved Provider's View

211. The approved provider submitted that their service should be rated as 'exceeding NQS' in this standard.

212. Regarding Exceeding theme 1, the approved provider submitted no additional evidence or feedback.

213. Regarding Exceeding theme 2, the approved provider submitted that:

- *All staff participate in a staff performance annually and set goals for the coming year.*
- *All educators have release time each week to reflect and program for the children.*
- *Reflective journals are used by the educators and nominated supervisor.*

214. Regarding Exceeding theme 3, the approved provider submitted no additional evidence or feedback.

Regulatory Authority's View

215. In making their decision, the panel considered the additional evidence provided by the provider, as well as the evidence and commentary provided in



response to the draft assessment and ratings report.

216. Regarding Exceeding theme 1 the panel stated that:

The panel considered all evidence supplied by the approved provider and when considered with evidence recorded by the officer against this Standard, describe practices that support Theme 1 in this standard being amended to 'Yes.' In the panel's opinion, the additional information from the provider demonstrates that the services approach demonstrates high quality practice is usual at the service that supports collaborative partnerships with families and communities.

217. Regarding Exceeding theme 2 the panel reported that:

The panel considered all evidence supplied by the approved provider and when considered with evidence recorded by the officer against this Standard, describe practices that support Theme 2 in this standard being amended to 'Yes.' In the panel's opinion, and review of the evidence collected at the time of the visit the services approach demonstrates high quality practice is usual at the service in relation Practice is informed by critical reflection.

218. Regarding Exceeding theme 3 the panel reported that:

The panel considered claims by the approved provider considers that Theme 3 should be amended to Yes to support a higher rating of Exceeding. The panel noted that feedback and evidence submitted with the Application for Review of Ratings by the Regulatory Authority. It is acknowledged that the service is familiar with the Exceeding Theme 3 in the Guide to the National Quality Standard, as outlined in the [REDACTED] however evidence supplied by the approved provider was limited to support a higher rating of Exceeding.

Decision

219. The panel evaluated the evidence for all three exceeding themes, and amended the findings for themes 1 and 2 to 'yes'. The rating for Standard 7.2 remained at 'Meeting NQS'

Second Tier Review

Approved Provider's submission

220. The approved provider claims that theme 3 is met.

221. They argue that the following pieces of assessor evidence support their claim:



- EV905658: posing questions are presented to families to break down areas of philosophy for review.
- EV905665: Any major changes to policies are displayed for families to comment on.
- EV905649: A selection of policies are available in the staff room for educators to review and provide feedback on.
- EV905664: children were asked, "What should we tell the visitors about [REDACTED] The children expressed their favourite things about preschool and these responses are now included in the information book and on the website. (THEME 2).

222. The approved provider commented:

There is an effective self-assessment and improvement plan in place which can be contributed to by families and Educators. It is embedded, critical reflection takes place, and families and the communities are involved. Families have answered reflective questions about each quality area, parents have attended meetings. All staff have participated in the NQS Quality area card game regularly at meetings. Our service is small, and regularly reflects on current practice and considers the community. We have great relationships with feeder schools, other childhood services including playgroup, speech therapists, library, fire brigade, [REDACTED]

223. The approved provider has submitted the following evidence for review for both Standards 7.1 and 7.2:

- Parent feedback on centre philosophy
- Parent survey on centre hours. From this survey we then changed our hours to cater for the family's needs.
- Email to families about policy review
- Email inviting parents to QIP review. This email has an RSVP from a parent.
- Email to parent about QIP review with reflective questions for them.
- Excerpt from parent information book with children's philosophy.
- Certificate of attendance to a workshop "understanding the revised NQS.
- Invite for educators to attend [REDACTED]

Panel's Consideration

224. As themes 1 & 2 had previously been found to have been met, the panel focussed discussion on whether theme 3 was evidenced.



225. The panel discussed the QIP note in relation to the role of the educational leader:

The role of the educational leader is suitable for programming planning however this role can also be used to teach others about theorists, provide professional readings and identify opportunities for professional development. Also, draw on contributions from other services, network meetings and consultations to shape practice.

The panellists commented that this point was not resolved in the additional evidence, and that it was not clear from the existing evidence how extensive their role was.

226. The panel commented, as with previous themes, that there was evidence that the service was collecting information, but not about how it was shaping practice and service delivery.

Decision

227. The panel confirmed the regulatory authority's finding of Exceeding theme 2 as 'no' for this standard. The rating for Standard 7.2 remains as 'Meeting NQS'.