

File Reference:
(if applicable)



National Quality Standard Assessment and Rating Report



Australian Children's
Education & Care
Quality Authority

Service Name Moorak Preschool

Service Approval Number SE-00010663

Provider Name Department for Education

Provider Approval Number PR-00006069

Assessment & Rating Number ASR-00023497

Report Status Final

Date Report Completed 24 September 2018

About this report

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to give the approved provider notice of the outcome of the rating assessment and the rating levels for their education and care service (under section 136 of the Education and Care Services National Law).

The goals of the report are to provide:

- an assessment of the education and care service against the National Quality Standard (NQS) and the National Regulations
- the reasons for rating the service at each level
- support for the ongoing quality improvement of the education and care service

The rating system

The National Regulations prescribe the rating levels within the assessment and rating process (regulation 57). The rating levels are:

- Exceeding National Quality Standard
- Meeting National Quality Standard
- Working Towards National Quality Standard
- Significant Improvement Required

Further information on how ratings are determined is available in the [Guide to the National Quality Framework](#) (Chapter 3: Part 3-Assessment and rating process) available on the ACECQA website at www.acecqa.gov.au.

Assessment and rating visit details

Type of service

Long Day Care Outside School Hours Care (OSHC)

Family Day Care Preschool/Kindergarten

Nominated Supervisor Peter Mitchinson

Educational Leader Peter Mitchinson

Primary Contact
(for assessment & rating) Peter Mitchinson

Quality Improvement Plan
Date Received 17 July 2018

Visit/s

Date 6 August 2018

Authorised officers

Name 1 Melissa Thompson

Further information (if applicable)

Moorak Preschool is a Department for Education (the department) school-based preschool located approximately 5km from Mount Gambier. Children from surrounding towns of the lower Limestone Coast attend the service. The majority of children who attend the preschool transition to the primary school.

The preschool operates on a part-time basis Monday, Tuesday and Wednesdays (even weeks of school terms only). A site funded playgroup facilitated by the preschool school support officer (SSO) operates in the preschool on Friday mornings.

Upgrades to the internal and external spaces of the preschool are planned for the future with a concept plan on display for feedback during the visit. The concept plan includes toilet and kitchen facilities directly accessible to the preschool as well as increased storage and internal floor space.

The assessment and rating visit (the visit) was conducted over two days consisting of the afternoon on day one and the morning of day two.

Quality Area 1 – Educational program and practice

Standard 1.1	The educational program enhances each child's learning and development.	
1.1.1	Curriculum decision making contributes to each child's learning and development outcomes in relation to their identity, connection with community, wellbeing, confidence as learners and effectiveness as communicators.	Met
1.1.2	Each child's current knowledge, strengths, ideas, culture, abilities and interests are the foundation of the program.	Met
1.1.3	All aspects of the program, including routines, are organised in ways that maximise opportunities for each child's learning.	Met

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 1.1

Practice is embedded in service operations	No
Practice is informed by critical reflection	No
Practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community	Yes

Standard 1.1 is rated

Meeting NOS

Evidence for Standard 1.1

The educational program is guided by the Early Years Learning Framework (EYLF), current curriculum requirements as deemed by department priorities (such as numeracy and literacy indicators) and developmental milestones. The service philosophy highlighted the belief of children as competent and capable learners, active participants in their learning and a play-based approach to learning. These beliefs align with some of the principles and practices of the EYLF and were evident to the authorised officer (AO) during the visit.

Educators record observations of children as well as other documentation such as Pic Collages and learning stories and use the language of the EYLF outcomes indicators in their analysis. This is a deliberate intention to not just link or list outcome numbers to children's documentation rather to promote meaningful analysis of children's learning and to support parent/guardian familiarity/understanding of the outcomes. Observations of individual children inform the program as do a range of strategies to extend/challenge children's abilities, thoughts and understandings, through play and inquiry. These include educator's critical reflection discussions and recordings which occur each day.

Educators plan a termly overview which contains the 'big picture' ideas for the term related to a EYLF learning outcome focus. The lead teacher explained that educators ensure the five outcomes are covered across the year. This process supports each child's learning and development in relation to the five learning outcomes. The focus of Term 1 is always learning Outcome 1: Children have a strong sense of identity in regards to children's sense of belonging and identity. The focus outcome for the current term was Outcome 2: Children are connected with and contribute to their world. This aligned with the services' focus on sustainability based on educators noticing that children were not

confident in the use of separate bins for waste as well as children's interest in bugs. Parent input also informed this decision as a parent who works at Bunnings offered to do an activity with the children such as planting or establishing a worm farm.

The preschool routine is organised into blocks of time to accommodate free play, group times-whole group and small group as well as eating times (fruit, recess (optional) and lunch). The routine on display provided children with a significant block of time for free play in the morning (approximately two-and-a half hours) and another 45 minutes in the afternoon to maximise their opportunities for learning. Although, during the visit children's access to free play was reduced due to the number and duration of group times and routines. For example, in the afternoon children came together as a whole group or in small groups for group times and yoga, for a combined duration of 80 minutes. Children also engaged in free lunchtime play in the school yard for a period of approximately 40 minutes. In the morning, children engaged in another 30 minute plus group time. Educators used group times as opportunities for intentional teaching or to reinforce/revisit previous learning.

Standard 1.2	Educators facilitate and extend each child's learning and development.	
1.2.1	Educators are deliberate, purposeful, and thoughtful in their decisions and actions.	Met
1.2.2	Educators respond to children's ideas and play and extend children's learning through open-ended questions, interactions and feedback.	Met
1.2.3	Each child's agency is promoted, enabling them to make choices and decisions that influence events and their world.	Met

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 1.2

Practice is embedded in service operations	No
Practice is informed by critical reflection	Yes
Practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community	Yes

Standard 1.2 is rated Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 1.2

Educators discuss individual children's needs, development and observations as well as the overall group informally during the day or after the session. This is replicated formally during the fortnightly planning meetings attended by all educators to inform future planning and their daily interactions with children. Through these discussions and ongoing critical reflection, educators extend and engage children in their learning as they support their interests, engage in conversations and promote group-time experiences and/or inquiry projects. There was a display in the preschool of an ongoing learning experience/project around construction that occurred in Term 2. This was a joint experience with the Reception/Year 1 class. This display also made children's learning visible to families. Educators respond to children's ideas and suggestions during play such as their requests for chalk for outside play and additional resources for making experiences.

