



Summary Table – 2020 Early Learning Service Complaints

The table attached summarises the complaints the Ministry of Education received about early learning services in 2020.

It includes a high-level summary of the complaints received, action undertaken by the Ministry and outcome of each complaint. The summary does not include every action the Ministry, a service, or another agency may have taken.

Where appropriate we have indicated where a service has subsequently closed.

Please note that we do not publish complaints summaries where there is an ongoing investigation by another agency into the events leading to the complaint as the information released in the complaints summary may prejudice the ongoing investigation.

Summary of Complaint

This is a summary of the complainant's concerns and alleged issues.

Summary of Action

This is a summary of the actions undertaken in response to the complaint.

Outcome of Investigation

We assess each complaint we receive to determine if further investigation or action is required. We work with complainants and early learning services to assess what action is required.

A complaint is upheld when, after investigation, it is found that regulated standards have not been met by the service or the Ministry considers improvement is required in a particular area related to the complaint. Complaints are upheld in part when some but not all aspects of the complaint are substantiated.

Sometimes a complaint is 'not upheld', but when investigated other issues are identified and appropriate actions are taken. The Ministry is obligated to follow up on all regulatory breaches identified during an investigation, as it is the responsibility of every licensed early learning service to comply with all regulated standards to obtain and maintain a licence.

Why some complaints are not investigated

After an initial assessment, some complaints do not require investigation. These complaints:

- were referred to the service's own complaints procedure,
- were referred to another agency,
- could not be investigated due to lack of information provided by the complainant or were withdrawn by the complainant and the nature of the complaint didn't indicate a risk to participating children, or
- didn't involve the Ministry, because the service or another agency could respond more appropriately.

Some complaints were not investigated because the complainant withdrew their concerns or did not want action to be taken. In some cases the complainant simply wanted their concerns noted, but action was not required (for example a parent who had removed their child from the service and their concerns were resolved by the early learning service).

