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Agenda & Reports
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Our Vision

*A City which values its heritage, cultural diversity, sense of place and natural environment.*

*A progressive City which is prosperous, sustainable and socially cohesive, with a strong community spirit.*
21 February 2019

To all Members of the St Peters Child Care Centre & Pre-School Committee

Committee Members
- Cr Evonne Moore (Presiding Member)
- Cr Kester Moorhouse
- Ms Monica Di Lernia
- Ms Georgia Brodribb
- Mr Bill Fuller

Staff
- Sharon Perkins (General Manager, Corporate Services)
- Alice Parsons (Director, St Peters Child Care Centre & Pre-School)

NOTICE OF MEETING

I wish to advise that pursuant to Sections 87 and 88 of the Local Government Act 1999, the next Ordinary Meeting of the St Peters Child Care Centre & Pre-School Committee, will be held in the Staff Room, St Peters Child Care Centre, 42-44 Henry Street, Stepney on:

Monday 25 February 2019, commencing at 5.30pm

Please advise Sharon Perkins on 83664585 or email sperkins@npsp.sa.gov.au, if you are unable to attend this meeting or will be late.

Yours faithfully

Mario Barone
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TERMS OF REFERENCE:
The St Peters Child Care Centre & Pre-School Committee is established to fulfil the following functions:
- to provide feedback on the St Peters Child Care & Pre-School Centre’s Strategic Plan and Business Plan;
- to undertake general oversight of issues related to child welfare, programming and safety of the Centre; and
- to execute such powers as the Council may lawfully delegate to it.

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ST PETERS CHILD CARE CENTRE & PRE-SCHOOL COMMITTEE HELD ON 22 OCTOBER 2018

2. PRESIDING MEMBER’S COMMUNICATION

3. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

4. QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE
   Nil

5. WRITTEN NOTICES OF MOTION
   Nil

6. STAFF REPORTS
6.1 DIRECTORS QUARTERLY ACTIVITY REPORT – DECEMBER 2018

REPORT AUTHOR: Director, St Peters Child Care Centre & Preschool
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Corporate Services
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4585
FILE REFERENCE: S/00913
ATTACHMENTS: A - C

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this Quarterly report is to provide information in respect to the following:

- Provide comments on the Centre’s Strategic Plan and Business Plan prepared by Centre Management for the Child Care Centre.
- Undertake, under the direction of Council and on behalf of Council, the general oversight of issues related to child welfare, programming and safety of the Centre.
- To execute such powers as the Council may lawfully delegate to it.
- To do anything necessary, expedient or incidental to performing or discharging the functions of the Committee as listed in the terms of Reference or to achieving its objectives.

This report provides the Committee with a status report on the activities of the St Peters Child Care Centre & Preschool for the period 21 December 2018.

BACKGROUND

The Centre has been in operation since 1976. The Centre is licenced to accommodate 105 children per day, however to ensure the high quality of care the Centre is known for is maintained, the number of available places has been capped at 94 places per day.

The key activities completed during the Quarter ended December 2018, together with actions completed in previous Quarters, as required by the Centre’s Strategic and Business Plans, are included in the Discussion Section of this report.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

This report informs the Council on the St Peters Child Care Centre & Preschool activities and supports Council attaining:

Outcome 1: Social Equity: A connected, accessible and pedestrian-friendly community

Objective 1: Convenient and accessible services, information and facilities.

Strategy 1.2: Maximise access to services, facilities, information and activities.

Strategy 1.3: Design and provide safe, high quality facilities and spaces for people of all backgrounds, ages and abilities.

Objective 4: A strong, healthy, resilient and inclusive community.

Strategy 4.2: Encourage and provide opportunities for lifelong learning.

Strategy 4.3: Provide spaces and facilities for people to meet, learn and connect with each other.

The operations of Childcare Centres and Preschools are governed by the National Quality Framework.

The Centre’s policies and procedures are reviewed and updated over a twelve (12) month to two (2) year period, in line with National Quality Standards and the Centre’s Continuous Review Policy.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.
EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Nil

SOCIAL ISSUES

The Centre actively promotes a policy of inclusion for all children and their families. Its location in a mixed use area, results in a potential client base of working parents who live and work in close proximity to the Centre.

The information provided in the report has no direct social issues which need to be considered.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Not Applicable.

CONSULTATION

- Committee Members
  Not Applicable.

- Community
  Not Applicable.

- Staff
  Not Applicable.

- Other Agencies
  Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

Child Numbers

The Centre is licensed for a maximum of 105 children daily, however to ensure a high quality of care, the daily attendance numbers are capped at 94 per day on Mondays, Thursdays and Fridays. To meet family needs, the attendance numbers are increased on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, with the available spaces capped at 98 per day. The mix of the numbers per age group may change on a needs basis. For example, the Centre has up to 28 under two (2) year olds, up to 30 two (2) to three (3) year olds and up to 36 over three (3) year olds. The average number of children for which services were provided for the December 2018 Quarter is detailed in Table 1 below.
TABLE 1 – CHILD NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Child</th>
<th>Staffing Ratio</th>
<th>Number Allowed at</th>
<th>Number of Children - Average for the Quarter</th>
<th>Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Centre (maximum)</td>
<td>This Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Twos (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 weeks to 24 months</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 weeks to 24 months</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>14.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Twos (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years to 3 years</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years to 3 years</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Threes (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years to 4 years</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>18.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year to 5 years</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>17.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sessions where 90 children attended for the Quarter</td>
<td>44 days out of a total of 60 days</td>
<td>45 days out of a total of 60 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average attendance – Year to Date 91.87

While the Centre is licenced for 105 long day care places, to ensure that the Centre continues to provide above standard quality care, the Centre has limited the number of available places to an average of 94 places. Due to an increase in new Centres being opened within the local area and across the metropolitan area in general, the 2018-2019 Budget has been set at 90 places.

Staff to Child Ratios

The Centre is required by the National Quality Standards to maintain a minimum Educator to Child Ratio at all times. The minimum Educator to Child ratios are detailed in Table 2.

TABLE 2 – MINIMUM EDUCATOR TO CHILD RATIOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Grouping</th>
<th>Educator to Child Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-24 months</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 months – 36 months</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 months to 5 years</td>
<td>1:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Figure 1, the Centre continues to exceed the Educator to Child ratio in the Over Three’s (3) only. Due to the strong demand for places in the three (3) and under age group, without appointing additional staff, it is difficult for the Centre to exceed the minimum Educator to Child ratio within this age group, while maintaining full Centre capacity.

To meet the demand for peak days, the number of spaces has been increased to 98 places per day for Tuesdays & Wednesdays. While the Centre is capped at an average of 94 places per day, increasing the number of available spaces to 98 on Tuesdays to Wednesdays, has enabled the Centre to maintain occupancy, with the December quarter being 103% of the Centre budgeted capacity.

The year-to-date utilisation has increased from 98.7% in the September Quarter to 102% of Budgeted capacity. The increase flexibility in being able to match daily available spaces with demand, has driven the increased utilisation. It should be noted that with the current spread of demand across the week, given the current staffing numbers, there is no further capacity to increase the capped places beyond 98 places.
 FIGURE 1: STAFF TO CHILD RATIO

Staffing

To ensure that the Centre meets the required staff to child ratios, the Full-time Equivalent Educator positions required are as follows:

- Under 2’s  7.00 FTE
- 2 -3 years  6.00 FTE
- Over 3’s     4.00  FTE

To ensure the ongoing continuity of care, during periods of staff absences, the Centre utilises Educators from within the casual pool. Not only does this ensure that children are cared for by familiar Educators when their primary care givers are absent from the Centre, it ensures that operational costs are maintained, as there is less reliance on engaging temporary contract staff through temporary contract labour hire agencies to cover absences.

The staff numbers have kept relatively steady since the opening of the new room from 2016. The Centre has total 28 employees, which consist of 3 management and administration staff, 13 full-time, 6 part-time, and 7 casual staff as shown in Figure 2.

FIGURE 2: STAFF NUMBERS BY EMPLOYMENT CATEGORY
Universal Access to Early Childhood Education

Funding can be claimed for every four (4) year old child who remains at the Centre in the twelve (12) months prior to full-time schooling and has access to fifteen (15) hours of preschool services, providing the child is not accessing a preschool service from another external service, such as a Department of Education Preschool or Kindergarten.

For the year-to-date period to December 2018, the Centre has received $2,677 under the Universal Access Scheme for the children utilising the Centre for the pre-school service. The funding has been used to offset the salary costs of the Early Childhood Teachers.

National Quality Standard

Staff practices, policies and procedures are continually reviewed in line with the new National Quality Standards and a Quality Improvement Plan has been completed. The Centre has undergone a round of Rating and Assessment. The Centre received an overall rating of 'Meeting' under the revised framework.

The seven (7) areas identified under the National Quality Standard are:

- Educational program and practice
- Children’s health and safety
- Physical environment
- Staffing arrangements (including the number of staff looking after children)
- Relationships with children
- Collaborative partnerships with families and communities
- Leadership and service management

The Centre is set to be reviewed annually under the National Quality Standards. In preparation for the Annual National Quality Standard Review, the Centre’s Director and Educational Leader have been benchmarking with other Centres to share knowledge and gain ideas.

The Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) was submitted to the Education Standards Board on 17 August 2018. The Educations and Standard Boards assessor’s visited the Centre to conduct the Ratings & Assessment on Wednesday 10 October 2018. The final report was received on 3 December 2018, with the Centre receiving an overall result of 'Meeting' under the revised The National Quality Framework which came into effect on 1 February 2018. A copy of the final report is contained in Attachment A.

Since the initial ratings and assessment review, the following has been implemented at the Centre;

- an extended program for the children which visualises the links between the curriculum and the five (5) learning outcomes from the Early Years Learning Framework (EYLF) within the classrooms:
- produced and implemented check sheets to ensure that allergy information is updated; and
- a representative from the Gowrie Institute of Training, visited the Centre to provide assistance to Educators on how to document critical reflection focussed on the operations of the rooms.

In addition, the courtyard adjacent to the kitchen has been transformed into a sustainability focused area, with raised garden beds, a compost bin and a worm farm, for projects relating to protecting our environment.

Work Health and Safety

At the October Committee Meeting a report from Mr Colin Thornton of Treevolution was presented on the heath and structural integrity of the River Red Gum (Eucalyptus camaldulensis) and Sugar Gum (Eucalyptus cladocalyx) located within the St Peters Child Care Centre. A copy of Mr Thornton’s report is contained in Attachment B.

The Council’s City Arborist advised, that the method for the long term management of the two (2) eucalypts within the rear outdoor play space of the Child Care Centre can be best described as speeding up or mimicking the ageing process of the trees, known as Veteran Tree management.
Veteran Tree management involves slowly and gradually reducing the most extended branches, which then encourages new growth within the tree canopy and therefore continually providing pruning options to remove taller, longer branches which reduces the overall ‘target’, which in this case is the area below the tree that branches may fall.