As mentioned in standard 1.1, educators used whole and small group times for intentional teaching purposes. For example, during a whole group-time before lunch an educator read a story about the local area and linked the story to the visit in the morning from 'Aunty Michelle', a community elder and author of the book. The educator assisted children's engagement in the story by asking them questions and enabling them to share their knowledge and experience about the topic as well as ask questions. The educator facilitated a discussion about topics such as the Blue Lake and volcanoes. The educator introduced the concept of dormant volcanoes and explained to children what this meant. Children were heard contributing to the discussion, sharing their visits to the Blue Lake and the names for the lake including 'drinking hole'. After the whole group-time, children broke into smaller groups to work with their primary educator. Each child was asked to draw a picture about something from the story. One child was heard saying they were not a very good drawer, the educator stated that she was not a very good drawer either and encouraged them to have a go. One child was observed not wanting to participate in the group time but was given limited 'choice' to do so (refer to standard 5.1). The following day during small groups, children revisited stone stories they had previously created and were asked to transfer their stone stories onto paper. While most

children engaged in this, the boy who did not want to participate in small groups the day before sat with the group but did not engage in the experience. He was observed swinging the adult chair back and forth instead.

Children's agency was supported during free play as they could choose to play inside/outside at times and choose from the play spaces organised for them by educators as well as from the resources accessible to them, stored in open shelving. During lunchtime play, children could choose to play on the playground, on the oval, in the cubby house or sandpit. One child was observed engaging with the school's loose parts with an older child. Furthermore, children's independence was promoted through initiatives such as encouraging children to sign themselves in on arrival (also promoting their literacy skills), displaying their name cards to enable children to collect them to assist with writing their names on their work and packing their own bags at the end of the day.

Standard 1.3 Educators and co-ordinators take a planned and reflective approach to implementing the program for each child.		
1.3.1	Each child's learning and development is assessed or evaluated as part of an ongoing cycle of observation, analysing learning, documentation, planning, implementation and reflection.	Met
1.3.2	Critical reflection on children's learning and development, both as individuals and in groups, drives program planning and implementation.	Met
1.3.3	Families are informed about the program and their child's progress.	Met

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 1.3

Practice is embedded in service operations	No
Practice is informed by critical reflection	Yes
Practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community	Yes

Standard 1.3 is rated

Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 1.3

The programming format was rejuvenated in the middle of Term 1 with support from the preschool's Early Childhood Leader (ECL). Educators felt the previous format was not working and they wanted a format that was more meaningful with clear learning intentions instead of activities to make the learning more visible to educators and families.

The service has a clear ongoing cycle of planning which informs the overall group program and involves, observation, analysis, documentation, planning, implementation and reflection. As mentioned in standard 1.1, educator's observations (formal and informal) discussed during daily reflection and fortnightly planning meetings inform the program for the following fortnight as does the termly overview. Educators develop the program initially at the planning meeting before adding to it over the fortnight guided by children's interests, spontaneous play and educator's critical reflections and observations. Educators reflect on the fortnightly program at the end of the cycle. A template used to document educator's daily observations and reflections is discussed at the planning meeting as is the observation book in which each child has their own page for educators to record formal observations, possible lines of development and child/family voice. This book is reviewed at planning meetings to ensure each child is being observed and captured in the program. The primary educator for each small group ensures every child is being captured in planning intentions and documentation. Educators record Pic Collages and learning stories for group experiences with individual children's photos and details of their participation and learning. Educators also record a statement of learning for each child every term. These are displayed in their individual portfolio, accessible to families and children in the preschool and sent home regularly. Families have the opportunity to provide feedback on the statement of learning. Educators were able to provide examples of children's individual cycle of planning during discussions with the AO when it was not as clear as the cycle of planning which informed the overall group program.

In addition to using critical reflection to drive ongoing program planning development and

implementation, educators replicate critical reflection techniques to make changes/improvements to the physical environment and other practices. For example, educators noticed that children preferred to work on lower surfaces including the floor, made changes to the physical environment by removing some tables and introducing low line tables and more floor space. During discussions, the lead teacher explained how educators used the document Respect, Reflect, Relate (RRR) and in particular the wellbeing scales to reflect on relationships between children and between children and educators.

The Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) stated that educators critically reflect on their own teaching practices to continually improve themselves as educators, the program and opportunities offered to children.

The aforementioned learning portfolios also contained samples of children work and photos of them engaged in the program. Information about the program and children's progress is made available to parents/guardians through online systems such as a closed Facebook page and the application See-Saw. A white board at the front of the service also provides information to families about the preschool and program. For example, during the visit the whiteboard stated 'On Monday local Aboriginal woman Aunty Michelle will be sharing *Annie's Story* about the local Boondik language and culture'. As mentioned in standard 1.2, a learning journey involving various experiences with construction was on display. The teacher explained the intention of this display was to be a visual to families of the inter-connectedness and cyclic nature of children's learning, play and experiences and the learning intentions behind experiences. Other samples of children's participation and learning such as art work were also on display in the preschool. During the visit, an educator was heard informing a parent at the end of the session about their child's achievement on the playground, and how through perseverance and practice the child was successful in climbing the chain/rope wall (Refer to standard 2.1). Educators sharing positive feedback with families about the children's day, was a strategy highlighted on the service's QIP. This was recorded under the priority to establish authentic and meaningful relationships with families, where they are involved and contribute to their child's learning.

Quality Area 1 summary

QA1 Minor Adjustment Notes

It is recommended educators:

- reflect on the routine to enable more opportunities for children to engage in periods of uninterrupted play to maximise their learning
- consider how children's agency can be supported at times other than free play, in particular during small groups
- explore how the cycle of planning for individual children can be strengthened in particular the linkage and documentation. While assessment of children's learning is evident through the termly statement of learning; individual children's learning intentions/goals are not as clear in documentation. Educators may want to consider strengthening the evidence of their use of the EYLF learning outcomes in children's statement of learning.

QA1 Quality Improvement Plan Notes

QA1 Compliance Notes

For Quality Area 1, is there a significant risk to the health, safety or wellbeing of children?

No

Regulation 62(2) prescribes that an Exceeding National Quality Standard rating may only be given for Quality Area 1 for an education and care service that educates and cares for children who are in the year that is 2 years before grade 1 of school if the service either provides a preschool program or has a documented arrangement with an approved provider of another education and care service to provide a preschool program and informs parents of this arrangement.

Does the service educate and care for children who are in the year that is 2 years before grade 1 of school?