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was concerned their child suffered sun burn and possibly heat stroke at the service. They also alleged a teacher had an inappropriate conversation with their child. The child was removed from the service.	The Ministry investigation identified the service had a number of sun shaded areas and a sun safety policy was in place. However, the service was required to complete a review of their sun safety policy and practice as sunblock had not been applied as regularly as noted in their policy. The allegation of an inappropriate conversation was not substantiated.	upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns about the service, including the service not being aware of their child's injury when at the service, an unsatisfactory response to the incident, a lack of supervision and high staff turnover. The child no longer attends the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not make a mandatory notification about the incident and did not conduct an adequate investigation into the incident. The complaints procedure also did not meet requirements. Due to previously identified issues not being rectified by the service, the licence was cancelled.	upheld
The complainant alleged there was an occasion where their child had not been changed for almost five hours and had severe nappy rash. The complainant had raised the concerns with the service and was unhappy with the response they received.	The Ministry reviewed relevant policies and documentation. There had been miscommunication between teachers and the complainant about the child's nappy change. Staff in the service had been supported to review the service's procedures. These were revised to ensure it was clear that teachers are responsible for all nappy changes. The Ministry supported the service to review the complaints process to ensure actions taken are clearly recorded.	upheld
The complainant had concerns about a lack of documentation of their child's learning at the service.	The Ministry was already engaged with the service regarding these matters and supported the service by putting SELO PLD in place to improve their performance.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about staffing levels, lack of communication with parents and increased illnesses at the service.	The Ministry supported the service in a review of their supervision plan to ensure all children were actively supervised and involved in meaningful interactions. The service also reviewed their illness policy with staff and provided training to ensure this is implemented consistently. A new leadership team and teachers have improved communication with parents and cleaning schedules were now consistently completed. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service's transport arrived at homes up to an hour early for drop off and then the children wait in the van for parents to arrive home.	The Ministry investigation identified breaches of regulatory requirements relating to transport, enrolment and attendance records. The service was issued a provisional licence and implemented required changes with support from the Ministry. They have since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant was concerned the service was not meeting the qualified teacher requirement.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not meet qualified teacher requirements. A provisional licence was issued and the service was able to return to full licence after meeting the requirements.	upheld
The complainant was concerned the water temperature in hand basins for children was not at a temperature which supported hygienic practices.	The Ministry contacted the service and the issue was rectified immediately. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant raised a number of concerns relating to governance, accident and incident recording, COVID-19 wage subsidy, adult:child ratios requirement not being met, poor support for children with additional needs and lack of non-contact time which led to limited curriculum planning.	The Ministry undertook a full licence assessment of the service due to this and a number of other complainants. As previously identified issues were not being rectified by the service, the licence was cancelled before the investigation into the complaints was concluded.	upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns, including no accident report provided for a recent injury, a lack of supervision and hot drinks in the play space. They had raised their concerns with the service and were dissatisfied with the response.	The Ministry reviewed the service's investigation of the complaint and the related policies. As a result of the complaint the service reviewed their complaints procedure and policy, made improvements to their injury policy, mitigated the risk of hot drinks, and conducted an evaluation of their environment and hazard management. The Ministry continued to monitor the service as they embedded changes to practices.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about the service's administration of 20 Hours ECE after their children changed session times, which resulted in additional fees.	The Ministry found the service was correctly administering the 20 Hours ECE, but the information provided to families was inconsistent. The service was advised to review their 20 Hours ECE and fee schedule to improve transparency for families.	upheld
The complainant raised several concerns, including a lack of supervision, adult:child ratios and issues with the management of children's aggressive behaviour. The concerns had been discussed with the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service had breached supervision and accident reporting requirements. The aggressive behaviour had been managed to the Ministry's satisfaction. The service was issued a provisional licence. They have since returned to a full licence.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant alleged their child suffered a dislocated elbow due to a teacher pulling their arm. The service had advised they did not witness how the child was injured but assumed they had fallen when running outside.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegation against the teacher. The service placed the teacher on non-contact during their investigation and informed Oranga Tamariki and NZ Police. The allegation was not substantiated. The Ministry supported the service to clarify and update policies and procedures for accidents, illnesses, incidents and complaints and child protection.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service exceeded the regulated maximum number of children in one home and that not all adults in that home had been police vetted.	The Ministry investigation substantiated the allegations. The service made changes to police vetting, induction and record keeping processes and reduced the number of children in the home.	upheld
The complainant had a range of concerns, including set up of the sleep room, lack of shade and storage and adult:child ratios.	The Ministry investigation, including an unannounced visit, found the service met adult:child ratios, provided sufficient sun protection outside and storage was adequate. Issues with the set-up of the sleep room were confirmed and immediately addressed.	upheld
The complainant was concerned the service used prams as sleep furniture.	The Ministry investigation confirmed prams were used. As a result of the investigation the service removed the prams and introduced appropriate strategies to help children sleep. The Ministry also identified unrelated issues that were consequently remedied by the service.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy the service could not explain their child's bruise and didn't provide an incident report. In addition, they were concerned about supervision as teachers did not know where their child was at pick up time.	The Ministry investigation found the service was in breach of a number of regulated requirements, including supervision and incident reporting. The service was issued a provisional licence and worked with the Ministry to ensure immediate and future compliance. They have since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant alleged not all information about a child was shared with those who are legally entitled to that information. The service allegedly was not responsive when these concerns were raised. A further concern about the same matter was received later from the same complainant.	The Ministry investigation found the service provided information to all parents and guardians. It was agreed the related policies and procedures would be reviewed and that staff understanding of them would be strengthened. The second complaint about the same matter was also investigated with the same outcome.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about how staff had communicated concerns about a child's wellbeing and engagement in the curriculum.	The Ministry requested an incident report from the service. Some improvements to processes were identified and the service was supported to review and strengthen these.	upheld