The staged removal of the third tier branches, followed by the removal of the second tier branches to leave a smaller stout tree with a reduced target whilst retaining most of the benefits of having a tree particularly in a location such as this.

Older, over mature native trees, managed this way become an important habitat location for birds nesting in hollows and other animals and invertebrates. The retention of the tree using this style of tree management could result in the tree become an amazing asset for the Centre and a valuable learning tool by way of installing bird boxes for example, searching for geckos etc.

This methodology is described in further detail in Section 7.0 Tree Two - Future Management Options of the report (Attachment B20) and outlined in the Table 3 below.

**TABLE 3 – FUTURE MANAGEMENT OPTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2018</td>
<td>Initial tree inspection – Veteran tree management with crown reduction by 10%.</td>
<td>Before 7 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June 2019</td>
<td>Re-inspection to determine outcomes of initial Veteran Tree Management. Potential reduction pruning to further encourage the formation of released dormant buds.</td>
<td>Within 4 week of identified inspection date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June 2020</td>
<td>Ongoing inspection and reduction works to reduce overall crown spread to a manageable structure and form a crown size conducive to the retention of a veteran tree in the Urban environment.</td>
<td>Within 4 week of identified inspection date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every three (3) years from 2020</td>
<td>Ongoing inspection and veteran tree management of newly formed crown structure and management of epicormics growth.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first stage of pruning, which involved the reduction of the crown by 10% was completed in May 2018.

**Strategic Plan**

The Centre’s Strategic and Business Plans have been approved by the Committee and the Council. The Centre’s Business Plan established Key Result Areas/Targets. The achievement of the outcomes up to December 2018, are contained in Attachment C.

**OPTIONS**

Not Applicable.

**CONCLUSION**

The St Peters Child Care Centre & Pre-school is recognised as a leader in the provision of high quality child care. It is expected that this will continue. The Centre on average for the September Quarter has 90 children accessing the service on a daily basis, with an expectation that this will increase throughout the year. Despite the increase in licenced places the Centre continues to maintain a waiting list for 2019, with a significant proportion of these referrals coming from word of mouth.
COMMENTS

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and noted.
# National Quality Standard Assessment and Rating Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Name</th>
<th>St Peters Child Care Centre &amp; Preschool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Approval Number</td>
<td>SE-00010960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider Name</td>
<td>City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider Approval Number</td>
<td>PR-00006048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment &amp; Rating Number</td>
<td>ASR-00024310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Status</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Report Completed</td>
<td>3 December 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Day Care</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside School Hours Care (OSHC)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Day Care</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool/Kindergarten</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nominated Supervisor**

Alice Parsons

**Educational Leader/s**

Michaela Gardner

**Primary Contact (for assessment & rating)**

Alice Parsons

**Quality Improvement Plan**

**Date Received**

17 August 2018

**Visit/s**

**Date**

10 October 2018

**Authorised officers**

**Name 1**

Gayle Noolan

**Name 2**

Sally Nicholas

**Further information (if applicable)**

St Peters Child Care Centre & Preschool is a community centre owned and governed by the City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peter Council (Council). They operate six rooms; Emerald – eight weeks to two years, Ruby – six months to two years, Aquamarine – two years to three years, Diamond – two years to three and a half years, Amethyst – three years to four years and Preschool – four years to five years. The centre receives funding through the Universal Access Program for kindergarten aged children.

The centre received Working Towards the National Quality Standard (NQS) in five Quality Areas in the last assessment and rating in May 2016. The director and educational leader (EL) were in their current roles in the 2016 assessment and rating and have continued to make improvements to the practices and procedures of the centre.
Summary comments
# Quality Area 1 – Educational program and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1.1</th>
<th>The educational program enhances each child’s learning and development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Each child’s current knowledge, strengths, ideas, culture, abilities and interests are the foundation of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>All aspects of the program, including routines, are organised in ways that maximise opportunities for each child’s learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 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 | No |

## Standard 1.1 is rated

Meeting NQS

## Evidence for Standard 1.1

The program and routines throughout the centre contribute to a positive learning environment and opportunities for each child’s learning and development.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 1.1:

- There is continuous reflection and changes to the programming throughout the centre. The director and EL reflected on the program to ensure that links to each child’s learning and development was visible and developed a program format for all rooms. Through continuous self-assessment of the program by each room’s educators, the program format has been adapted for different age groups. For example, the preschool program developed by the Early Childhood Teacher (ECT) is a weekly program divided into domains such as maths, science, language, literacy, creative, physical whereas the Emerald room program is a fortnightly program divided into learning outcomes. All formats are informed by the Early Years Learning Framework (EYLF) outcomes, principles and practices. These are made visible through links to the children's observations and evaluations.

- Throughout the day there are both planned and spontaneous learning opportunities for groups and individuals which are based on the children’s strengths, interests and family input. The learning experiences observed and included in the program were relevant to the age group and supported children in their learning, development and wellbeing. Children’s voice is recorded in observations, floor book and wall displays.

- Each room has a group learning focus to assist the children to learn from each other. It was evident to the authorised officer that the children were actively learning about these focuses through conversations with the children. For example, a child pretended cooking in the home...
corner using real parsley. The child approached the authorised officer while eating some of the parsley and explained where and how they had grown it and what it tasted like, inviting the authorised officer to eat some too.

- Science week and book week are programmed to engage the children in science and literacy.
- The centre has asked for educators to volunteer to be the sustainability coordinator and cultural inclusive practice coordinator where they are supported with professional development and time off the floor to research ideas for programming. Children over two years regularly go on excursions to the adjoining Linde Park and community garden to enhance their learning relating to sustainability.

- Cultural awareness and practices are incorporated into routines. All rooms started their morning group time with an engaging, age appropriate acknowledgement of country and the Ninna Marni song. Discussions of Aboriginal peoples and learning some Kaurna language, such as colours and body parts are included within the programs. Cultural celebrations are thoughtfully programmed with group discussions and activities such as Reconciliation Day, NAIDOC week, Christmas, Easter, Halloween, St Patricks Day and Harmony Day.

- The routines are organised to ensure that children were unhurried in their play and given opportunity to finish what they were doing before moving to meal and rest times. The older children collected their own food, serving themselves with tongs, and sat at tables of their choice. Discussions about healthy food, manners, fairness and general conversations were heard by the authorised officer. Meal routines were child-focused and unhurried, although this led to some children waiting behind a line of children until they could serve themselves. The director stated that the lunch routine was discussed at the staff meeting and was still being adjusted.

- Group times varied in each room and allowed for intentional teaching and smooth transitions to meal and rest times.

### Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 1.1

It is recommended that the centre:

- continue to reflect on the lunch time routines.
Standard 1.2  Educators facilitate and extend each child’s learning and development.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Educators are deliberate, purposeful, and thoughtful in their decisions and actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Educators respond to children’s ideas and play and extend children’s learning through open-ended questions, interactions and feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>Each child’s agency is promoted, enabling them to make choices and decisions that influence events and their world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 1.2

| 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 1.2 is rated  Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 1.2

Educators at the centre engaged with the children purposefully and intentionally through child-led initiatives to extend children’s learning and development.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 1.2:

- Educators are aware of the children’s interests, responding to them spontaneously or by including them in future programming. For example, in the younger rooms, educators were observed to sing songs or play with musical toys spontaneously to engage children waiting for meals. The program also included the same two action songs at group time for the week to help the children master them. This practice is a regular inclusion in two of the rooms’ programs due to critical reflection and sharing information between these rooms.
- Intentional teaching to further children’s knowledge and interests occurred in all rooms in group times and through their room focus. The intentional teaching is varied, engaging and age appropriate, including a range of media to keep the children’s interest such as a smartboard, books, puppets and games with cue cards. During group times the children were asked about their knowledge and ideas which were extended and clarified by the educator.
- Educators were observed to shift between teaching strategies to keep the children engaged, including joining children’s play to share humour and to introduce concepts such as counting, colours, traffic rules, ball skills, construction, gross motor skills and cooking. Room focuses were extended in the indoor and outdoor environments. For example, an educator was observed to extend their room focus of transport and traffic rules into the outdoor environment with children walking and on bikes.
- Excursions to the neighbouring community garden and Linde Park are regularly programmed for the older children to extend the gardening and sustainability program.
- To extend children’s literacy skills, children are encouraged to bring their favourite books to share and read within their room. In the kindy room, a child sat at the front of the group with...
the educator where they were supported to tell the story.

- Children’s self-help skills were intentionally part of the program and were a focus in some children’s observations, such as dressing skills, serving their own food, packing away their dishes, packing up resources, toileting, hygiene and applying sunscreen. Children were given roles in the older rooms such as lunch helpers, feeding the pet and packing up toys.
- Children had access to inside/outside play throughout the day and could always choose what and who to play with.

Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 1.2
**Standard 1.3**

**Educators and co-ordinators take a planned and reflective approach to implementing the program for each child.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3.1</th>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Critical reflection on children’s learning and development, both as individuals and in groups, drives program planning and implementation.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Families are informed about the program and their child’s progress.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 1.3**

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

**Standard 1.3 is rated**

Meeting NQS

**Evidence for Standard 1.3**

The centre’s program has been developed through educators’ reflective practices both individually and in groups to extend each child’s learning and development. This information was shared with the children’s families.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 1.3:

- Permanent educators are assigned a care group of children where they are responsible for their learning, development and care. The format for observations is the same throughout the centre. Educators observe, evaluate and extend each child’s learning through their interests at least once a month.
- The educators received professional development to help enrich their observations, evaluations and extension of children’s learning. Trainings attended are:
  - critical reflection on observations, the program and centre practices
  - Aboriginal inclusion
  - natural environments training
  - Jolly Phonics training
  - early childhood theorists.
- Through reflection, educators adjusted their programs to ensure intentional teaching and children’s learning is visible. As referred to in standard 1.1, the Emerald room found that they needed to change from a weekly to a fortnightly program so all experiences could be implemented.
- Educators reflect on their care groups learning and where possible both permanent educators in a room are given time off the floor together to discuss and reflect on all children’s learning to inform the program; except the Emerald room where the children are too young to have both educators leave the room. The program and activities are evaluated on the back of the program.
• The EL receives two hours per week to support the team leaders to develop their program and to support any educators with their observations and planning cycle.

• Each room has a critical reflection book where they pose a question about various practices. This is available for educators and families to write their comments, so they can be considered. For example, ‘Should children have the choice of whether they want to join in group time?’ and ‘Should children have the choice to play outside in winter?’ There is also a centre critical reflection book in the entrance foyer that asks questions relating to the centre. These critical reflections are discussed between room educators and by all educators at staff meetings so that a decision can be reached.

• Families are informed about the program and their child’s progress through:
  o parent night in October where information on the centre’s program and the EYLF are explained
  o parent/teacher interviews if requested by the parent
  o individual portfolios which include end of term reports
  o informal conversations
  o emails
  o floor books
  o programs displayed on the wall.