Yes

Does the service have a preschool program? A preschool program means an early childhood educational program delivered by a qualified early childhood teacher.

Yes

Quality Area 1 is rated

Meeting NQS

Quality Area 2 – Children’s health and safety

Standard 2.1	Each child’s health and physical activity is supported and promoted.	
2.1.1	Each child’s wellbeing and comfort is provided for, including appropriate opportunities to meet each child’s need for sleep, rest and relaxation.	Met
2.1.2	Effective illness and injury management and hygiene practices are promoted and implemented.	Not Met
2.1.3	Healthy eating and physical activity are promoted and appropriate for each child.	Met

Standard 2.1 is rated

Working Towards NQS

Evidence for Standard 2.1

Information about children’s health and wellbeing needs is collected from families at enrolment and educators have regular discussions with parents/guardians about this. Families are regularly reminded to inform the preschool if there are any changes to children’s individual needs. Children’s health needs are promoted through information displays, visits from Child And Family Health Services (CAFHS) when possible, healthy eating and physical activity. Fruit time is offered every morning and children were observed collecting the fruit from their bags and sitting under the tree to eat. Families supply children’s lunch boxes for preschool and are able to provide ‘foils’ which are foods such as toasted sandwiches or pies wrapped in alfoil which can be heated in the school kitchen as there is no onsite canteen. The principal explained that the school parent club often organised other special lunch options such as soup or pasta day. Preschool children have participated in the Veggie play program which promotes increased knowledge about and consumption of vegetables. Children’s participation in this program was detailed in their learning portfolios as well as prominently displayed in the preschool.

Children were observed engaging in active play in the outdoor space directly surrounding the preschool such as balancing on stepping stones and tyres, and climbing a tree. During lunchtime play, children were observed running around the oval, engaging in games such as chasey and climbing, balancing and swinging on the playground. Some children needed assistance from educators to negotiate the playground (Refer to standard 3.1). The AO observed one child attempt to climb the chain wall on the playground unsuccessfully. An educator tried to provide verbal guidance to the child but they were still unsuccessful. The educator moved closer to assist the child and encouraged him to place his feet in specific positions. The child was able to climb half-way up the wall before having difficulty and climbed back down again. The educator continued to encourage the child to persist until he was successful and assisted multiple children to try and navigate this piece of equipment. At the end of day group time, an educator asked the children to follow her outside and she gave them actions to follow such as jumping and star jumps before returning inside. When the children returned to the preschool from lunchtime play, they engaged in a 25 minute interactive yoga session facilitated by a teacher with the support of the smart board. While the yoga session was a physical experience it was designed to calm and relax children in preparation for the afternoon. Children had access to spaces in the preschool where they could be more sedate if they chose to, these included the reading corner with curtain teepee, cushions and book shelf inside, and the tree cubby and bench seating under the tree in the outdoor environment.

A hygiene station was organised near the middle of the room and provided signage informing

children to cover their coughs and when to wash their hands, as well as tissues and a rubbish bin. A child was observed blowing his own nose at the hygiene station and placed his tissue in the bin before being reminded by the educator to wash his hands at the trough in the room. A poster displayed above the trough demonstrated effective hand washing techniques. However, despite this poster demonstrating the steps for effective handwashing including using running water, soap and paper towel, inconsistent hand washing was observed throughout the visit. For example, in the early afternoon the AO noticed the trough quite full of soapy water and the child who had wiped his nose rinsed his hands in this water before drying them on a communal towel hanging nearby. At lunch time, children's hand washing techniques included splashing their hands in the soapy water only, wetting their hands in the trough before applying soap from the available soap dispenser and rinsing off in the trough, wetting their hands under the running water from the tap before applying soap and rinsing in the trough and one child wet their hands under running water from the tap but applied no soap. The children that dried their hands all did so on the shared towel. The following morning the AO noticed a clean towel hanging up and fresh water in the sink. Children were observed demonstrating similar hand washing techniques as the day before. These techniques including the use of a shared towel do not support best practice recommendations for effective handwashing as highlighted by the display poster. When the AO asked the lead teacher about the water in the trough she explained that this was a strategy to reduce water usage and to assist some children who had difficulty with the taps. She also stated that the water was changed at each eating-time but this was not observed by the AO.

Standard 2.2	Each child is protected.	
2.2.1	At all times, reasonable precautions and adequate supervision ensure children are protected from harm and hazard.	Not Met
2.2.2	Plans to effectively manage incidents and emergencies are developed in consultation with relevant authorities, practised and implemented.	Met
2.2.3	Management, educators and staff are aware of their roles and responsibilities to identify and respond to every child at risk of abuse or neglect.	Met

Standard 2.2 is rated

Working Towards NQS

Evidence for Standard 2.2

Service leaders and educators endeavour to keep children safe through a range of precautions including hazard identification and reporting processes, risk minimisation plans, risk assessments and supervision practices although the physical design and the facilities of the preschool and school site make this difficult (refer to standard 3.1). Preschool children access the school toilets located behind the preschool. Educators supervise children accessing the toilets from outside the preschool door, although the AO did observe one child access the toilet at the end of small group time with no supervision from an educator. The preschool is not separated from the school by an internal fence. Children know they can only access the outdoor spaces surrounding the preschool if an educator is present and the lead teacher explained that educators remind children of the invisible boundary points for the preschool, referencing the grey pavers as a boundary and visual reminder to children to play in the safe spaces surrounding the preschool. However, during the visit the AO noticed a child at the front of the preschool for a couple of minutes before an educator noticed and moved to this space to supervise this child.

Preschool children wear hi-vis vests during lunchtime play to provide a visual to educators and school staff to assist their supervision practices. The AO noticed preschool children spread across the vast outdoor play spaces of the school making supervision difficult. The principal who also supports/supervises lunchtime play confirmed this in discussions with the AO. The playground accessed by children during lunchtime play is predominantly suitable for school aged children. While some educators provided close active supervision to preschool children accessing the playground, others did not and were noticed standing back on the grass away from the equipment. The principal stated that the correct soft-fall absorption rates were maintained under the playground as they were checked three times per year.

As mentioned, risk assessments are completed by educators as a precaution to keep children safe and children have been included in discussions about potential risky play and equipment to articulate their ideas on how to minimise these risks and help keep themselves and others safe. These ideas have been added to the risk assessments. However, some of these risk assessments are not implemented consistently in practice such as the supervision of children during lunchtime play. Furthermore, a safety procedure for using the hot glue guns present in the preschool was displayed but not always adhered to. For example, the procedure highlighted that an educator must be present when the glue guns are in use. In the morning, three children were observed in the making area along with the parent of one of the children when one child using the glue gun burnt her hand and began to cry. The educator supervising from afar while working on the mat with a group of children responded to the child's injury.