The complainant alleged that adult:child ratios were not always met and that there were not enough resources for the children at the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service maintained adult:child ratios across the licence. However, they were required to provide a greater variety of resources appropriate to the ages and development of the children attending. The service was issued with a provisional licence for this, and unrelated breaches identified during the investigation. The Ministry provided SELO PLD to support professional development for staff. The service has since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service falsified attendance records and that full educational records for their child were not made available to them.	The Ministry contacted the service who confirmed there were concerns about their attendance records. They had initiated actions to upskill all staff on legal requirements for enrolment and attendance records. They also worked with their IT provider to resolve the issue of records being available to the complainant. The Ministry supported the service to complete these changes.	upheld
The complainant was concerned their child had been sunburnt at the service. There was no incident report completed as the service had not noticed and their response to the complainant's concerns had been unsatisfactory. The complainant also alleged the service sent their child home sick unnecessarily on multiple occasions.	The Ministry investigation found no clear evidence the child was sunburnt whilst attending the service but required the service to update their injury, illness and incident procedures and sun protection policy. The Ministry did not identify any concerning patterns in the service's requests for the child to be taken home early due to sickness.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service bullied teachers, which resulted in high staff turnover. They were also concerned about a lack of investment in curriculum resources.	The Ministry investigation found that staff turn-over had been reasonable and no breaches of regulatory requirements were identified. However, the Ministry required the service to include a clear process for staff to follow in their complaints process. SELO PLD was put in place to strengthen governance and management areas, including HR, managing complaints and budgeting.	upheld
The complainant alleged staff had been verbally abused for taking sick leave. They also alleged the premises was in disrepair and had mould growing, which had led to an accident.	The Ministry undertook a full licence assessment and found the premises and facilities did not meet regulated requirements. The concerns about treatment of staff were not substantiated. A provisional licence was issued for these and unrelated breaches. The service was provided SELO PLD support to improve and maintain practice and was able to return to a full licence.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant had concerns about supervision, lack of response to complaints, lack of communication and delay in reporting to Oranga Tamariki. These concerns related to the service's incident management of inappropriate play between children.	The Ministry investigation found the service in breach of child protection, incident management, hazard identification, parental involvement and behaviour management requirements. A provisional licence was issued to the service. The Ministry provided ongoing monitoring and support and the service has since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant alleged that school-aged children were present at the service unsupervised during the school holidays.	The Ministry investigation confirmed that staff's school-age children were, at times, in the service's staff room unsupervised. The Ministry required the service to cease the practice and advised them to amend their staff's children policy accordingly.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service falsified records for the COVID-19 wage subsidy. They were also concerned about the quality of food served to children.	The Ministry investigated and found the service met regulated requirements in relation to the complaint. An audit also found no concerns. An unrelated breach identified during the investigation was quickly addressed by the service.	upheld
The complainant alleged ill-treatment of children, restricting access to toilets and bullying of staff by a teacher at the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service failed to conduct a formal investigation into the complaint. A provisional licence was issued related to this, restricting independent access to toilets and a number of breaches not related to the complaint. The service consequently conducted a full investigation to the Ministry's satisfaction, which did not substantiate the allegations of ill-treatment and bullying. The service has since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant alleged there were insufficient qualified teachers at the service and that safety checking was not completed for unqualified staff.	The Ministry conducted an investigation and identified the service was in breach of safety checking requirements. The allegation of insufficient qualified teachers was not substantiated. The licence was suspended and they returned to a full licence when evidence of compliance was received. SELO PLD was provided.	upheld
The complainant was concerned their child had broken their foot at the service who did not notice the injury or explain how it happened. The child advised they had hurt themselves on the slide.	The Ministry investigation found the service had failed to assess the child sufficiently when they complained of pain shortly before pickup. No issues with the slide or supervision were identified. However, the supervision policy required an amendment to better suit the service's size. The service reviewed their accident and incident policy to improve practice.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that on several occasions there was no qualified teacher present at the end of day.	The Ministry investigation found the service was in breach of qualified teacher requirements and a provisional licence was issued. After meeting qualified teacher requirements, the service returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service was falsifying records of enrolment, attendance and children's learning. They were also concerned about the curriculum and assessment provided and that health and safety checks of homes were not completed.	The Ministry visited the service and identified a range of non-compliances. The licence was suspended and subsequently cancelled when the service was unable to demonstrate compliance.	upheld
The complainant was concerned the service was not meeting the qualified teacher requirement.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not meet qualified teacher requirements. A provisional licence was issued and the service was able to return to a full licence after meeting the requirements.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service did not provide details about their child's injury when they fell off play equipment and asked for a blank incident form to be signed. The child required surgery.	The Ministry investigation identified steps to seek immediate medical assistance were not taken and there was no procedure for accidents. The play equipment did not meet safety requirements. The service was issued a provisional licence and received SELO PLD to embed quality practices, processes and procedures. WorkSafe were notified of the accident. The service has since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about a lack of accident documentation, teacher's interaction with their child and insufficient adult:child ratio on an excursion.	The service's internal review, in response to the complaint, confirmed the issues. The service reviewed their relevant policies and procedures and implemented supports for the teacher to raise their practice. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's response to the issues identified.	upheld