The centre has reflected on family feedback from the 2018 parent survey in relation to a suggestion to receive information about their child through an online application and have now had approval granted from the Council for funding for iPads. They are currently researching the different applications available.

---

**Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 1.3**

---

**Response to Provider Feedback for Standard 1.3**

| Element 1.3.3 | Feedback received following the report for Standard 1.3 has been considered and does not support changing the rating for this standard. |
### Quality Area 1 summary

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

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?  

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

### Quality Area 1 is rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting NQS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting NQS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. | Met |
| 2.1.3 | Healthy eating and physical activity are promoted and appropriate for each child. | Met |

**Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 2.1**

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

**Standard 2.1 is rated**

Meeting NQS

**Evidence for Standard 2.1**

The centre provides a safe, healthy environment where each child was supported to manage their own health, hygiene and wellbeing. It is noted that improvements have been implemented in hygiene and the management of health/medication plans since the previous assessment and rating visit.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 2.1:

- The centre ensures the routines and environment in each room provide each child with sleep, rest and relaxation according to their individual needs. For example, families of the younger children advise the educators of their child’s routine which is taken into consideration with the child’s needs for when they sleep. The daily routines of the older children’s rooms include age appropriate sleep and rest times which are also guided by the advice of families and the child’s choice. Inside and outside environments have quiet areas where children can relax such as, reading and sedentary play areas, as referred to in standard 3.2.
- All educators attend Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS) training every two years and follow the guidelines for safe sleep practices.
- Critical reflection as a centre has informed the decision that children should play outside in winter, with appropriate warm clothing and that shoes encouraged to be worn.
- Toilets are easily accessible to children in all rooms during indoor and outdoor play. Nappies are changed regularly in an unhurried manner.
- Educators follow the centre’s illness, injury and medication procedures which comply with regulatory requirements. For example, when contagious illnesses are reported notifications
are displayed for families and thorough cleaning of the centre is conducted. The centre is currently reviewing their illness policy due to family feedback about the exclusion of children with certain symptoms. Educators showed awareness of a child’s comfort when they were ill and updated parents throughout the day on the wellbeing of the child.

- Families are offered free flu injections for their children under five years and can pay for their own and their older children. Families were invited to attend the cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training.
- Effective hygiene was embedded into the centre’s routines with regular handwashing, cleaning and disposable gloves worn. For example, at meal times educators and children washed their hands before eating; the tables were washed before and after the meals and gloves were worn by educators to serve the food.
- The first aid kits are regularly checked, clearly labelled and easily accessible to educators and families. All educators have current first aid qualifications including emergency anaphylaxis and asthma which they are prompted to update.
- The children’s dated medication action plans and medication expiry dates are recorded on the Action Plan and Medication Reminder chart. Emails are sent to families three months prior to expiry of the medication or for the annual review of the action plan. Families are prompted when their child’s immunisations are due.
- The qualified cook has been at the centre for nine years and prepares a seasonal menu according to the Get Up & Grow dietary guidelines and ensures he follows recommended food safe practices. The service has responded to family feedback in relation to the menu for:
  - recipes for children with allergies; serving pasta, meat, vegetables and sauces in separate bowls to cater for allergies and food preferences
  - allowing parents to bring packet cake mix for the cook to make their child’s birthday cake to ensure safe food practices are maintained.

The cook attends the Cooks Big Day Out training annually and the director and some team leaders attended I’m Alert food safety training.

- Healthy foods are also encouraged through planting seeds and herbs to use in cooking and in the classroom home corners and sensory areas. For example, as referred to in standard 1.1, a three year old girl was eating some parsley in the home corner and asked the authorised officer if they would like to taste it and how they had grown it in the courtyard. Drinking water is available all day.
- The children have the opportunity to engage in a range of spontaneous and planned physical activity both inside and outside such as, dance lessons, yoga, action songs, bikes, balancing, running and climbing.

**Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 2.1**
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. | 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

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 2.2

| 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 2.2 is rated | Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 2.2

The centre ensures that the children are protected from harm and hazards through effective supervision, management of emergencies and risk assessment of the centre. The educators are aware of their role in keeping the children safe.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 2.2:

- The centre follows the Cancer Council of Australia’s *SunSmart* recommendations and encourages the children to apply their own sunscreen and put their hats on.
- Restricted areas such as the kitchen, storeroom, adult toilet and laundry were inaccessible to the children. Chemicals are clearly labelled and locked in cupboards.
- Educators maintained supervision of the children at all times by moving across the environments and talking to each other about where they were going so that all of the children remained within sight. Educators were observed moving to children that were engaged in risky play and helping children safely include a child with additional needs, as referred to in standard 5.2. An educator remained in the sleep room when children are sleeping.
- There are fire evacuation plans and procedures at each of the exits. The evacuation procedure had been practiced and evaluated by the centre at least every three months. The fire extinguishers are readily accessible and regularly checked.
- All educators are aware of the child protection and risk management policy and the procedure to follow if they suspected a child was at risk of abuse or neglect. All of the educators attend Responding to Abuse and Neglect (RAN) training at the centre so that they can learn and discuss the procedures together. The families are also invited to attend the training. The preschool children were involved in a dance along safety show in relation to protective behaviours.
Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 2.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 2 summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Quality Area 2, is there a significant risk to the health, safety or wellbeing of children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Area 2 is rated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Area 3 – Physical environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 3.1</th>
<th>The design of the facilities is appropriate for the operation of a service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Outdoor and indoor spaces, buildings, fixtures and fittings are suitable for their purpose, including supporting the access of every child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>Premises, furniture and equipment are safe, clean and well maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 3.1

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 3.1 is rated | Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 3.1

The centre was purpose built for child care in the 1970s and is suitable for the learning, development and wellbeing of children. The premises is kept clean and well maintained. The building and outdoor areas are described in the 2016 assessment and rating report and remain unchanged.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 3.1:

- Entry to the centre is secured by a keypad with an entry code. The fencing surrounding the premises is well maintained and prevents children from being able to leave unattended or for any unauthorised people to enter. The back gates are kept locked with a key readily accessible to educators.
- The indoor area has sufficient natural light and ventilation and is maintained at a comfortable temperature.
- Each room has access to the outdoor play area to facilitate indoor/outdoor play.
- The furniture and fittings are appropriate for the age of the children and promote independence and free access to resources. There is a range of natural and man-made resources both inside and outside, with most indoor resources being made of wood. Resources are arranged so that the exits are kept clear.
- The authorised officer discussed with the director that the sleep mats stored in the Aquamarine art room are not secured and pose a risk of falling on children. Children are usually supervised by an adult while in this area, however, a safe alternative for storing these sleep mats needs to be implemented.
- There are viewing windows to the bathroom and nappy change areas to allow for effective supervision. The toilets are accessible to the outdoor area.
- There is a daily cleaning roster for educators in each room and a professional cleaner attends every night after care. The carpets are cleaned every three months.
The Council maintains the inside and outside of the premises and any long-term maintenance is included in the Strategic Plan and QIP. The centre engaged an arborist to assess the safety of the gum trees in the yard due to parent concerns.

The centre is critically reflecting on:
- making the outdoor areas more natural
- the rooms to use for the young children’s play rooms and sleep rooms

### Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 3.1

It is recommended that the centre:

- continues to reflect on the environment to reflect the community
- safely secures the mats stored in the Aquamarine art room so they are not a risk to children’s safety.
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

| 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 |

The environment at the service is arranged to support all children’s interests, learning and development, where children learn through play in a relaxed supported environment. Since the 2016 assessment and rating visit, educators have continued to improve on the content of sustainability in the program with clear strategies now in place to support children to understand and care for the environment.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 3.2:

- The indoor areas are arranged with resources to accommodate children with various interests. For example, art and craft, construction, home corner, nature play and reading areas are established in each room with age appropriate resources. The resources available provide children opportunities to explore literacy, numeracy, problem-solving and creativity as well as culturally inclusive resources. Children could freely access activities from the shelves and take them to tables or mats, to use independently or in groups.
- Tables, chairs, shelving and resources are arranged so that small groups of children can engage in play without being interrupted. Quiet reading areas are arranged to limit interruptions from others walking through and are comfortably set up with cushions, sofas and chairs suitable to the age group in the room. The tables and mats are arranged to enable free flow between activities and the exits. The zero to two year old rooms have ample floor space and matting for babies to safely engage in floor play.
- Outside resources are organised with areas suitable for active play such as ride-ons, push/pull toys, ball play, climbing frames, slides and chasey so as not to interfere with the children engaged in sedentary play, such as the sandpit, cubby and blocks on the mat and painting. There are varying levels of risk provided with climbing equipment arranged with appropriate softfall to support risk taking and the safety of the children.
• There was continuity of experiences between the indoors and outdoors such as home corners/cubbies/mud kitchens, reading areas, construction and nature play. For example, in the younger rooms and their yard there is opportunities for children to explore sound, with instruments inside and a music wall in the outside playspace. In the Diamond room there is a table containing mud and trucks.

• Through reflection the centre has continued to develop their indoor and outdoor environments to include more natural resources for the children to explore. A covered courtyard has been transformed into an all-weather sustainability yard for all age groups to use and contains recycled fittings such as tyres for growing herbs and vegetables. A bark area surrounded by tyres has been established in the younger children’s yard.

The centre has critically reflected on their sustainability practices and engages in the following sustainable activities:

• As referred to in standard 1.1, a sustainability coordinator has been initiated to research and guide the educators on sustainability
• all children are involved in growing vegetables from seeds, as referred to in standard 1.1
• teaching the children about recycling and recycling bins. Educators all attended KESAB training and intentionally teach the children about recycling through developmentally appropriate games, puppets and stories
• recycling food scraps in the food bin
• conserving electricity where possible such as ensuring lighting and air-conditioning is kept between 18 and 22 degrees
• drying the washing on the clothes line if possible
• art smocks are shirts donated from the families
• families are invited to bring in recycled items to use for crafts, props for the home corner and to make learning resources such as post it bottles
• coffee pods are collected from families for recycling
• each room cares for a pet such as a frog, turtle or fish
• regular excursions to the community garden and Linde Park to engage in nature exploration
• reducing the use of laminating and plastic food wrap.

Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 3.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 3 summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Quality Area 3, is there a significant risk to the health, safety or wellbeing of children?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 3 is rated</th>
<th>Meeting NQS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Quality Area 4 – Staffing arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 4.1</th>
<th>Staffing arrangements enhance children’s learning and development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>The organisation of educators across the service supports children’s learning and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>Every effort is made for children to experience continuity of educators at the service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 4.1

Practice is embedded in service operations | Yes
---|---
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 centre considers the organisation of educators and staff satisfaction to enhance the learning, development and wellbeing of each child.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 4.1:

- The centre ensures that the roster always meets Regulatory requirements in regard to ratios and qualifications and ensures that there is always an educator on duty with first aid, anaphylaxis and asthma training.
- Educators are purposefully assigned to rooms according to educator compatibility, qualifications and educator preference so as to benefit the learning and wellbeing of the children. Each room has regular permanent educators with at least one being full time.
- Each child has a primary carer in their room who is responsible for their learning and development.
- The director or ECT is rostered on the opening shift to be present for conversations with the families and to help settle the children with familiar educators.
- The centre has a list of regular casual staff. These educators cover programming and lunch shifts throughout the centre ensuring they are aware of room routines and are familiar to the children.
- The centre provides incentives for the educators to encourage continuity of educators at the service by: above award pay rate, insurance, access to free counselling, mental health day if required, rostered day off for full-time educators, staff birthdays celebrated, paid staff meetings and training, Council recognition for years of service and three Christmas parties (Council, educators and families).
- Manual handling training is provided for the educators in their induction and then bi-annually. Educator reflections in relation to their backs getting sore resulted in each educator only
setting up four beds instead of one educator setting them all up at rest time.

- The director has an open door policy where any of the educators can talk about issues and ideas, which are acted upon through brainstorming.

Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 4.1
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 | Yes |
| Practice is informed by critical reflection | Yes |
| 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

The centre maintains professional practices through being informed and guided by professional standards and professional discussions and develops professional educators who work respectfully together.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting in standard 4.2:

- Educators are recruited to bring a variety of skills, culture, interests and perspectives into the centre. The centre has recruited a highly qualified staff base. For example, they employ four ECTs, one working towards ECT, diploma and four certificate III educators; two working towards their diploma. The director stated that they intentionally employ educators to bring new ideas to the centre, learn new perspectives, skills and challenge each other’s biases.
- Peers nominate each other for the centre’s values awards which are then selected by the Council.
- The rooms share resources and the centre has resource kits made up for the rooms to use. For example, sustainability ideas and resources which can be adapted for the different age groups.
- Staff meetings are held monthly where educators share professional development, attend in-house training and discuss theorists, centre critical reflections and practices. Gossip was discussed at a staff meeting and is discouraged. Educators are asked to share what practices they have liked from other rooms and their colleagues strengths which are written on leaves and displayed in the staff room. For example, one room was repeating the same two songs for the week so that the children could become familiar and confident in the words and actions which another room could see worked well. This was discussed at the staff meeting and the practice was also implemented in their room.
- The team leaders meet every two months and discuss any centre focuses, ideas and how they can adapt them for their age group of children.
- As referred to in standard 1.1, educators in the role of sustainability coordinator and cultural inclusive practice coordinator share their research and professional development with all educators.
• Educators have a good rapport with each other and work respectfully within their roles. They were observed to talk to each other when they were shifting location, about to undertake a routine task or to inform another educator about children’s individual needs that had been communicated by the family. At times educators moved between the rooms to ask if anyone needed help as their room was settled. The routine tasks were shared between the educators.
• The centre accepts students studying an early childhood qualification which helps educators grow in their knowledge by providing mentoring and having conversations with trainers to keep current with early childhood trends and new ideas for practice.
• The director attends professional meetings to discuss practice such as the Universal Access Group and with the Community Child Care Centre’s directors meeting.
• Professional standards that guide practices are the Early Childhood Australia Code of Ethics, EYLF, NQS, United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child Guidelines, Red Nose, the service policies, procedures, philosophy and values.

Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 4.2

Response to Provider Feedback for Standard 4.2

Element 4.2.2 Feedback received following the report for Standard 4.2 has already been considered and does not support changing the rating for this standard.
### Quality Area 4 summary

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 4 is rated</th>
<th>Meeting NQS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Area 5 – Relationships with children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 5.1</th>
<th>Respectful and equitable relationships are maintained with each child.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>Responsive and meaningful interactions build trusting relationships which engage and support each child to feel secure, confident and included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
<td>The dignity and rights of every child are maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demonstration of Exceeding themes for Standard 5.1

| 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 5.1 is rated Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 5.1

Interactions with the children and families at the service were observed to be consistently supportive, respectful and equitable. Each child’s dignity and rights are maintained through routines and to support children’s individual needs.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 5.1:

- The centre creates a sense of belonging for families and children and is culturally inclusive. Displayed on the walls are children’s artwork, greetings and keywords in different languages, charts and flags representing children’s heritage, Aboriginal cultural displays and family photos. The rooms have a homely feel with sofas, mats and aquarium pets.
- Educators and families engaged in conversations at arrival and departure times where information about the child’s needs and activities were shared. To build the relationship with the children and families, the children are assigned primary care educators who are responsible for their learning, development, wellbeing and communication with the family. Families have input into the daily needs for their child such as sleep, food requirements and settling their child.
- Educators showed awareness of children’s interests and emotions and in the younger rooms was able to identify non-verbal cues to respond to their needs. For example, an educator asked a child if they were upset and needed a hug. The educator then took the child by the hand outside to do some climbing which the child enjoyed.
- Educators’ interactions with the children are developmentally appropriate, with high one-on-one interactions at eye level for the younger children compared to interactions that promoted group play and independence for the older children. The educators are able to communicate with the children on various levels such as instructional when asking them to complete necessary routines, comforting or sharing humour with the children as they entered their play with balls and chasey. Educators were observed acknowledging children’s successes.
- Educators respected children’s dignity and rights. For example, they talked to the children before changing their nappy and informed them what was happening next to give them time to transition. The children were given choices in many of the routines such as when to join in group and meal times and what they wanted to eat. Children with a language other than English were supported by educators through learning common words from their family.
- The centre is in the process of attaching doors to the preschool toilets to provide children privacy.
- Educators attended in-house trainings on early childhood theorists to further their understanding of relationships and interactions with children.
- The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child is displayed in the rooms and practices observed by the authorised officer reflected these rights being upheld.

Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 5.1
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

Children are supported in their social skills to play together, learn together and from each other. Children were observed developing self-regulation skills and awareness of other children’s needs and emotions with the guidance of educators.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 5.2:

- Each room provided both programmed and spontaneous activities for groups following children’s interests, room focus or areas for development. Children of all ages were seen engaging in group activities where they were encouraged to take turns, lead, listen, watch and help each other. For example, in the Emerald room children were supported to take turns to stack blocks and the educator stated, ‘Good job, you did that together’. In other rooms children were observed playing in groups throughout the indoor and outdoor areas, which was supported by the set up of resources as referred to in standard 3.2. For example, role play in the cubby, trucks, cooking and chasey. The ECT stated that she deliberately does not step in to the children’s role plays so they can explore their own ideas.
- An educator was observed to support two girls include a child with individual needs in playing with a rope and then extend their play to the cubby house where they were supported to role play together.
- Group times supported children to listen and learn from each other with age appropriate expectations on self-regulation. Children were respectfully reminded to sit or listen to others in the older rooms and in the preschool room they were encouraged to put their hand up to speak and ask questions.
- Educators responded to conflict between children promptly and guided their behaviour with choices to resolve the issue. Educators spoke calmly explaining why the behaviour was not appropriate and what needed to be done. For example, ‘Please don’t throw. That could hit someone. Could you please put it in the home corner and Use your words’. An educator supported a toddler with being gentle hugging others and said, ‘High five for gentle hands. Good listening’. At times educators were instructional without helping children to arrive at their own solutions. For example, ‘Wait till they are finished’ and ‘We go around, remember’
when reminding a child not to go up the slippery dip.

• Educators could be heard talking about children's emotions which were also included in the program.

Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 5.2

It is recommended that the centre:

• reflects on their approach to encourage positive behaviour in children, and supporting them to understand the expectations for their behaviour and the consequences of inappropriate behaviours.
## Quality Area 5 summary

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 5 is rated</th>
<th>Meeting NQS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Area 6 – Collaborative partnerships with families and communities

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

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 | No |

Standard 6.1 is rated Meeting NQS

Evidence for Standard 6.1

The centre supports families to be involved and contribute to centre decisions as well as the learning and development of their child. Information about the centre and organisations that support parenting and family wellbeing is shared with families.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 6.1:

- Relationships are established with families from the initial phone call where they are invited to have a tour of the centre and given a parent information pack containing information about the service program, policies and practices. On enrolment, families complete the enrolment forms with information about the family, child and the care required. Orientation visits are also organised to meet their needs. The families and children meet the educators in their room and the program and routines are shared with them. Parents stay for this visit and are supported to leave the child for short periods while remaining on the premises. Orientation visits are tailored to the individual family who may visit as often as needed to ensure a smooth transition.
- On enrolment, families are advised about how they can be involved in the service and about the Advisory Committee which consists of three families, the Mayor, General Manager of Corporate Services and the director of the centre. This committee meets four times per year to share information and discuss improvements for the centre. Families are emailed policies and the menu for their input when they are being reviewed.
- A family survey is conducted bi-annually and used by the service to critically reflect on their practices. The centre responds to all comments and suggestions. For example, the
introduction of iPads and electronic applications for sharing information with families as referred to in standard 1.3.

- Families are able to borrow books from the centre library to read to the children at home.
- Families can provide input into their child’s learning and the centre through:
  - making suggestions on the critical reflection sheets in each room or in the foyer of the centre
  - writing on whiteboards near the sign-in sheet
  - the program includes family input from discussions with parents and what they have noticed about their child’s learning, how they like the activities and likes and needs of their child
  - in the child’s individual portfolios, on learning stories and end of term reports
  - sharing their culture with the children by reading stories in different languages, cooking and songs
  - being involved in family projects with the preschool children, which are shared at group time
  - informal conversations at arrival and departure of the child.

- Families are invited to attend:
  - grandparent’s day
  - Mother’s Day
  - Father’s Day
  - sports day
  - the centre’s Christmas party.

- Families are kept informed about the service and community services including support organisations by:
  - newsletters every term
  - emails
  - receiving information in the family pigeon holes in the foyer
  - parent night as referred to in standard 1.3
  - referrals to early childhood professionals
  - community brochures and parenting factsheets.

---

Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 6.1
### Standard 6.2
Collaborative partnerships enhance children's inclusion, learning and wellbeing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.2.1</th>
<th>Continuity of learning and transitions for each child are supported by sharing information and clarifying responsibilities.</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2</td>
<td>Effective partnerships support children's access, inclusion and participation in the program.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3</td>
<td>The service builds relationships and engages with its community.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 | No |

### Standard 6.2 is rated

Meeting NQS

### Evidence for Standard 6.2

The centre has developed transition processes that support children to transition between environments and routines and for children to feel included in the program. They have formed relationships and participate within the community.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 6.2:

- As referred to in standard 6.1, the children are supported to transition into the service with the centre’s enrolment and orientation procedure.
- When a child is ready to transition to the next room and a space becomes available, the family receives a letter for the parent to accept the transition occurring. The child has transition visits to the older room for about four weeks at varying times of the day where the length of time is extended with each visit. They are supported with a familiar educator if necessary.
- The preschool has a chart displaying which schools the children will be attending next year and has contact with some of the 13 schools represented. The ECT stated that they prepare the children for school by:
  - discussions about what their expectations are and about the transition visits when they return
  - building independence with increased responsibility for their belongings, packing their bags, filling their own drink bottles, dressing, toileting, packing up, learning the 5LS, more structure at group times and lunch box days where they practice opening and shutting containers and removing glad wrap.
- The centre is a member of Gowrie SA and receives funding and support from the Inclusion Support Subsidy for a child with additional needs. An individual support plan has been developed and a meeting to discuss the strategies for inclusion was attended by the director,
team leader, inclusion support worker and support educator. Support for this child to be included in play with other children was observed by the authorised officer as described in standard 5.2. Other health professionals engaged by the families, such as speech therapists, attend to work with the children and discuss strategies with the educators.