Emergency evacuation maps and procedures were displayed within the preschool and when the AO arrived on the school site, the principal provided her with an induction on emergency procedures, along with a copy of the plans for her reference. Emergency procedures including evacuation and invacuation are practised each term and recorded on a register. Emergency procedures and situations are discussed with children to reduce anxiety.

All educators are aware of their roles and responsibilities to respond to every child at risk of abuse or neglect as they all have a current Responding to Abuse and Neglect (RAN) certificate. The departments 'Keeping them safe- child protection curriculum' is implemented across the year and the lead teacher stated it was modified as needed. For example, the topic of bullying was not deemed relevant to the current cohort of children so was not included, while the concepts of touching and physical space were extended due to their relevance. Families are informed of the child protection curriculum with the lead teacher explaining that one family opted to keep their child at home on the day one of the topics was being delivered.

Quality Area 2 summary

QA2 Minor Adjustment Notes

It is recommended:

QA2 Quality Improvement Plan Notes

- the service ensures children follow the effective hygiene practices they promote through the use of running water, soap and individual paper towel or hand dryers
- educators ensure the risk assessments documented are consistently implemented in practice
- the approved provider review the physical environments accessed by the preschool children and ensure the design of the building and surrounds as well as the facilities and equipment are suitable for the age of the children accessing the preschool.

QA2 Compliance Notes

For Quality Area 2, is there a significant risk to the health, safety or wellbeing of children?

No

Quality Area 2 is rated

Working Towards NQS

Quality Area 3 – Physical environment

Standard 3.1	The design of the facilities is appropriate for the operation of a service.	
3.1.1	Outdoor and indoor spaces, buildings, fixtures and fittings are suitable for their purpose, including supporting the access of every child.	Not Met
3.1.2	Premises, furniture and equipment are safe, clean and well maintained.	Met

Standard 3.1 is rated

Working Towards NQS

Evidence for Standard 3.1

The building and other spaces accessed by the preschool were clean and well maintained. A cleaner and grounds person oversees the whole site while preventative maintenance and major breakdowns are managed by contractors approved by the department.

While educators conduct regular safety checks and precautions are taken to protect children, the premises, in particular some outdoor spaces, are not safe for children. As mentioned in standard 2.2, there is no fencing around the preschool providing a designated safe space for children. Preschool children have limited outdoor space nominated as their own and therefore access the school yard for further physical play opportunities. The vast spaces of the school makes supervision of the preschool children difficult and reduces the role of educators to primarily supervisory rather than engaging. Furthermore, the play equipment in the school yard is predominantly designed for older children and not suitable for preschool aged children. For example, a swing frame that went up and down like a see-saw, was activated by children's weight. The preschool children were unable to get on/off this equipment unassisted and hovered more than a metre off the ground when seated on the swing.

The preschool has access to other facilities in the school including library and kitchen and these spaces are suitable. The preschool building is located at the front of the school next to the office. The building itself consists of a large open room, with a small space for administration in one corner and open shelving along one side of the room. The room is organised into spaces using furniture and resources (Refer to standard 3.2). A small verandah accessed by a ramp and stairs is located at the front of the building with a second small verandah located at the back of the building. This verandah also provides cover to a section of the walkway to the school toilets.

Standard 3.2	The service environment is inclusive, promotes competence and supports exploration and play-based learning.	
3.2.1	Outdoor and indoor spaces are organised and adapted to support every child's participation and to engage every child in quality experiences in both built and natural environments.	Met
3.2.2	Resources, materials and equipment allow for multiple uses, are sufficient in number, and enable every child to engage in play-based learning.	Met
3.2.3	The service cares for the environment and supports children to become environmentally responsible.	Met

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 3.2

Standard 3.2 is rated

Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 3.2

The preschool room is organised into play spaces to promote children's competence and exploration. This included a large mat area in the middle and to one side of the room supporting floor activities as well as the quiet corner. Small groups of children supported by an educator were observed playing a shopping board/card game on the mat. Open shelving with a selection of resources (including construction, dinosaurs and puzzles) were accessible to children along the edge of the mat with further storage units located to the side of the room. Table top experiences including a car park and vehicles, doll house and people figurines and story stones and drawing/writing materials were organised for children by educators according to the program. A socio-dramatic play space consisting of a shop was organised in one corner of the room with a making area in another part of the room. This making area contained the hot glue guns, a box of recycled boxes as well as a shelving unit containing a variety of resources children could access as they desired. A child was observed arriving at preschool and choosing to play in the shop while two girls requested additional resources to support their making. Two painting easels along with palette paints were organised under the verandah behind the preschool and children were observed accessing the easels even when it was raining.

During outdoor play, children were observed integrating loose parts such as sticks with equipment like climbing frames and balancing steps. Program documentation demonstrated children building with materials such as timber, pavers and bricks. School children have a selection of their own loose parts and a preschool child was observed engaging with them during lunchtime play alongside an older child. The child appeared to make a vehicle using old tyres, a timber beam, a plastic seat and steering wheel. The child was assisted by the older child and a teacher to collect two pieces of coloured 'card' and tried to stand them up in multiple ways without success before placing them on the ground in front of the vehicle. Children had access to sand play near the preschool and school playground.

Timber furniture including shelving units, tables and stools were used in the preschool and natural/recycled items including smooth stones and cardboard boxes/containers were repurposed for experiences.

Separate bins for sorting waste into general rubbish, recycling and food scraps were present in the preschool and as mentioned in standard 1.1, the focus for the term was sustainability in response to educators noticing some children's confusion in regards to sorting waste. The AO sighted a display in the preschool where children had sorted items for rubbish and recycling. During the visit, an educator facilitated a group discussion about this sorting experience from the previous week to

revisit children's learning. This was followed by watching a video on the smart board produced by the local council about general rubbish, landfill and recycling in Mount Gambier and surrounding areas.

Preschool children have access to the school garden beds and have assisted with planting and weeding, while produce is sourced on occasions for cooking experiences. Food scraps collected in the preschool mini bin is shared between the school's worm farm and compost bin.