Complainant had multiple concerns about a service, including their child being left in wet clothing, poor teacher behaviour, toilet training and behaviour management practices.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate allegations of leaving the child in wet clothing and found the service had reviewed and improved policies and practices on managing the child's behaviour. No further action was required.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was concerned about a lack of supervision and unsecure premises when a child left the premises unattended. The child was returned to the service by a member of the public immediately and unharmed.	The Ministry investigation found the premises were secure, but the service had not supervised children effectively or met qualified teacher ratios at the time of the incident. The service subsequently addressed the risk by installing an extra gate with large signage for gate safety, changing their supervision plan for pick up time and reviewing relevant policies such as supervision and qualified teacher requirements to ensure compliant practice. The Ministry was satisfied with the actions taken.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that information from the service regarding 20 hours ECE and fees was unclear.	The Ministry investigation upheld the complaint and required the service to make changes to improve the clarity.	upheld
The complainant was concerned their fully bottle-fed child was given crackers at the service and alleged that clothing was cut off one of their children.	The Ministry investigation upheld both complaints. The service subsequently improved their practice and reviewed their processes regarding provision of food and drink as well as responding to parent aspirations for children.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy with the service's response to their previous complaints about their child's photo being on social media, that another child brought a camera to the service and that an injury sustained at the service was not managed properly.	The Ministry investigation confirmed the service published photos of the child without consent, but no video was taken by the child with the camera. The service was found to have responded appropriately to the child's injury. The service updated their privacy policy and included privacy training induction for staff. They also updated their complaints policy and procedures to clarify the process for parents. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with the service's management of their child's injury, which required surgery.	The service had mitigated fall risks by use of an impact absorbent mat and notified WorkSafe of the injury. As a result of the Ministry investigation into the service's incident records and procedures the service was required to improve their accident reporting practice.	upheld
The complainant alleged a teacher inappropriately immobilised their child. They were also concerned about the transition process into the service.	The Ministry investigation substantiated the allegation and found the service had not stood down the teacher during their internal investigation. Staff at the service received professional development regarding restraint and the service improved their processes and practices around enrolment and transitioning into the service.	upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns, including accidents and incidents not being reported, a lack of supervision and an unsatisfactory response from the service when concerns were raised.	The Ministry investigation found the service had conducted an accident analysis and made improvements to their reporting of accidents to parents. The Ministry did not identify issues with supervision. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant was concerned children had repeatedly been hurt by other children, their communication plan was not met by the service and incidents may not be reported accurately to parents.	The service acknowledged shortcomings in meeting the communications plan. The Ministry investigation found the service met incident reporting requirements. The service received support, including SELO PLD, to improve implementation of positive guidance curriculum.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about the adult:child ratios in specific rooms of the service. When raised with the service, the service stated that ratios are applied centre wide.	The Ministry investigation, which included an unannounced visit, found the service had breached adult:child ratios requirements. A condition limiting the number of children in each defined space was added to the service's licence.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about adult:child ratios, staff on site not having sufficient qualifications, that the emergency exit gate was blocked, gaps in the fence and accident forms not completed.	The Ministry investigation found the fence met requirements but need to be added to the daily hazard checks. Accident records were found to be compliant. The Ministry required the service to remove objects blocking the emergency gate and to display staff qualifications.	upheld
The complainant was concerned the service had not notified Oranga Tamariki of an incident of sexualised play between children and that they had not been given a report on the day of the incident.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of breaches related to behaviour management and incident reporting. The service was issued a provisional licence. The Ministry provided ongoing monitoring and support and the service has since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy the service had not informed them of an injury their child had sustained at the service, which required hospitalisation overnight. They also alleged the child previously broke their arm and this had not been picked up by the service.	The complainant notified Oranga Tamariki and the Ministry made a notification to NZ Police. No notification to WorkSafe was made. The Ministry investigation found the service had not identified the injury and had, therefore, not been able to report this to the complainant. The service met adult:child ratios and supervision requirements but reviewed their hazard and accident management processes and provided further training on accidents and incidents to staff. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant was dissatisfied with administrative issues related to the service not charging fees during COVID-19 lockdown. The complainant felt the service's communication was disrespectful.	The Ministry required the service to review their complaints policy to ensure they work more collaboratively with parents. The service completed an emergent evaluation. The fees were fully reimbursed to the complainant.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant alleged the service altered records to maximise funding. This included allegations of altering attendance records and falsifying staff records to cover up breaches of adult:child ratios.	The Ministry investigation included an unannounced visit and review of records held at the service. Breaches of adult:child ratios were found and the service was able to demonstrate this had been addressed to the Ministry's satisfaction. An audit confirmed the service was not compliant with funding rules and an over-claim was recovered by the Ministry.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy with the service's supervision, accident management and complaints procedure. This followed an incident where staff were unaware of how a child received a scratch on their face. The complainant was not happy with the service's response to the complaint about this and their delay in response.	The Ministry investigation found the service met regulated requirements for supervision and accident management. The service acknowledged there was a delay in reporting back to the complainant regarding their concerns. An amendment was made to their processes to ensure cover for staff absences. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant was concerned the service had excluded their child due to behavioural concerns. The complainant had not been advised of these or been consulted when determining teaching strategies.	The Ministry investigation identified issues with record keeping, communication with parents and involving parents in decision making. The service had not sought advice from Learning Support prior to excluding the child. The Ministry supported the service to review and revise documentation. SELO PLD was provided to strengthen teacher practice regarding social and emotional competence.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about the number of head injuries a child had sustained. A supervision plan had been agreed between the complainant and the service, yet injuries still occurred.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not review the accident well, their daily hazard check did not meet requirements and there was equipment unsuitable for the age of the children. The service reviewed these areas, improved practices and renovated the outdoor area.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service had insufficient adult:child ratios, staff records were not kept correctly and staff were paid late.	The Ministry investigation found the service in breach of minimum qualified staff requirements. The maximum number of children the service was licensed for was reduced to ensure this requirement was met.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with the service's response to bullying behaviour of children and lack of response to concerns.	As a result of both the Ministry and the service's own investigation, the behaviour management policy and procedures and the complaints process were improved.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about safety of play equipment and supervision at the service. This followed an incident where two children were allegedly hurt outside when there was no teacher supervising. The complainant had complained to the service, but this had not been addressed to their satisfaction.	The service removed the equipment and revised their hazard checking process and supervision plan with support from the Ministry. No further action was required.	upheld
Complainant was concerned about record keeping, school children attending during school holidays and unenrolled children attending.	The Ministry investigation confirmed that children enrolled in school had attended during holidays and there were irregularities with records and enrolments. The service confirmed school aged children will no longer attend. An audit found no anomalies.	upheld
Complainant was concerned with the service's management of their child's toilet training, communication and behaviour management.	The Ministry's investigation found no concerns related to health and safety, but the service did not meet behaviour management standards. The service was able to address the breaches to the Ministry's satisfaction.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about children hurting other children, inadequate supervision, lack of, and condition of, resources for children and insufficient communication with parents regarding their children and the service's operation.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not provide evidence of planning curriculum for social competence and the condition of resources was poor. The service addressed the identified breaches to the Ministry's satisfaction.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about water pooling in the under two outside area after heavy rain.	The Ministry investigation found the service was appropriately mitigating the potential hazard while working on a more permanent solution.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service excluded their child with additional learning needs when they turned five years old and that teachers had not sufficiently engaged the child in activities.	The Ministry investigation found that, while it was evident the child had been included in the programme and was an active participant in the group, the service needed to strengthen their teaching practice for children with additional learning needs. SELO PLD was provided for that purpose. The allegation of exclusion was found to be a result of miscommunication between learning support and teachers.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about a lack of safety precautions, potentially unsafe toys and accidents involving children. These issues had been raised with the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not meet accident reporting requirements and recommended a review of the toys in question. The service strengthened their supervision plan, chose to remove the toys and took additional safety precautions for the complainant's children. No further action was required.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was concerned about the service's management of a child's concerning behaviour and the lack of response from the service when concerns were raised.	The Ministry investigation found the service had not followed their behaviour guidance procedures. Learning Support was put in place for the child and the service worked with the complainant to ensure the wellbeing of their child. The service reviewed their child protection, communication, involvement and complaints and positive guidance policies. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant was concerned there had been occasions during COVID-19 Alert Level 3 when no first aider had been present at the service. The complainant also indicated that no plan had been developed to support reopening under Alert Level 3.	The Ministry clarified requirements with the service who acknowledged that, due to a misunderstanding there had been at least one occasion where no first aider was on site. The service provided documentation of their plan for reopening under Alert Level 3.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about the service's fee structure, especially regarding 20 Hours ECE and charging for public holidays.	The Ministry investigation led to the service reviewing fee structures and improving parent information. The Ministry provided advice on enrolment agreement forms and compliance with funding rules. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy with how the service had managed an accident where their child had hit their head. They were also concerned that nappy rash cream had not been applied, that a teacher left the service at short notice and the outdoor equipment may not be safe.	The Ministry investigation found the service had not followed appropriate processes to make the decision not to call an ambulance following the child's accident. No breaches were identified in relation to the remaining concerns. The service was issued a provisional licence for accident management and other unrelated breaches. They have since been able to return to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about the service's management of their child's accident at the service.	The Ministry investigation found a breach of accident recording requirements as well as several breaches not related to the complaint. As a result, the service was issued with a provisional licence. SELO PLD was provided to support the service and they were able to return to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant was concerned the service didn't record and report an injury to their child. They also alleged a staff member responded aggressively when they raised the issue with the service.	The Ministry conducted a full licensing review and found a significant number of breaches, including accident recording and a lack of policies and processes to investigate the conduct of staff. The service was issued a provisional licence and received SELO PLD support. The staff member resigned from the service and the child no longer attends the service. The service has returned to a full licence.	upheld
Complainant alleged that a homebased service was operating homes outside of the region they were licenced for.	Based on the limited information that the complainant was able to provide the Ministry identified three service providers. The Ministry ensured that all homes outside of the licenced region were removed from the licences. A subsequent assessment of the services identified a number of non-compliances leading to a total of eight licences being suspended across the three service providers. Three licences were consequently cancelled and five have been able to reopen under provisional licences.	upheld