- The centre employs educators with a range of cultures and ability to speak second languages such as, Mandarin, German, Spanish, Philippine, Serbian, Greek and Italian. They have been able to support children of families with limited English by translating for them and finding what interests the child.

- The service has built relationships with community groups through their involvement in activities and providing support for specific projects. These include:
  - the City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters Council. Children also decorate wooden Christmas trees for display on Osmond Terrace each year
  - involvement in the Babies and Children’s Expo
  - the local library where children visit and have a librarian read them stories
  - visits from the local fire officers to discuss fire safety
  - dental checks from a local dentist
  - annual flu injections provided by Eastern Health Authority
  - children attend excursions to the neighbouring community garden where they have their own garden bed and Linde park
  - excursions and incursions including the museum and African drummer
  - promoting local businesses to families
  - supporting charities such as White Balloon Day, Salvation Army - Christmas toy appeal and the Biggest Morning Tea
  - providing families with tickets to events that have been donated to the centre
  - mentoring students from the pre-service teacher education program at Flinders University.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 6 summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Quality Area 6, is there a significant risk to the health, safety or wellbeing of children?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 6 is rated</th>
<th>Meeting NQS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Quality Area 7 – Governance and leadership

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

**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 centre is governed by the City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters Council who oversee the operation of the centre to ensure the children’s welfare, safety and learning are maintained in accordance with the NQS. The centre’s philosophy, vision, outcomes and values guide their practices towards the families, children, educators, environment and community.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 7.1:

- The philosophy reflects the practice observed by the authorised officer where the children were supported in a 'safe, happy and stimulating environment, free from bias and provides opportunity for children to engage in sustainable practices and be connected to the community'. The philosophy is reviewed annually by the educators and parents are emailed the philosophy for their input. The philosophy is displayed on the wall throughout the centre.
- A part-time administration person ensures the staff and family records are up-to-date and stored securely in a locked cupboard in the administration office.
- The prescribed information is displayed in the foyer.
- The policies are reviewed at least every two years in accordance with the centre’s Continuous Review Policy.
- The director and EL are aware follow their Grievance Procedure in relation to complaints and are aware of their responsibility in relation to notifications that need to be made to the Regulatory Authority.
- Educators are all aware of their requirements for documenting injuries including reporting serious incidents to the Regulatory Authority.
• As referred to in standard 1.3, the EL, sustainability coordinator, cultural inclusive practice coordinator and room educators receive time off the floor for planning and programming to ensure the educational program and wellbeing of the children is supported.

• Risk minimisation strategies include, risk assessments for excursions, audits by the council and indoor/outdoor checklists completed by the educators.

• A panel consisting of a council representative, the director and another educator, interview candidates for recruitment and take into consideration their experience, skills, qualifications and perspectives, as referred to in standard 4.2. Permanent and casual educators are inducted; casual educators with a checklist and permanent educators complete an induction booklet. New educators are placed on three months’ probation and receive mentoring by the team leader. The director maintains a list of all educators’ qualifications and relevant history assessments to ensure they are kept current.

• All educators are aware of their roles and responsibilities through their induction, staff meetings and job list in each room.

Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 7.1
Standard 7.2  
Effective leadership builds and promotes a positive organisational culture and professional learning community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.2.1</th>
<th>There is an effective self-assessment and quality improvement process in place.</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.2.2</td>
<td>The educational leader is supported and leads the development and implementation of the educational program and assessment and planning cycle.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3</td>
<td>Educators, co-ordinators and staff members’ performance is regularly evaluated and individual plans are in place to support learning and development.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 director and City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters committee (committee) provide the centre with ongoing continuous improvement through self-assessment and building a professional team of educators.

The following demonstrates how the centre is meeting standard 7.2:

- Together with the committee the centre has developed a five-year strategic plan that integrates with the centre’s QIP and outlines the centre’s strengths and areas where improvement is required or is occurring. The QIP is available to families and educators are regularly asked to reflect on sections for their input. The committee meets four times a year to review the strategic plan and monitor the progress of the objectives.
- The EL is qualified as an ECT and receives two hours per week to support the team leaders and educators with their observations, learning stories and programs and is available to help with extension ideas.
- Performance evaluation of staff occurs through the EMPOWER Performance Development Review. The review is completed annually in three stages; stage one the educator establishes work goals in line with the centre’s values and objectives and identifies professional development opportunities, stage two the director conducts an interim review with the educator as to their progress towards their goals, and stage three the director conducts the annual assessment to discuss the educators performance and achievements. There is two way feedback where the educator is able to provide evaluation of the director.
- The director is reviewed by the General Manager of Corporate Services & Centre Committee.
- Educators have participated in whole of centre training such as CPR, SIDS and Child Safe Environments. Individual professional development is also attended as outlined in their
performance evaluations.

Quality Improvement Plan notes for Standard 7.2
### Quality Area 7 summary

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 7 is rated</th>
<th>Meeting NQS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Assessment and rating summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Area 1</td>
<td>Meeting NQS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Area 2</td>
<td>Meeting NQS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Area 3</td>
<td>Meeting NQS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Area 4</td>
<td>Meeting NQS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Area 5</td>
<td>Meeting NQS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Area 6</td>
<td>Meeting NQS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Area 7</td>
<td>Meeting NQS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall rating

- **Meeting NQS**
### Quality improvement plan notes summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Standard 1.1  | It is recommended that the centre:  
  • continue to reflect on the lunch time routines. |
| Standard 1.2  |  |
| Standard 1.3  |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Standard 3.1  | It is recommended that the centre:  
  • continues to reflect on the environment to reflect the community  
  • safely secures the mats stored in the Aquamarine art room so they are not a risk to children’s safety. |
| Standard 3.2  |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Standard 5.2  | It is recommended that the centre:  
  • reflects on their approach to encourage positive behaviour in children, and supporting them to understand the expectations for their behaviour and the consequences of inappropriate behaviours. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Area 6</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Provider Feedback summary

#### Quality Area 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1.3</th>
<th>Feedback received following the report for Standard 1.3 has been considered and does not support changing the rating for this standard.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element 1.3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quality Area 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 4.2</th>
<th>Feedback received following the report for Standard 4.2 has already been considered and does not support changing the rating for this standard.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element 4.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 SUMMARY

This report describes the inspection and assessment of the River Red Gum (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*) and Sugar Gum (*Eucalyptus cladocalyx*) located within the St Peters Child Care Centre, Henry Street, Stepney, to determine their overall health and structural integrity and to identify suitable management options when considered against the Principles of Development Control contained within the Norwood Payneham & St Peters (City) Development Plan.

The inspection and assessment identified that **Tree One** has relatively poor form with over extended branches that extend over the child care centre building and play area. Pruning has been identified that will assist in minimising the risk to a more broadly acceptable level whilst retaining the tree.

**Tree Two** is showing fair structure having a relatively large and wide spreading framework of large diameter scaffold branches, which in turn support a typical arrangement of smaller secondary scaffold and lateral branches.

The risk assessment undertaken identified minor defects within the trees main branching structure that would need to be abated to reduce the risk of potential failures and reduce the risk to a more broadly acceptable level that could be managed into the future.

The report details the short term veteran tree management options which should be carried out as soon as practicable and clearly demonstrates the crown reduction necessary to allow the tree to show a growth response whilst retaining sufficient foliage to minimise the effect on the trees normal life processes.

The long term management options are also identified clearly showing that further reduction pruning is required in order to reduce the overall size of the crown to a more manageable size whilst reducing the potential for branch failure.

The long term management options identified are dependent on the overall tree response to the initial short term pruning regime, which will ultimately dictate the time scales in which to implement further pruning.

When the tree is considered against the Objectives contained within the Norwood Payneham & St Peters (City) Development Plan it clearly fulfills the criteria to deem it to be regulated tree with attributes worthy of retaining.

The veteran management identified for the tree is also deemed to fulfill the criteria contained within the Development Plan with regard to pruning as this will assist in abating potential ongoing hazards and risks associated with the tree’s structure.
INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters have identified the River Red Gum (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*) and Sugar Gum (*Eucalyptus cladocalyx*) located within the St Peter Child Care Centre, Henry Street, Stepney for inspection to determine their suitability for retention within their current setting.

The assessment forms part of an ongoing management plan adopted for the Child Care Centre, which is undertaken on a biennial basis, as part of their duty of care.

ASSIGNMENT

The purpose of the inspection is to provide an assessment of the trees to determine whether any defects are present within their structure, and identify whether any defects identified are such that they could affect their overall health, structural stability or long term retention.

The assessment includes a comprehensive risk assessment that is in line with the methodology produced by the Quantified Tree Risk Assessment (QTRA).

LIMITS OF THE ASSIGNMENT/INVESTIGATION

A complete analysis of the structural integrity of the upper canopies was not undertaken. Therefore, the report is limited to those details available and visible at the time of inspection from the ground only, a climbing inspection was not requested for the purposes of this investigation.

OBSERVATIONS

A site visit and assessment was undertaken on the 28th March 2018.

CONTEXT

The trees are both mature specimens that are located within the rear playground area of the Child Care Centre. The area surrounding the trees is set out with Softfall matting and play equipment. There are two large sail shade areas directly to the west of the trees and high use areas directly beneath the trees.

The child care buildings are located to the south west of the trees.

The prevailing wind direction is primarily south westerly, combined with strong northerly winds and the easterly gully breezes that occur regularly in the warmer months (November – March). The local surroundings provide moderate shelter from wind, with the trees being
large co-dominant specimens with the immediate locality and exposed to the prevailing weather conditions.

**METHODOLOGY**

The site inspection comprised a Visual Tree Assessment undertaken initially from ground level supported by an aerial inspection of the upper crown sections to allow the collection of the following data for the subject trees:

- **Species**
- **Height (m)**
- **Diameter at Breast Height (DBH)**
- **Crown spread (in M taken along all 4 compass points)**
- **Approximate age**
- **Condition**
- **Defects and diseases**

All measurements taken during the site inspection utilised digital recording devices to determine crown height, spread and proximity of adjacent features. In the case of stem circumference, measurements were made to the nearest centimetre.

4.0 QUANTIFIED TREE RISK ASSESSMENT (QTRA)

The inspection includes an individual Quantified Tree Risk Assessment. Ellison (2012) defines QTRA as a system established to quantify the risk of significant harm from tree failure within predetermined risk thresholds.