During the visit, an educator asked two children to assist with sweeping the floor at the end of the day and they used the adult size broom, dust pan and broom. The educator was heard asking the boys 'How is it looking?', and when they announced they were finished she asked 'Are you happy with the work you have done?'

Quality Area 3 summary

QA3 Minor Adjustment Notes

QA3 Quality Improvement Plan Notes

It is recommended the approved provider review the physical environments accessed by the preschool children and ensure the design of the building and surrounds as well as the facilities and equipment are suitable for the age of the children accessing the preschool.

QA3 Compliance Notes

For Quality Area 3, is there a significant risk to the health, safety or wellbeing of children?

No

Quality Area 3 is rated

Working Towards NQS

Quality Area 4 – Staffing arrangements

Standard 4.1	Staffing arrangements enhance children's learning and development.	
4.1.1	The organisation of educators across the service supports children's learning and development.	Met
4.1.2	Every effort is made for children to experience continuity of educators at the service.	Met

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 4.1

Practice is embedded in service operations	No
Practice is informed by critical reflection	No
Practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community	No

Standard 4.1 is rated

Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 4.1

The preschool is staffed with three educators, two early childhood teachers and one SSO. One of the teachers is permanent and has worked in the preschool for four years, the SSO has also worked in the preschool over the last couple of years. A second teacher was appointed to the preschool for the first time this year to meet educator-to-child ratio and qualification requirements due to increased enrolments. The principal explained how the current staffing arrangements (the presence of a second teacher) provided the preschool with greater flexibility and improved outcomes for children such as the ability to offer small groups, appointing a primary educator to oversee the small groups and the whole staff team planning meetings. The principal attempts to attend these meetings every fortnight. The benefit of these planning meetings in allowing all educators to contribute to decision making was repeatedly emphasised to the AO. The lead teacher stated that the meetings allow for the needs and observations of all children to be discussed as part of an ongoing cycle of planning.

The QIP stated that where possible additional staffing positions are allocated to educators that have been working at the site, promoting consistency for children and families.

Educator lunch breaks are rotated with two SSOs from the school providing cover. One of these has a certificate III qualification and is a regular lunch cover/relief educator in the preschool. The second SSO providing lunch cover did not have a qualification as required by National Regulations but was covered by the exception for educator-to-child ratios for thirty minutes or less covered by National Regulation 325A. This second SSO is currently covering the long service leave of the SSO with a certificate III level qualification who normally provides lunch cover/relief for the preschool. Every effort is taken to secure a regular relief teacher to cover the absence of the preschool teacher. The principal stated that the service has access to a temporary relief teacher list containing educators with early childhood qualifications or approved to work in preschools. The department partnership the preschool belongs to understands the lack of availability of relief early childhood qualified teachers and educators and provides support where possible. This includes trying to organise professional learning opportunities on Thursdays and Fridays when the preschool does not operate.

Standard 4.2	Management, educators and staff are collaborative, respectful and ethical.	
4.2.1	Management, educators and staff work with mutual respect and collaboratively, and challenge and learn from each other, recognising each other's strengths and skills.	Met
4.2.2	Professional standards guide practice, interactions and relationships.	Met

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 4.2

Practice is embedded in service operations	No
Practice is informed by critical reflection	No
Practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community	No

Standard 4.2 is rated

Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 4.2

Professional standards including *the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL)*, department *Protective practices guide for educators* and both the *Public Sector and Early Childhood Australia Code of Ethics* guide educators practices, interactions and relationships. During discussions, the lead teacher explained that the current educator team had the same philosophy and were on the same page in regards to children. This was demonstrated through their practices of engagement with children ('talking with them and not at them'), scaffolding their learning and similar ways of managing behaviour ('allowing children to sort it out'). The lead teacher highlighted the benefit of this unison and how this had not always occurred with previous staffing arrangements for the preschool.

Educator's strengths and skills are recognised through planning meetings, sharing experience/ideas from previous roles such as program planning and passions/interests for the benefit of children. Opportunities for educators to challenge and learn from each other also occur during planning meetings, reflection discussions, hub meetings and training and development opportunities. This is always undertaken with respectful dialogue and an emphasis on collaboration and knowledge sharing.

Educators were observed working respectfully and collaboratively throughout the visit. For example, an educator informed her co-worker of her movement to the kitchen taking four children with her. The second teacher informed the SSO of what she was doing in preparation for the morning small groups and specifically what she was planning for the children (making books and transferring story stones). As mentioned previously, all three educators are responsible for a small group of children at group times and for their program documentation. This initiative is supported by the fortnightly planning meetings attended by all educators. Furthermore, during the visit the educator facilitating whole group times was supported by the other two educators who sat on the floor with children, joining in conversations and encouraging children to do so as well. As highlighted in standard 5.1, educators ensured children were supported to participate in group times.

This collaboration and respect was replicated by the principal who visited the preschool and made himself available to provide assistance when an educator was called away momentarily. The principal

was observed watching group time (whole and small groups) and interacting with children during their small group work.

Quality Area 4 summary

QA4 Minor Adjustment Notes

QA4 Quality Improvement Plan Notes

QA4 Compliance Notes

For Quality Area 4, is there a significant risk to the health, safety or wellbeing of children?

No

Quality Area 4 is rated

Meeting NQS

Quality Area 5 – Relationships with children

Standard 5.1	Respectful and equitable relationships are maintained with each child.	
5.1.1	Responsive and meaningful interactions build trusting relationships which engage and support each child to feel secure, confident and included.	Met
5.1.2	The dignity and rights of every child are maintained.	Not Met

Standard 5.1 is rated

Working Towards NOS

Evidence for Standard 5.1

Children are assigned a primary educator and organised into focus groups. These groups are established once educators know the new cohort of children and have begun to develop relationships. Educators were observed throughout the visit engaging with all children in a variety of scenarios. For example, assisting children at the making table, assisting them to put on their jackets/vests and as co-players on the playground and with the shopping game. The SSO in particular, was observed as a co-player with children to support their participation and learning. She was heard inviting three children to join her to play the shopping game on the mat. The SSO informed the children the game used to belong to her son, showing them his name on the box. She told the children how she used to play the game at home with her family. At this time, the SSO noticed a child who was sad at saying goodbye to her parent and invited her to join the game. The SSO collected the child and sat her on her lap to play. The SSO provided reassurance to the child that her mum would be back later and suggested she could maybe play with 'X' (sibling/friend?) at recess time. The QIP stated that educators know when to inject themselves into children's play, to work alongside them and to scaffold their learning or when to sit back and observe and this was evident to the AO.