The complainant was concerned they had not been advised that a relief teacher worked at the service and were unhappy that the teacher played tickling games with their child. They were also concerned about an incident where their child had been drawn on with a marker on their underwear and legs.	The Ministry investigation found the service's supervision was insufficient as they had not witnessed the incident of the child being drawn on. The investigation also found communication to parents about teaching staff on roster was insufficient. The service rectified both issues to the Ministry's satisfaction.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with a lack of notice for a fee increase, which led to them receiving a large, unexpected invoice.	The Ministry contacted the service who acknowledged there was no notice of a fee increase provided. The service was able to resolve the issue with the complainant. No further action required.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with the number of biting incidents and lack of appropriate teaching strategies at the service. They had raised the concerns with the service and were unhappy with their response.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not manage children's behaviour or support their social competency adequately. The service was supported by Learning Support to make improvements. The complainant withdrew their child from the service.	upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns, regarding adult:child ratios not being met, mixing of under twos and over twos, a lack of food for children, a lack of new resources for children and lack of communication and information to teachers from management.	The Ministry investigation found adult:child ratios were not always met, there were a lack of resources and curriculum planning and food provision did not meet children's needs leading to behavioural issues. The service was issued a provisional licence and was supported by the Ministry to address the non-compliances. The service has since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant had concerns about their child being repeatedly hurt by another child.	The Ministry investigation found the service had made a referral for Learning Support for the child hurting the other and this had been put in place. The service also implemented behaviour management strategies and sought PLD support.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant had a number of concerns, including the standard of care, unexplained injuries, supervision and cleanliness at the service. They alleged their child was verbally abused at the service based on their observation of the child's behaviour.	The Ministry investigation found the service had breached adult:child ratio requirements during meal preparation, the food was not of good nutritional value and children were not always supervised while eating. These issues were immediately rectified by the service and they also provided mentoring and ongoing support to staff. The allegation of verbal abuse was not substantiated.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy their child suffered a broken elbow when they fell from a climbing box and that they had not been notified of the incident.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not seek immediate medical assistance following the accident and did not communicate sufficiently with the parents. The Ministry supported the service to improve accident management practice.	upheld
The complainant alleged they witnessed ill-treatment of children at the service by a teacher. They also had concerns about the service's nappy changing procedure and were unhappy with the service's response to their complaints.	The service stood down the teacher during their investigation. The allegation of ill-treatment was substantiated. A mandatory report to the Teaching Council was made and the teacher resigned. The Ministry found the service had not followed their nappy changing policies and procedures. These were reviewed by the service to strengthen practice. The complaint procedures met regulated requirements.	upheld
The complainant alleged a teacher rough handled a child.	The Ministry investigation found the service had failed to identify the incident as ill-treatment of a child and required the service to make a notification to the Teaching Council. The service was able to address these, and other breaches identified during the investigation, to the Ministry's satisfaction.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service did not protect children effectively from the sun and that bi-cultural practices were not reflected, respected or encouraged in the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service's sun protection measures and bicultural practice met regulated requirements. However, the Ministry recommended the service provide more areas of shade, practice their sun smart policy and continue to build on their culturally responsive practices.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that an injury to a child at the service was not noticed by staff and no incident report was provided. They were also concerned with behaviour management with a number of child hurts child incidents. They were dissatisfied with the response from the service to their concerns.	The Ministry required the service to revise their complaints procedure and procedures for notification of serious incidents and accidents. This was implemented to the Ministry's satisfaction. The service received SELO PLD to support positive guidance.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that two staff members were smoking while on an excursion and responsible for children.	The Ministry contacted the service who undertook an investigation and took disciplinary action against the staff members. The service also reviewed their related policies.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with how the service managed an injury to their child's finger, which required hospitalisation. In particular, they were concerned no ambulance was called, the accident report lacked detail and the risk of the cupboard doors causing the injury was not mitigated.	The Ministry conducted an unannounced visit and reviewed policies and procedures. The investigation found the service had not followed its hazard procedures, did not seek immediate medical assistance, did not report the accident to WorkSafe and that the accident record was incomplete. A provisional licence was issued and SELO PLD was provided to the service. The full licence was returned when all breaches had been resolved.	upheld
The complainant was concerned parents were no longer able to enter the service to pick up their children and that the service had made changes to processes without consulting parents.	The service clarified parents were still able to enter the service and provided evidence of communication with families. The Ministry required the service to review how parental input is gathered, recorded and informs change. The service was also required to revise their complaints procedure to cover complaints about service management and team leaders.	upheld
The complainant was concerned teachers at the service did not effectively manage the behaviour of a child who was aggressive towards other children. They also alleged that incidents are not recorded appropriately. The service did not address the concerns to the complainant's satisfaction.	The Ministry investigation found the service's complaints and accident and injury policies did not meet requirements. The service was also required to conduct a self-review of their positive behaviour and social competence policy. The service addressed the breaches to the Ministry's satisfaction.	upheld