Values for the targets (people and property), the size of part (size of most likely part to fail) and the probability of failure are derived from an assessment of the tree and its surroundings. The values of these three primary components are then combined to calculate the probability of harm using Monte Carlo simulations (see Appendix Two).

The risk assessment and inspection was undertaken during working hours and minimal vehicular and high pedestrian movements were noted. It is anticipated that an increase in the number of vehicles and pedestrian movements might occur outside of working hours, which is reflected in the final Quantified Tree Risk Assessment.

**TREE CONDITION**

The following tables provide a summary of typical tree dimensions, and give a description of the tree and its general structure and health. The dimensions provided describe the tree’s size and form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree #</th>
<th>Genus + Species</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Ht M</th>
<th>Circ @ 1 m</th>
<th>Crown Spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Eucalyptus camaldulensis</em></td>
<td>River Red Gum</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>N 7  E 3  S 6  W 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Comments**
The tree is located in the soft fall area of the playground on the north eastern side of the childcare centre, being 4.4 metres west from the eastern boundary and 5.28 metres north east from the north eastern corner of the child care building.

**Roots and Butt**
The tree displays poor basal flare having minor fill placed over its rooting system.

**Stem**
The tree develops a single stem showing a heavy bias of 15 degrees from vertical to the west. The first scaffold branch emerges from its south eastern aspect at 3.6 metres above ground level, this branch extends to the south west at 20 degrees from vertical having had all lower branches previously removed leaving a horse-tailed arrangement of remaining branches, which are low hanging and end weighted. The main stem extends to 5 metres where it divides to form two main leaders held in a north east/south west orientation.

North Eastern Leader – This leader is generally upright in form to 7.5 metres where it divides to form two upright scaffold branches held in a north/south orientation, both of which display a heavy arrangement of terminal branches all of which extend to the west.

South Western Leader – This leader extends to the west at 15 degrees from vertical having had all its lower branches previously removed. The main secondary branches commence at 9 metres and exhibit good overall form, but exhibit over extension and end weighted form.

**Crown**
Large wide spreading but heavily asymmetrical crown that shows major suppression on its east from the adjoining tree. The crown shows a heavy bias to the west with over extended arrangement of branches. Foliage density is considered to be fair.

Photograph showing the tree when viewed from the south, showing the low hanging branches on its western aspect.
Photographs showing the large scaffold branch on the south eastern side of the stem that has had all lower branches removed leaving a lions tailed arrangement of low hanging branches. Photographs provide indicative pruning locations.
Photograph showing the point at which the main stem divides to form two large leaders, and demonstrates the numerous pruning wounds on their lower aspect from previous branch removal events.

Photograph showing the slightly over extended branches associated with the main scaffold branches on the trees western aspect, and provides indicative pruning locations.
TREE ONE - QUANTIFIED TREE RISK ASSESSMENT

The section of tree on which the QTRA was undertaken was identified as the part that overhung the target area with the highest occupancy rating or damage potential, and deemed to have the most significant relationship between the tree and targets. Both human occupation and property damage were considered and identified below, with the highest target rating used within the final assessment.

TARGET RATING ASSESSMENT

Human Occupation – The area beneath the tree is the main play area for the Child Care Centre and is considered to support an occupancy rating of between 2.5 hours per day to constant use. This is considered to be a reasonable approach to the occupancy rating taking all eventualities into consideration, and therefore allocated Target Rating 1.

Property Damage – The Child Care Centre building occupies a small area beneath the western aspect of the tree’s crown and is considered to have the potential to be damaged by any falling branches. The level of damage that could be caused was estimated to fall within the category of between $400 and $4,000, and therefore allocated Target Rating 4.

SIZE OF PART ASSESSMENT

The relatively large diameter over extended branches that overhang the building and play area were estimated to be within the size range of between 110mm diameter and 250mm diameter and therefore allocated Size of Part Rating 3. The Property classification within the Target Rating was also considered as part of this assessment.

PROBABILITY OF FAILURE ASSESSMENT

At the time of inspection, the tree was showing defects that would suggest that it has an increased potential for failure, with the overall assessment of the probability of failure being reflected in the assessment. This was undertaken taking into account any reasonably foreseeable effect on the trees structure and was up scaled two levels from a base line of 7. This was deemed to be a reasonable approach to the overall assessment and as such allocated a Probability of Failure Rating 5.

| QUANTIFIED TREE RISK ASSESSMENT – Human Occupation |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
| TARGET EVALUATION | 1 Situated within the Child Care Centre’s main play area that is exposed to human occupation of between 2.5 hours per day and constant use. |
| SIZE OF PART | 3 Relatively large diameter over extended scaffold branches on the western aspect of the crown with an average size of between 110mm and 250mm dia. |
| PROBABILITY OF FAILURE | 5 The tree was showing minor defects in the form of slightly over extended branches that would suggest that it had a slightly increased potential to shed the branches identified within the size of part section of the assessment. The rating allocated was rounded up two steps from the lowest probability rating, which in this instance was deemed to be a reasonable approach. |

TOTAL 1/500,000

This results in a risk assessment calculation that is within the limits of tolerability category of risk that deems it to be posing a generally tolerable level of risk over the period of inspection (12 months).

| QUANTIFIED TREE RISK ASSESSMENT – Property Damage |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
| TARGET EVALUATION | 4 Close proximity to the Child Care Centre building that could sustain damage within the range of between $400 and $4,000. |
| SIZE OF PART | PROPERTY Relatively large diameter over extended scaffold branches on the western aspect of the crown with an average size of between 110mm and 250mm dia. |
| PROBABILITY OF FAILURE | 5 The tree was showing minor defects in the form of slightly over extended branches that would suggest that it had a slightly increased potential to shed the branches identified within the size of part section of the assessment. The rating allocated was rounded up two steps from the lowest probability rating, which in this instance was deemed to be a reasonable approach. |

TOTAL 1/1,000,000

This results in a risk assessment calculation that is within the broadly acceptable category of risk that deems it to be posing an acceptable level of risk over the period of inspection (12 months).
General Comments
The tree is located in the newly constructed play/soft fall area of the playground on the north eastern side of the childcare centre, being 6 metres west from the eastern boundary and 10 metres north east from the north eastern corner of the child care building. There is a small sand pit and shade sail area directly adjacent to the western side of the tree.

Roots and Butt
The tree displays good basal flare but has had minor fill placed over its rooting system.

Stem
The tree develops a single stem to 4.7 metres above ground level to the first large scaffold branch on its north western aspect. This scaffold branch extends in a horizontal plane to the north west having previously been reduced to a large stub that now supports new epicormic growth.

There is a further scaffold branch on the southern side of the stem at 4.8 metres that extends horizontally to the south developing a poor arrangement of previously pruned branches leaving low hanging lateral branches that are held terminally. There is a small scaffold branch on the northern side of the stem at 5.5 metres that has previously been reduced and supports terminally held epicormic growth.

There are two large scaffold branches on the north at 7 metres that are held in a north east/north west orientation. The north eastern scaffold branch extends horizontally to the north east dividing at 1 metre to form two heavily reduced secondary scaffold branches that currently display fair form. The north western scaffold branch extends to the north west where it supports a poor arrangement of secondary and lateral branches.

The stem extends to 8.6 metres to a further two scaffold branches held on the northern and southern stem aspects, the northern scaffold branch is held in a horizontal plane extending to the north east having previously been reduced and showing fair form. The southern scaffold branch divides at a metre developing two poorly formed secondary branches held in an east west orientation. The main stem extends at 15 degrees from vertical from 8.7 metres where it develops three main scaffold branches, all show relatively poor overall form.

Crown
Large wide spreading crown that shows a slight bias to the north. Foliage density is considered to be good having previously been reduced, and responding with new internal growth. There is large diameter deadwood in the western crown.

Photograph showing the tree when viewed from the north west, showing its fair overall shape and form.
Photograph showing the primary scaffold branch on the north western side of the stem that has previously been reduced and supporting new epicormic growth.

Photographs showing the poorly formed and twisted scaffold branch on the southern side of the stem that supports terminal arrangement of low hanging lateral branches.
Photograph showing the terminal epicormic growth supported on the northern scaffold branch that has previously been reduced to a stub.

Photographs showing the north eastern scaffold branch on the main stem at 7 metres that has been heavily reduced.
Photograph showing the north western scaffold branch held on the main stem at 7 metres which displays poor form.

Photograph showing the north scaffold branch held on the main stem at 8.6 metres that has been heavily reduced.
Photograph showing the southern scaffold branch held on the main stem at 8.6 metres which displays poor form.

Photograph showing the point at which the main stem divides to form three poorly formed scaffold branches.
TREE TWO - QUANTIFIED TREE RISK ASSESSMENT

The section of tree on which the QTRA was undertaken was identified as the part that overhung the target area with the highest occupancy rating or damage potential, and deemed to have the most significant relationship between the tree and targets. Both human occupation and property damage were considered and identified below, with the highest target rating used within the final assessment.

TARGET RATING ASSESSMENT

Human Occupation – The area beneath the tree is the main play area for the Child Care Centre and is considered to support an occupancy rating of between 2.5 hours per day to constant use. This is considered to be a reasonable approach to the occupancy rating taking all eventualities into consideration, and therefore allocated Target Rating 1.

SIZE OF PART ASSESSMENT

The relatively large diameter over extended branches that overhang the building and play area were estimated to be within the size range of between 110mm diameter and 250mm diameter and therefore allocated Size of Part Rating 3. The Property classification within the Target Rating was also considered as part of this assessment.

PROBABILITY OF FAILURE ASSESSMENT

At the time of inspection, the tree was showing defects that would suggest that it has an increased potential for failure, with the overall assessment of the probability of failure being reflected in the assessment. This was undertaken taking into account any reasonably foreseeable effect on the trees structure and was up scaled two levels from a base line of 7. This was deemed to be a reasonable approach to the overall assessment and as such allocated a Probability of Failure Rating 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>QUANTIFIED TREE RISK ASSESSMENT Human Occupation</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TARGET EVALUATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Situated within the Child Care Centre’s main play area that is exposed to human occupation of between 2.5 hours per day and constant use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE OF PART</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relatively large diameter scaffold and secondary scaffold branches in the upper aspect of the crown with an average size of between 110mm and 250mm dia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBABILITY OF FAILURE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The tree was showing minor defects in the form of slightly over extended branches that would suggest that it had a slightly increased potential to shed the branches identified within the size of part section of the assessment. The rating allocated was rounded up two steps from the lowest probability rating, which in this instance was deemed to be a reasonable approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This results in a risk assessment calculation that is within the limits of tolerability category of risk that deems it to be posing a generally tolerable level of risk over the period of inspection (12 months).

AS LOW AS REASONABLY PRACTICABLE

When considering whether the risks associated with the tree are as low as reasonable practicable the costs and benefits associated with the level of risk control need to be considered. The control of risk should only be undertaken when significant benefit is achievable at a reasonable cost.