Children demonstrated a sense of belonging and confidence during the visit. For example, children were observed seeking help and support from educators and sharing their achievements with them; such as their work during small groups or creations at the making table. In another example, a child arrived at preschool, skipped across the room to the 'shop', settled herself behind the register and announced 'Who wants to shop?'

During group time, an educator was observed collecting a textured mini blanket for a child to support his sitting and participation. The educator was heard quietly asking the child questions about the group discussion to include him in the experience. At lunchtime, educators sat or stood while children ate their lunch. Discussions between children and educators at this time, were predominantly around the routine such as reminders to sit down and to eat their food. Two relief educators were present during this routine.

Children's dignity and rights were maintained on most occasions, although as mentioned in standard 1.2, there were examples sighted by the AO when children were not engaged and their agency was not respected as they were offered limited choice. These examples, involved the same child. During small groups before lunch, the child did not want to participate in drawing a picture about the morning visit with Aunty Michelle or the corresponding book read at group time. The educator informed the child he would need to do this activity at lunchtime if he did not participate now. The educator asked the child if he wanted to complete the activity at lunchtime and he indicated no. The educator repeated to the child his need to complete the activity now or at lunchtime, stating that it was 'his choice'. The child remained on the mat for a time before collecting a drink of water and joining his small group. The educator acknowledged the child and thanked him for joining the group.

On the following morning, during small groups which involved the children transferring their story stones to paper booklets, the child was not engaged in the experience. He was noticed sitting behind the educator and swinging on the office chair as the other children drew their pictures and shared their stories for the educator to scribe. The child was left to last, sitting for a period of time before the educator talked to him about his story.

Standard 5.2	Each child is supported to build and maintain sensitive and responsive relationships.	
5.2.1	Children are supported to collaborate, learn from and help each other.	Met
5.2.2	Each child is supported to regulate their own behaviour, respond appropriately to the behaviour of others and communicate effectively to resolve conflicts.	Met

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 5.2

Practice is embedded in service operations	No
Practice is informed by critical reflection	No
Practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community	No

Standard 5.2 is rated Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 5.2

The QIP stated that children’s inclusion skills and social skills were promoted through the Child Protection Curriculum, 'Play is the way' program and the wider school community. The AO sighted the 'You Can Do it' positive education display in the preschool.

A restorative practices approach is taken to support children to effectively resolve conflicts and to regulate their own behaviour. Educators were observed responding appropriately to children in support of them regulating their own behaviour. For example, an educator was heard reminding a child to use an inside voice, while in another example an educator responded to children crashing their vehicles into the story stones. The educator got down to the children’s level and asked them to have a think about what they were doing. The educator asked the boys to consider what would happen to the stones if they continued crashing into them. Noticing one stone was already damaged, she asked the boys how they thought the child who made the stone would feel. The boys expressed empathy for the child who made the story stone and changed their play.

In another example, two children were involved in a dispute at the end of the day over a 'creation' they both believed they made. The educator informed the boys they would talk about it the next day due to the time of day and parents waiting. The boys were informed the creation would stay at preschool overnight until they could talk about it and find a solution. After multiple reassurances of this from the educator, one of the boys stated he was happy for the other child to take it home and he would make another the following day. The educator asked the boy if he was sure and if he was happy with the suggestion, confirming this was the solution he was proposing. The educator collected a similar box used in the 'creation' ready for the child to use the next day.

Multiple opportunities were available for children to collaborate, learn from and help each other. These included:

- a partner clapping game facilitated at the end of lunchtime play when the children came together
- working together to pack-up inside and outside
- the socio-dramatic, shopping experience

- group times (whole and small) children were encouraged to share their interests, knowledge and work with each other
- the shopping game. This experience was initiated by the educator who supported a group of children to play before moving away to check on other children. The children continued playing saying 'X's turn' or 'My turn' until two of the original players moved away. Two different children joined the game in their place and the same co-operative play continued.

Furthermore, opportunities for collaboration with school/older children promoting peer learning are consistently facilitated, such as during shared experiences/events, assemblies and lunchtime play. During this time, preschool and school aged children were observed playing games together such as chasey, sharing the playground and other equipment (Refer to standard 3.2 regarding loose parts play). As well as this, a preschool child was observed working in the sandpit for a period of time, filling up buckets to make sand castles or just using his hands to make mounds of sand before jumping on and squashing them. Other children observed this and joined in, jumping on the mounds/castles and using rakes or sticks to dig. At times the boys worked separately and at other times together such as digging a joint hole.

Children were observed supporting/assisting and showing care for each other. For example, one child was heard informing a child he had dirt on his forehead after outdoor play and proceeded to wipe the dirt from his head. In another example, a child found a beanie on the floor and commented 'This is X's hat, I will put it on the teachers desk so it doesn't get lost', which he did.

Quality Area 5 summary

QA5 Minor Adjustment Notes

QA5 Quality Improvement Plan Notes

It is recommended educators:

- consider how they can promote and support children's agency, dignity and rights during group experiences
- reflect on their responses to individual children and their needs, in particular when they are not engaged in the program.

QA5 Compliance Notes

For Quality Area 5, is there a significant risk to the health, safety or wellbeing of children?

No

Quality Area 5 is rated

Working Towards NQS

Quality Area 6 – Collaborative partnerships with families and communities

Standard 6.1 Respectful relationships with families are developed and maintained and families are supported in their parenting role.		
6.1.1	Families are supported from enrolment to be involved in the service and contribute to service decisions.	Met
6.1.2	The expertise, culture, values and beliefs of families are respected and families share in decision-making about their child's learning and wellbeing.	Met
6.1.3	Current information is available to families about the service and relevant community services and resources to support parenting and family wellbeing.	Met

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 6.1

Practice is embedded in service operations	No
Practice is informed by critical reflection	No
Practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community	Yes

Standard 6.1 is rated

Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 6.1

The philosophy detailed a commitment to respectful, effective and collaborative partnerships with families and this was evident to the AO. New families are invited to tour the service and meet and greet educators when enquiring for preschool. If not already doing so, parents/guardians are encouraged to attend the onsite playgroup to support familiarity, relationship building and the transition to preschool for children and themselves. Children are invited to attend two transition days in Term 4 with extra visits offered where possible to support a successful transition into preschool. A welcome morning tea as well as an acquaintance night is offered to new families at the beginning of the year.