The complainant alleged that a teacher at the service had provide drugs to another adult outside of the service. They were unhappy with the service's management of the allegation.	The Ministry investigation found the service had followed appropriate procedures when investigating the allegation. The teacher's actions were found to be serious misconduct and the service notified NZ Police and the Teaching Council. They also sought advice from an employment lawyer to strengthen employment contracts. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about the clarity of the service's updated fee schedule, particularly in regard to 20 hours ECE.	The Ministry reviewed the service's fee information and required the service to make changes to improve clarity of information provided to parents.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant outlined concerns relating to the service's governance, management and administration. This included lack of leadership, no staff appraisals or support for teacher registration and high staff turnover. They were also concerned about the daily rostering, under twos being present in the over twos space and inappropriate sleep provision.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the concerns about adult:child ratios or staffing issues. Issues with the set-up of the sleep space were addressed immediately. The service was supported to address issues with their safety checking and to strengthen their appraisal procedure. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant raised concerns that school-aged children were present at the service during the school holidays. They also had privacy concerns relating to pictures of children.	The Ministry investigation found school-aged children were attending for short periods of time and the service was required to cease this. The service's privacy policies and processes were found to be compliant.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with the service's enrolment processes when parenting agreements are in place.	The Ministry investigated the service's enrolment procedures and found they did not meet the funding rules. The service was issued a provisional licence due to these and a number of unrelated breaches and has since been returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service had not taken care of their child's injury hygienically and provided inadequate care for the child when they became unwell at the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service had failed to seek immediate medical attention when the child became sick. The service was already on a provisional licence due to breaches of accident and injury management requirements. The service was able to improve processes and practice and has since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that supervision had been insufficient when their child suffered burns on their hands while using a glue gun at the service.	The Ministry required the service to review the incident and their processes around use of glue guns and provision of first aid for burns. The Ministry was satisfied appropriate precautions were put in place by the service.	upheld
The complainant alleged a teacher's under two-year-old attended the service though the service was not licenced for under-twos. They also alleged a staff member yelled at a child and that staff qualifications displayed at the service included a teacher who had left.	The Ministry investigation found the service had breached its licence by allowing an under-two to attend, that incorrect information was displayed for parents and staff did not always provide positive behaviour strategies. The service was placed on a provisional licence with a short compliance timeframe for these and a number of unrelated breaches. They have since been able to return to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant alleged inappropriate toilet training strategies were used. They also raised concerns about hygiene of sleep surfaces.	The Ministry investigation found inappropriate nappy changing practices were used and hygiene of sleep surfaces needed to be improved. Oranga Tamariki were notified by the Ministry. These, and additional breaches not related to the complaint, led to the service being issued a provisional licence. They have since been able to return to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy with the lack of information the service shared about an incident involving their child. The service cited privacy concerns as the reason for not disclosing details of the incident.	The Ministry investigation into the complaint and incident led to the service being issued a provisional licence for a number of breaches not related to the complaint. Regarding the complaint, the Ministry required the service to ensure incident reports and information relating to their child are made available to parents. The service has since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service altered records to maximise funding. This included allegations of altering attendance records and falsifying staff records to cover breaches of adult:child ratios.	The Ministry investigation included an unannounced visit and review of records held at the service. Breaches of adult:child ratios were found and the service was able to demonstrate this had been addressed to the Ministry's satisfaction. An audit confirmed the service was not compliant with funding rules and an over-claim was recovered by the Ministry.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that while the service had notified parents no fees would be charged during COVID-19 lockdown, they had not refunded an automatic payment for this period.	The Ministry contacted the service and agreement was reached that the over-payment would be refunded. The complainant notified the Ministry that this had been actioned.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about teachers' lack of knowledge of te reo Māori, adult:child ratios and having no sun sail.	The Ministry investigation found the service complied with adult:child ratios. The service installed shade sails in response to the complaint and acknowledged a capability gap regarding bicultural practice. The service sourced PLD to address this.	upheld
The complainant alleged a child's enrolment was terminated when they reduced the enrolled hours and the service was unprofessional when providing the letter of termination. They also alleged they were charged a fee for 20 hours ECE they attested to.	The Ministry investigation found the termination of enrolment was in line with the service's policies but confirmed breaches related to parent's access to information and 20 Hours ECE funding rules. The Ministry required the service to make changes to ensure all families receive their full entitlement.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was concerned the service required parents to provide lunch boxes during COVID-19 Alert Level 2 due to the Ministry's requirements and would not reimburse fees for food provision in full.	The Ministry clarified COVID-19 Alert Level 2 guidance with the service. The service corrected their communication to parents regarding the introduction of lunchboxes and reimbursed the fees for food provision in full.	upheld
The complainant alleged there was often no qualified teacher present at the beginning and end of days.	The Ministry investigation found the service was in breach of qualified teacher requirements. A provisional licence was issued and returned to a full licence after the service met requirements.	upheld
The complainant alleged workplace bullying and poor employment practices as well as a lack of mentoring.	The Ministry investigation found the service had since implemented satisfactory processes after a period of change. The complainant was referred to the Teaching Council regarding concerns about teacher mentoring.	upheld
The complainant was concerned their child returned from the service with an unexplained injury. They were unhappy with the response from the service when they raised their concern.	The Ministry investigation found the injury had likely occurred during a lapse of supervision at the service. The Ministry provided support and advice to the service to strengthen practice and processes.	upheld
The complainant was concerned their child received unexplained injuries at the service. They alleged the service did not record incidents and was also concerned with the lack of communication following the injury.	The Ministry investigation identified concerns relating to supervision practice. The service provided evidence these concerns were immediately resolved.	upheld