This tree has major benefits associated with the retention of large veteran trees in the urban environment. Due to the defects identified and the benefits afforded by the tree the cost of works to implement a veteran tree management regime could be deemed appropriate in this instance.

This will involve the implementation of major reduction works to reduce the overall spread associated with the large scaffold branches to stimulate the tree to respond by releasing dormant buds on the retained sections of the scaffold branches.

The tree is currently showing a favourable response to past pruning works with the formation of new epicormic shoots being released from the reduced scaffold branches.

Major deadwood is apparent within the upper crown and forms the basis of the section of risk assessment associated with road and footpath users and would be removed as part of the veteran tree management approach therefore reducing the overall risk associated with the tree.
## TREE TWO– LEGISLATIVE ASSESSMENT

### COMMENTS MADE WITH REGARD TO OBJECTIVES 25 AND 121 CONTAINED WITHIN THE NPSP (CITY) DEVELOPMENT PLAN

**OBJECTIVE 120**
The conservation of regulated trees that provide important aesthetic and/or environmental benefit.

**YES** – The tree is a large mature specimen that is a local indigenous species, which has important environmental benefits from both a biodiversity and native fauna perspective.

**OBJECTIVE 121**
Development in balance with preserving regulated trees that demonstrate one or more of the following attributes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OBJECTIVE 121(a)</strong></th>
<th>The tree is indigenous to the local area.</th>
<th><strong>NO</strong> – The tree is an introduced species that is native to South Australia but not considered to be locally indigenous to the area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 121(b)</strong></td>
<td>The tree significantly contributes to the character or visual amenity of the local area</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong> – The area is characterised by well-vegetated public streets and private areas, this includes large mature trees of indigenous and introduced species located within the adjacent reserve to the north. This tree forms part of a larger but fragmented group of trees within the locality and as such could be considered to contribute to the character of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 121(c)</strong></td>
<td>The tree is a rare or endangered species</td>
<td><strong>NO</strong> – The tree is not a rare or endangered species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 121(d)</strong></td>
<td>The tree is important habitat for native fauna.</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong> – The tree is a species native to South Australia and as such is considered to form important habitat and feeding opportunities for native fauna.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS MADE WITH REGARD TO THE PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL CONTAINED WITHIN SECTION 410 OF THE NPSP (CITY) DEVELOPMENT PLAN

**PDC 410**
A regulated tree should not be removed or damaged other than where it can be demonstrated that one or more of the following apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PDC 410(a)</strong></th>
<th>The tree is diseased and its life expectancy is short.</th>
<th><strong>NO</strong> – The tree is showing fair form having a wide spreading but slightly asymmetrical crown that displays good overall health. There were no indications of disease at the time of inspection that would suggest or support the conclusion that it would have a short life expectancy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PDC 410(b)</strong></td>
<td>The tree represents a material risk to public or private safety</td>
<td><strong>NO</strong> – The tree has fair overall structure. The Quantified Tree Risk Assessment places it within the limits of tolerability category, and as such could be considered to pose a generally acceptable level of risk to persons utilising the Child Care Centre play area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PDC 410(c)</strong></td>
<td>The tree is causing damage to a building</td>
<td><strong>NO</strong> – The tree is within close proximity to the Child Care Centre building, but is not currently showing any signs of damage to that structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PDC 410(e)</strong></td>
<td>The work is required for the removal of dead wood, treatment of disease, or is in the general interests of the health of the tree.</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong> – The veteran tree management identified for this tree will improve overall structural stability whilst creating a smaller and more appropriately formed crown that will be readily managed into the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 DISCUSSION

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The trees are large mature specimens that are shown to fit with the overall landscape character of the area. Tree One is showing relatively poor form being heavily suppressed and having been subject to poor quality pruning. Tree Two is a large mature specimen that shows good overall shape and form with a large framework of scaffold branches that have previously been reduced.

Tree Two currently fulfils the criteria deeming it to be regulated tree with attributes worthy of retaining, in so far as it contributes to the character of the area by way of visual amenity and is consistent with the existing tree population in the immediate locality, and is a native species that will provide important habitat for native fauna.

TREE ONE

The tree is showing poor overall shape and form due to heavy suppressive forces from the adjacent larger tree. The shape and form is further compounded by the fact that the tree has been inappropriately lopped in the past, which has resulted in the internodal reduction of the scaffold branches, which have produced epicormic growth from the cut surfaces.

The risk assessment concludes that the tree demonstrates a low probability of causing damage or injury to the adjacent Child Care Centre building and play area, and is contained within the limits of tolerability category.

Pruning should be implemented to reduce the over extended branches on the western side of the crown.

TREE TWO

The tree is showing fair structure with good shape and form supporting a wide spreading crown that supports good foliage density with newly formed epicormic growth on the upper surface of the large scaffold branches, which is indicative of good overall health and tree response to past branch reduction pruning. It has experienced internodal lopping of scaffold branches on all aspects, resulting in the proliferation of a range of small diameter epicormic regrowth.

The response shown by the tree, with the formation of new epicormic growth on the lower to mid stem, combined with the release of dormant buds on the scaffold branch network is a typical response that is expected from mature trees that have been subject to this type of works.
The risk assessment undertaken provides the tree with a risk rating that is contained within the limits of tolerability category and as such is considered to pose a level of risk to the adjacent Child Care Centre that is generally acceptable when combined with mitigation measures to reduce the overall and ongoing level of risk.

6.0 VETERAN TREE MANAGEMENT

Senescence is a normal stage in the trees life cycle. As the tree ages it goes through a process of reducing its mass to allow the reducing energy levels to provide for a smaller more compact tree. This is typical tree architecture shown by ageing trees.

The work identified with regard to these trees is the implementation of an innovative pruning program. The pruning will require the removal of a large percentage of the upper canopy in line with veteran tree management principles undertaken in Europe and the UK.

This type of pruning is undertaken with the view to retain and prolong the ultimate life span of the tree whilst reducing its potential to continue to decline and ultimately reduce their potential to drop large limbs.

The principle associated with veteran tree management is to pre-empt what the tree will ultimately try and achieve through natural processes. Over mature trees start the process of old age by slowly reducing their ultimate size by closing down the branch extremities, and producing epicormic growth on the large lateral and scaffold branches closer to the main stem. This allows the trees to reduce the size of their mass thus reducing the amount of energy required to maintain the entire tree system.

Fortunately for Tree Two the process has already started with the production of epicormic growth on the main leaders and scaffold branches.

The purpose of veteran tree management is to reduce the large secondary branches to an extent and form that can be both adequately managed in the future, and which reduces the potential for large limb failure. If the tree retains its current shape and form with over-extended limbs any failure could have a significant impact on the targets surrounding it, and ultimately cause significant damage to the tree.

The proposed pruning will aim to reduce the trees to a range of framework branches that accurately reflect the current shape and form of its branching structure. One of the variables that also needs to be considered when pruning is the trees ability to respond and produce new growth.
Diagram showing the characteristics of a veteran tree that is likely to respond to cutting, and those of a tree that is less likely to respond

THE IMPORTANCE OF VETERAN TREES

All large mature trees have the potential, with the right form of management to become veteran trees. These trees are important as they may have historic value, each individual being a survivor from the past and a relic of the former landscape.

This is especially important in South Australia as the large tree population, which has the potential to become veteran, are under threat due to urban consolidation, agricultural and viticultural practices.

In addition to their importance as natural habitats, they are also a valuable part of our cultural heritage. Despite potentially surviving centuries, they are now largely at our mercy through the rapid pace of change brought about by modern technology. It only takes a few minutes to condemn a tree that has lived through more changes in its time than we can ever imagine.

In brief, veteran trees are of importance because:

They have aesthetic appeal and cause inspiration.
They may have a particular historic link, i.e. be associated with a specific person or event.

They often illustrate past land use or cultural landscapes. For example veteran trees are often found on wooded commons, in parkland, as boundary or field markers and in ancient farmland landscapes.

They are especially important for biological reasons, providing conditions suitable for a wide range of other plants and animals, many of which require the very special environment created in an old tree.

All the above reasons give sound reasoning into the retention of large mature trees in the urban and rural environment and are a valuable resource for future generations.

7.0 TREE TWO - FUTURE MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Tree retention is based on the requirements of further monitoring and comprehensive future management.

The works priority is identified as being within the mid echelons of the limits of tolerability [QTRA] and requires the implementation of some form of mitigation to move the level of risk into the more broadly acceptable level of risk. This mitigation needs to be balanced with overall tree retention and contrasted with the benefits afforded to veteran trees in the urban environment.

The mitigation measures propose the overall reduction of the larger more over extended scaffold branches situated throughout the entire crown structure. This reduction should be undertaken by initiating a reduction pruning procedure that fits with the principles of veteran tree management.

The crown structure of the tree should be reduced by a maximum of 10% back to suitable pruning locations and should be undertaken in the outer third of the crown structure only working from the branch tips inwards. No form of internal growth should be removed or damaged during the works.

All deadwood greater than 25mm in diameter should also be removed during this process.

Due to the level of risk allocated the mitigation should be undertaken with the coming months and should be completed within an 8 to 16 week period from the date of this report.

Ongoing management will require an assessment of the tree once the work is completed, to determine whether the total reduction meets an acceptable level to reduce the identified risks and meets the principles of veteran tree management.
Following on from the implementation of the reduction works, the tree should be monitored within a 12-month period to determine the overall response to the veteran tree management undertaken. Should this be deemed to be a favourable response, with the release of dormant buds along the stem and scaffold branch network then ongoing inspections should be undertaken on a 12 monthly basis to identify any further reduction works required to stimulate maturing of the released dormant buds.

Should the tree fail to respond to the pruning with no additional growth evident after an 18-month period then a further assessment should be made to determine whether it is a suitable for veteran tree management and long term retention.

The following table identifies timelines of management and inspection taking the date of this report as a starting point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>WORKS REQUIRED AND RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th April 2018</td>
<td>Initial tree inspection Veteran tree management - crown reduction by 10%</td>
<td>8 to 16 weeks or before 7th June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th June 2019</td>
<td>Re-inspection to determine outcomes of initial veteran tree management.</td>
<td>Within 4 weeks of identified inspection date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential reduction pruning to further encourage the formation of released</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dormant buds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th June 2020</td>
<td>Ongoing inspection and reduction works to reduce overall crown spread to a</td>
<td>Within 4 weeks of identified inspection date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manageable structure and form a crown size conducive to the retention of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>veteran trees in the urban environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 3 years from 2020</td>
<td>Ongoing inspection and veteran tree management of the newly formed crown</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structure and management of epicormic growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 CONCLUSIONS – TREE ONE

The tree is showing a heavy crown bias to the west, with long over extended branches supporting heavy foliage end weight. Pruning should be implemented to reduce the over extended branches by a maximum of 10% whilst thinning the remaining branching structure on the western side of the tree by 10%.