Ongoing, families are encouraged to attend special events/social days such as book week celebrations which are organised across the site on days the preschool operates. Parents/guardians regularly contribute donations to the service such as loose parts, as do members of the community. Families are encouraged to contribute feedback to the preschool via surveys and online systems such as Facebook and See-saw and through the department's annual survey. During the visit, the AO sighted the concept plan for the preschools' renovation displayed at the front of the service along with an invitation for families to provide feedback.

Parent/guardians are asked to complete a questionnaire about their child at the beginning of the year to inform educator's practice and program and planning decisions. Families also share in decision making about their child's learning and wellbeing through informal and formal discussions, corresponding on children's learning statements and surveys.

Parents/guardians have the opportunity to significantly contribute to the preschool and share in

decision making by joining the parent club or the governing council both of which 'allows preschool issues to be heard throughout the school community'. The parent club volunteers currently predominantly assist with fundraising initiatives and the provision of special hot lunch days. The principal stated he is in the process of looking at the roles and responsibilities of the parent club as he would like to get them more involved in the life of the school, such as listening to children read. The governing council oversee operational matters/governance for the preschool in line with departmental guidelines (refer to standard 7.1).

Current information about the preschool was displayed for families on the whiteboard as well as inside the preschool. This included prescribed information and photos of educators (regular and lunch cover/relief). Pamphlets about special education and inclusion as well as the departments 'How to raise a complaint' were also displayed for families. A whole site newsletter is published fortnightly while the preschool independently distributes a newsletter approximately two to three times a term. If educators believe families may need support in their parenting and family wellbeing they approach them and discreetly see what they can offer them. Examples of this have included recommending AC Care (the family and relationship centre) to families, offering vouchers or to raise money for those in financial need. Educators are comfortable to approach families to offer support due to the establishment of open relationships. Educators also approach parents/guardians if they believe their child may benefit from some additional support to assist their participation and learning (Refer to standard 6.2).

Standard 6.2	Collaborative partnerships enhance children's inclusion, learning and wellbeing.	
6.2.1	Continuity of learning and transitions for each child are supported by sharing information and clarifying responsibilities.	Met
6.2.2	Effective partnerships support children's access, inclusion and participation in the program.	Met
6.2.3	The service builds relationships and engages with its community.	Met

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 6.2	
Practice is embedded in service operations	No
Practice is informed by critical reflection	No
Practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community	Yes

Standard 6.2 is rated	Meeting NQS
------------------------------	--------------------

Evidence for Standard 6.2

As mentioned in standard 6.1, new families and children are offered a comprehensive transition/orientation process. This is supported by the transition process across the site and partnership, as all sites conduct their visits at the same time to support consistency and compliance (with space and ratios). Formal school visits are organised for two days in Term 4. At the end of Term 3/beginning of Term 4, the preschool and Reception/Year 1 class 'swap classes' for short time frames initially building up to half-a-day. Furthermore, the preschool and Reception/Year 1 class are currently working collaboratively on a Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths (STEM) project based on interests. This initially involved construction and has evolved to include materials and measurements. The preschool and Reception/Year 1 class regularly share in joint special events and professional development opportunities for educators.

The teacher from Reception/Year 1 supports the educators and children in their inclusive practices of children who identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander or other cultural backgrounds. This is made possible through a pre-existing relationship, cultural awareness/sensitivity and the provision of incursions/excursions such as the visit from Aunty Michelle. The lead teacher explained how persona dolls were recently introduced and children took it in turns of taking them home to share with their families. Moreover, educators understood that each child had a family culture which was promoted and supported at preschool.

Three children attending the preschool are accessing speech support, entailing a dedicated program written by a department speech pathologist and implemented by the SSO. One child is waiting to be assessed for this program. A department speech pathologist is visiting this term to meet with children and parents/guardians to discuss how support can be replicated at home. The lead teacher stated that educators have developed general strategies to support children who have difficulty with sitting and concentrating such as the example shared in standard 5.1. Previously, the preschool has accessed the services/resources of community health, Autism SA and CAFHS to assist with the

inclusion and participation of all children. The teacher stated that CAFHS checks were dependent on staffing/funding and as a result did not occur every year.

The preschool visits locations within the community including the Mount Gambier Theatre for the school concert and other performances, the Blue Lake and pumping station and the Agriculture Centre for the annual Mount Gambier show where children partake in discussions and demonstrations from local high school students and other professionals. The preschool participate in the school's bi-annual fete where they have responsibility to operate a stall, as well as the site art exhibition. Families were invited to contribute their own works to the exhibition which was open to extended family members and the community. The AO sighted evidence of families including extended members attending the preschool for mother's day and grandparent's day celebrations. The principal stated these events were attended by family members who do not normally attend the service.

Quality Area 6 summary

QA6 Minor Adjustment Notes

QA6 Quality Improvement Plan Notes

The service may want to consider how they can strengthen the provision of resources or opportunities to support parenting and family wellbeing.

QA6 Compliance Notes

For Quality Area 6, is there a significant risk to the health, safety or wellbeing of children?

No

Quality Area 6 is rated

Meeting NQS

Quality Area 7 – Governance and leadership

Standard 7.1	Governance supports the operation of a quality service.	
7.1.1	A statement of philosophy guides all aspects of the service's operations	Met
7.1.2	Systems are in place to manage risk and enable the effective management and operation of a quality service.	Met
7.1.3	Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, and understood, and support effective decision making and operation of the service.	Met

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 7.1

Practice is embedded in service operations	No
Practice is informed by critical reflection	No
Practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community	No

Standard 7.1 is rated

Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 7.1

The current philosophy has been in place for three years and was under review at the time of the visit. The principal explained that the school philosophy and values had recently been changed and it was important to do this first before reviewing the preschool philosophy to ensure a correlation between the two. While the lead teacher stated that the philosophy was still relevant in many places, reflection so far has identified it is quite wordy and there is a desire to ensure that it reflects on the language of the site and student agency.

The process for review has involved seeking feedback from families by asking them specific questions such as 'What makes us unique?' The next step of the process is to ask for feedback from the children. The ideas of educators, families and children will be collated to inform the updated philosophy which will be shared with families and the governing council.

The service's operations are guided by an extensive suite of department as well as site policies and procedures. These are accessible to educators and families. A policy folder was present in the preschool as well as other supporting documents such as pamphlets to guide families in raising a complaint. Policies and procedures are based on professional guidance and reviewed annually, bi-annually or in accordance with department guidelines. As mentioned in standard 2.2, risk management strategies and plans are in place including the use of risk assessments. The AO sighted risk assessments for loose parts play, children accessing the toilets and an excursion to a performance. Although, the AO identified some risks to children such as accessing the school playground where no risk assessment has been completed for this. Annual checks of indoor/outdoor environments are undertaken across the site by the school workplace health and safety officer. Two representatives from the site are booked in to do playground safety training in the near future.

Support/reporting systems provided by the department include EDSAS, EYS, IRMS and STAR are accessed by service leaders and school office staff to assist in the operation of the service.

The lead teacher is allocated administration time to complete enrolment and attendance information and all other requirements of the EYS program. The lead teacher and principal work together regarding enrolments and the budget, with other financial support/activities completed by the office SSO. The principal is supported in the overall management and operations of the preschool by the department and governing council who provide guidance and support in decision making (Refer to standard 6.1).

Standard 7.2		Effective leadership builds and promotes a positive organisational culture and professional learning community.
7.2.1	There is an effective self-assessment and quality improvement process in place.	Met
7.2.2	The educational leader is supported and leads the development and implementation of the educational program and assessment and planning cycle.	Met
7.2.3	Educators, co-ordinators and staff members' performance is regularly evaluated and individual plans are in place to support learning and development.	Met

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 7.2

Practice is embedded in service operations	No
Practice is informed by critical reflection	No
Practice is shaped by meaningful engagement with families and/or the community	No

Standard 7.2 is rated

Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 7.2

The lead teacher and principal work through the standards and elements of the NQS at the end of the year and identify strengths and areas for improvement. This process is supported by a department template developed to assist with self-assessment. A student closure day in Term 4, supports educators and leaders' further reflection and development of the QIP for the following year. The QIP is also informed by department priorities such as numeracy and literacy indicators as well as partnership priorities. These include playful pedagogies, learning, design, assessment and reporting as well as reflective practice and a focus on the RRR engagement scales. Feedback from families/guardians, gathered from the collation of annual departmental surveys also inform the QIP. The lead teacher explained that the preschool modified the suggested QIP template on the ACECQA website to their own format in an effort to be more parent friendly and hopefully encourage more feedback/input. The QIP is reviewed each term, progress notes are added as are other areas identified for improvement. Some improvements are removed from the QIP once viewed as successful. Service leaders meet with the ECL throughout the year to discuss and review the QIP.

Department priorities (including the partnership) inform educator's professional development plans. A new template and format for educator's performance evaluation and development plans was introduced by the department. This involves a six month review and 12 month follow-up of performance evaluation and goal setting discussed in conjunction with the principal. The lead teacher stated that the principal had an open door policy where educators could seek feedback at any time. As well as this, educators had informal conversations amongst themselves where they discussed their practice, goals and areas for improvement. The principal explained how one of the teachers provided feedback to him during their performance evaluation meeting, seeking his support to help her with her practice and to provide her with acknowledgement and feedback. An individualised format has been developed and implemented for the preschool SSO, requiring her to list her achievements, professional development opportunities undertaken as well as those sought for the future along with any general comments. The principal explained that the time frame for

implementation of performance evaluation meetings had been delayed due to his absence in Term 1.

The principal has the official title of educational leader as determined by departmental protocol. He has been in the position for four years, the first of which was in an acting role. The principal was upfront about his lack of prior experience with preschool and explained how he was very much supported and guided by the lead teacher in establishing his knowledge and experience. The principal stated that the role of educational leader was a shared one between himself and the lead teacher. This is supported through funding and the provision of time for an extra administration day for the lead teacher. These initiatives also support the release of the third educator, the SSO, to attend planning meetings. The principal explained that while this has only been for an hour this year, the benefit of this arrangement in outcomes for children was apparent and he was wanting to increase this for the entire two hours next year. The principal explained how he was endeavouring to attend the preschool planning meetings and had prioritised this in his schedule but unfortunately due to the nature of his role this was not always possible. The principal was also trying to attend professional learning opportunities accessed by the preschool educators.

Quality Area 7 summary

QA7 Minor Adjustment Notes

QA7 Quality Improvement Plan Notes

QA7 Compliance Notes

For Quality Area 7, is there a significant risk to the health, safety or wellbeing of children?

No

Quality Area 7 is rated

Meeting NQS

Assessment and rating summary

Quality Area 1 is rated	Meeting NQS
Quality Area 2 is rated	Working Towards NQS
Quality Area 3 is rated	Working Towards NQS
Quality Area 4 is rated	Meeting NQS
Quality Area 5 is rated	Working Towards NQS
Quality Area 6 is rated	Meeting NQS
Quality Area 7 is rated	Meeting NQS
Overall rating	Working Towards NQS

Minor adjustment notes summary	
Quality Area 1	
Quality Area 2	
Quality Area 3	
Quality Area 4	
Quality Area 5	
Quality Area 6	
Quality Area 7	

Quality improvement plan notes summary	
Quality Area 1	<p>It is recommended educators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● reflect on the routine to enable more opportunities for children to engage in periods of uninterrupted play to maximise their learning ● consider how children's agency can be supported at times other than free play, in particular during small groups ● explore how the cycle of planning for individual children can be strengthened in particular the linkage and documentation. While assessment of children's learning is evident through the termly statement of learning; individual children's learning intentions/goals are not as clear in documentation. Educators may want to consider strengthening the evidence of their use of the EYLF learning outcomes in children's statement of learning.
Quality Area 2	<p>It is recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the service ensures children follow the effective hygiene practices they promote through the use of running water, soap and individual paper towel or hand dryers ● educators ensure the risk assessments documented are consistently implemented in practice ● the approved provider review the physical environments accessed by the preschool children and ensure the design of the building and surrounds as well as the facilities and equipment are suitable for the age of the children accessing the preschool.

Quality Area 3	It is recommended the approved provider review the physical environments accessed by the preschool children and ensure the design of the building and surrounds as well as the facilities and equipment are suitable for the age of the children accessing the preschool.
Quality Area 4	
Quality Area 5	It is recommended educators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consider how they can promote and support children's agency, dignity and rights during group experiences • reflect on their responses to individual children and their needs, in particular when they are not engaged in the program.
Quality Area 6	The service may want to consider how they can strengthen the provision of resources or opportunities to support parenting and family wellbeing.
Quality Area 7	

Compliance notes summary	
Quality Area 1	
Quality Area 2	
Quality Area 3	
Quality Area 4	
Quality Area 5	
Quality Area 6	
Quality Area 7	