9.0 CONCLUSIONS – TREE TWO

When Tree Two is considered against the outcomes of the structural and health assessment, combined with the findings of the risk assessment it can be concluded that the tree has characteristics that are desirable and consistent with the local landscape.

The tree is considered to be within the limits of tolerability from a risk perspective [QTRA] but the risk assessment identifies that mitigation is required to further reduce the tree to a more acceptable level of risk.

The management of the tree with the basis of veteran tree management is a desirable and required outcome from a tree retention perspective. Crown reduction is deemed to be
appropriate in this instance and the 10% crown reduction should be implemented within the timescales identified within the ‘Future Management Options’ section of the report.

The works identified to manage and mitigate the level of risk posed by the tree accord with the requirements of the Norwood Payneham & St Peters Development Plan with regard to regulated trees.

COLIN S. THORNTON [Consulting Arborist]
Master of Science Degree in Arboriculture and Community Forest Management (UK) (MSc Arb)
Advanced Diploma in Arboriculture and Community Forest Management (UK) (Adv Dip Arb)
Higher National Diploma in Arboriculture (UK) (HND Arb)
National Diploma in Arboriculture (UK) (ND Arb)
Certificate IV Workplace Training & Assessment
Registered QTRA (Quantified Tree Risk Assessment)
11.0 APPENDIX TWO - QTRA METHODOLOGY

QUANTIFIED TREE RISK ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

DEVELOPING THE PROBABILITY OF HARM

TARGET EVALUATION

Target evaluation considers the use and occupancy of the area that would be struck by the defective part. For the purpose of the assessment, targets are considered in three categories:

- People in vehicles
- Other human occupation; and
- Property

The target evaluation is refined to the one category that has the most significant relationship with the tree or trees in the assessment.

Ellison (2012) explains target evaluation as the assessment of repair or replacement value of property or the average occupation of people (vehicles or pedestrians) in the coming year. The assessment is represented as a target range that represents the appropriate property repair/replacement value or the frequency of occupation.

SIZE OF PART

Size of part refers to the likely force of the branch or tree upon impact with the target. Assessment considers only the tree parts that are significant in their relationship with the identified target.

Ellison (2012) states that QTRA categorizes Impact Potential by using the connection between diameter and average mass of the tree parts that are significant to the target in the event of failure.

The size of a branch and therefore its mass is proportional to the amount of damage or injury it can cause in any particular situation.

PROBABILITY OF FAILURE

The probability of failure is an evaluation of the tree’s stability that is based on the structural condition of the tree. The estimate of the likelihood that a particular part of the tree will fail within the coming year is represented within a broad numerical range (Ellison).

The probability of failure is a ‘reasonably informed judgment’ based on the assessor’s tree assessment and his knowledge of the species, its structure and form and the impacts of its environment.

The presence of defects such as included bark, decay or cavities and the extent to which they impact the structure of the tree play a part in forming the probability of failure value.

VALID ASSESSMENT

To assist in determining the Probability of Failure [PoF] the VALID system of assessment was used to formulate the most appropriate benchmark and final PoF rating. The VALID system identifies key points of tree health structure and defect profile to determine the initial benchmarking point, and aids in establishing a final probability of failure by combining the overall results.

The VALID system utilising either a red or green letter allocation of each individual section of the assessment, with green indicating a good response or section profile with the red being poor response etc.

The lettering provides either a capital or lower case letter indicating a reduced profile from either green or red pulls. The final result looks at each category with the highest red or green score
indicating the starting point of the benchmarking process. Any negative or positive values scored over and above the benchmark level either increases or reduces the initial benchmark starting point.

The VALID assessment methodology is provided below and has been used in this instance to guide the probability of failure assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VITALITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V | Crown Density  
  Woundwood  
  Response growth |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANATOMY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A | Wood Properties  
  Architecture  
  H/D ratio |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOAD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| L | Exposure  
  Changes to the tree  
  Changes around the tree |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I | Failure Profile  
  Age of wounds  
  CODIT |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFECT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D | Soundwood  
  Decay – Extent  
  Feature or fault |
12.0 APPENDIX THREE - REFERENCES

**Australian Standards 4373 – 2007 “Pruning amenity trees”**.


**Schwarze, F.W.M.R. (2008) Diagnosis and Prognosis of The Development of Wood Decay in Urban Trees. ENSPEC, Rowville, Australia.**

**Ellison, M. (2014) Sudden Branch Drop. Australian Arbor Age**


13.0 APPENDIX FOUR – LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMER

This report only covers identifiable defects present at the time of inspection. The author accepts no responsibility and cannot be held liable for any structural defect or unforeseen event/situation that may occur after the time of inspection, unless clearly specified timescales are detailed within the report.

The author cannot guarantee trees contained within this report will be structurally sound under all circumstances, and cannot guarantee that the recommendations made will categorically result in the tree being made safe.

Unless specifically mentioned this report will only be concerned with above ground inspections, that will be undertaken visually from ground level. Trees are living organisms and as such cannot be classified as safe under any circumstances. The recommendations are made on the basis of what can be reasonably identified at the time of inspection therefore the author accepts no liability for any recommendations made.

Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible; however, the author can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
St Peters Child Care Centre & Preschool
Strategic Plan Update

**TARGET 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Results:</th>
<th>Achievement of meeting National Quality Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Indicator:</td>
<td>Rating for all 7 Quality areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets:</td>
<td>Achievement of meeting National Quality Standards in all seven areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The KRA actions and outcomes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; review Centres QIP (Quality Improvement Plan)</td>
<td>The Quality Improvement Plan is a 'living' document which is constantly reviewed, and is currently displayed next to quality area display boards to encourage Parents and Carers to participate in the process with ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIP to support a Meeting rating in the Rating and Assessment Report</td>
<td>Meeting has been reached in all 7 Quality Areas of the revised National Quality Framework on the 10th October 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement actions developed within the Centres Quality Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Continuously being reviewed to document outcomes achieved and progress made. Survey Monkey distributed bi-annually to obtain comments from Parents and Carers in relation to the Quality Areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TARGET 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Results:</th>
<th>High standard of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Indicator:</td>
<td>Annual customer survey rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets:</td>
<td>High standard reported in bi-annual customer survey The survey was distributed in May 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The KRA actions and outcomes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs to be user friendly and easy to read.</td>
<td>The program has been extended to include clear intentional teaching and to demonstrate how programming and learning is linked within the Centre. The Educational Leader has two (2) hours per week allocated to help rooms with any programming questions and or current research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for families to comment on programs, be involved in children's learning &amp; children's developmental progress.</td>
<td>End of Term reports and children’s folders were sent home to Parents and Carers in September 2018. The feedback received from Parents and Carers will help guide individual goals for the remainder of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction &amp; training to ensure current practices &amp; programs are current with new theories &amp; legislation.</td>
<td>The entire Centre participated in one (1) staff meetings in which information about theorists in early education were shared, and professional conversations on how we want next year to look event wise. Two (2) Educators are studying towards their Diploma in Children Service’s. Five (5) Team Leaders engaged in a leadership meeting. One (1) Educators participated in Warden training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TARGET 3
### Key Results:
High standard of child care facilities

### Performance Indicator:
Number of urgent maintenance requests

### Targets:
Nil urgent maintenance requests

The proposed KRA actions and outcomes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Budget to reflect funds required to maintain building and equipment. | • Budget for 2018-2019 was developed to ensure that the funds required continue to be available.  
  • No urgent maintenance requests are outstanding. |
| • Capital projects identified to ensure current facilities are maintained and upgrades of facilities implemented. | • No Capital works identified for 2018-2019 |

## TARGET 4
### Key Results:
Optimum customer service and satisfaction

### Performance Indicator:
Bi-ennial Customer Survey Results

### Targets:
High rating reported in biennial customer survey

The proposed KRA actions and outcomes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Annual customer satisfaction survey seeking parent feedback on how the Centre is meeting families’ needs and expectations. | • Survey results have indicated that there is a positive perception of the service and the quality of care provided by the Centre. Minimal improvements were requested and or identified.  
  • An Action Plan is being developed to address the issues raised as part of the survey that require attention |
| • Develop strategies & implement actions addressing feedback from customer satisfaction survey | • Issues raised as part of the Survey feedback is being addressed in conjunction with the continual review of the Quality Improvement Plan (Plan), to ensure that the Plan reflects changes and improvements to services and practices which aim to achieve positive outcomes for families. |
| • Email Parents about any changes to the service, for Parent input and invitations to join in advents | The following information has been emailed to Parents and Carers:  
  • Results of the National Quality Standard, Ratings and Assessment visit;  
  • the Centre Newsletter October 2018;  
  • updates in relation to staff movements;  
  • notice of upcoming special events;  
  • Information relating to 2019 enrolment’s. |
| • Provide opportunities for parent involvement through formal & informal events, fundraising, policy reviews & programming. | • On-going, parent reflection question to help guide service book, located in the Foyer  
  • Monday 8 October 2018, Come and Sing Show  
  • Wednesday 24 October 2018, Parent teacher night.  
  • Saturday 27 October 2018, Family Photo Day  
  • November 2018, Back Packs for SA kids  
  • Wednesday 12 December 2018, Preschool Graduation  
  • Wednesday 12 December 2018, Children’s and Families Christmas show. |
St Peters Child Care Centre & Pre-School
Strategic Plan Update

- Comparison of existing Centre fees & services offered with other nearby providers is reviewed & implement opportunities as appropriate.
- Fee and service comparison completed February 2018.

**TARGET 5**

**Key Results:**
Positive relationships with other educational organisations.

**Performance Indicator:**
Continuation of visits by educational organisations.

**Targets:**
Maintain positive relationship

The proposed KRA actions and outcomes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to implement annual benchmarking with other community based Child Care Services.</td>
<td>All rooms to visit another two (2) Centres to benchmark by March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to access professional support &amp; existing partnerships with Lady Gowrie Training &amp; Resources, Inclusive Directions, DECD.</td>
<td>Lady Gowrie is currently being accessed to assist in providing support for a child in the service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OTHER BUSINESS PLAN ACTIONS

**Develop a succession plan for all staff**

**Objective:** Continue to provide a stable staff environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develop staff training programs to work towards professional development goals and career advancement to support the succession plan.</td>
<td>• All training, which is currently being undertaken, reflects the Council’s EMPOWER Personal Development System to identify the skill required to support transition to the National Quality Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue to recruit highly qualified and experienced staff. Note the Centre currently has Three (3) Early Childhood Teachers, Ten (10) Diploma Qualified &amp; Five (5) Qualified Assistant Carers.</td>
<td>• A professional learning plan has been developed and training arranged to support the achievement of EMPOWER goals and the Centres Quality Improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A succession plan to be developed and will be reviewed annually.</td>
<td>• The Centre currently has two (2) Educators who are working towards Diploma level qualifications or above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developed and reflects the new staffing plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **OTHER BUSINESS**
   (Of an urgent nature only)

8. **NEXT MEETING**
   Monday 27 May 2019

9. **CLOSURE**