The complainant was concerned their child's image was used on the service's website without parental consent.	The Ministry investigated and, as a result, the service revised their privacy policy to protect the choice of parents not to have children's photos published.	upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns about the service, including that management were unresponsive to parent complaints, adult:child ratios, sleep and accident procedures, a lack of teacher engagement with parents and a lack of curriculum and learning stories for children.	The Ministry investigation found the service met complaints procedure, adult:child ratios, accident management and sleep procedure requirements. However, the service took measures to strengthen these areas. The Ministry upheld the complaint regarding curriculum, assessment and engaging with parents. The service took steps to immediately improve curriculum and parent engagement and the Ministry continued to monitor their progress.	upheld
The complainant alleged a home-based service was working with an educator who had previously been removed by another provider. They alleged that not all adults in the home had been police vetted and it was unsafe for children.	The Ministry investigation substantiated the allegations. The educator was removed from the network and the service revised their procedures and updated staff to ensure future compliance.	upheld
Complainant was concerned that a child was able to leave the service unattended by an adult.	As a result of the Ministry investigation, the service improved their supervision plan, ensured reception was always attended and installed gates in all rooms. The Ministry was satisfied with the mitigations and no further action was required.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service had forged teacher and parent signatures in their accident and illness register.	The Ministry conducted an unannounced visit and found accident and illness records were sometimes signed by persons other than children's parents or guardians. As a result of the investigation into this and other complaints, the service's licence was reclassified as provisional. The service received SELO PLD support and was able to return to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with the service's hygiene practices due to how staff supported a child's toileting needs. The child no longer attends the service.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the complaint. The Ministry recommended the service review their nappy changing policy and undertake an emergent evaluation on how they manage requests from parents, including reporting back to parents on progress on agreed actions.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy with the response from the service about how a cake made with alcohol was served to children and how they will ensure this will not happen again.	The Ministry investigated and was satisfied the service reviewed their healthy food and food preparation policies to mitigate this risk. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy with the service's response to their complaints, especially a recent concern regarding fees.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not provide a formal written response to the complaint. The service rectified this immediately. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns related to health and safety and hygiene at the service. They alleged the physical environment was unclean and unhygienic, the outdoor area was untidy and there were no chairs or resources available. They were also concerned there was only one qualified teacher.	The Ministry investigation found the service had insufficient qualified staff for the licence numbers and reduced the licence numbers and hours of operation. The Ministry upheld the complaint that the physical environment was untidy and noted incorrect daily hazard checks. These issues were quickly mitigated by the service. No issue with resources were identified.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant alleged the service did not meet the minimum requirements of qualified teachers and was relying on first year teachers and relievers.	The Ministry investigation confirmed that the service did not have the minimum ratio of qualified teaching staff. An audit confirmed that unqualified staff had been counted as qualified for funding purposes. The service was issued a provisional licence and has since been able to return to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that their child was excluded from the service for three days due to challenging behaviour. The complainant does not agree the child's behaviour was challenging.	The Ministry investigation found the service met regulatory requirements. As a result of the investigation, Learning Support provided support to the child, parent and teaching team to develop strategies to support the child's social competence. A teacher aide was provided for a limited time to release a teacher to work directly with the child.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service recorded teachers and children no longer at the service for their funding claim. They also alleged a lack of mentoring for new teachers and that sleep policies had not been agreed with parents.	The Ministry investigation found the sleep policies had been developed in consultation with parents but upheld the complaint relating to claiming children's attendance and identified a lack of teacher appraisal. This were addressed by the service to the Ministry's satisfaction. A funding audit confirmed an overclaim for the period, which was recovered.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with the premises and facilities and supervision at the service because a child left the premises unattended and on another occasion was separated from the group on an excursion.	The Ministry investigation confirmed there were sufficient adult:child ratios and supervision in place at the service and on the excursion. The latter also had an extensive risk management plan. The service made improvements to the premises to prevent children from leaving unattended.	upheld
Complainant was concerned with the safety of children around pools at the service.	The service provider investigated the home in question. Safety concerns were found and immediately mitigated to the Ministry's satisfaction. The service provider also strengthened their processes and practices.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that a beehive on the service's property constituted an uncontrolled risk. They were unable to resolve their concerns with the service due to the service allegedly not engaging with them.	The Ministry investigation confirmed the beehive could not be accessed by children. The Ministry required the service to review related risks and ensure parents are aware of these at enrolment. The service was also required to confirm with health authorities they are satisfied with the actions taken by the service.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service falsified records of children's attendance and the staff hour count.	The Ministry investigation found the service had not applied funding rules correctly. This was rectified by the service with support from the Ministry.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy their child had been given a known allergen by the service on multiple occasions. The child required medical care to manage their allergic reactions. The complainant was dissatisfied with the service's response to their complaint.	The Ministry investigation identified gaps in the service's procedures related to incident reporting, management of child health needs, food provision and complaints management. The Ministry supported the service to review and revise all procedures to meet regulatory standards.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service did not follow Ministry of Health requirements and the Ministry's guidance for operating under COVID-19 Alert Level 3.	The Ministry investigation found the service's processes and practices compliant and reminded the service to ensure these are followed in practise throughout Alert Level 3.	upheld
The complainant was concerned their child had a bump on their forehead that could not be explained by the service. They also alleged that first aid was not administered and that no incident form was provided.	The Ministry investigation found that the layout and design of the premises did not support effective supervision, which may have contributed to the injury not being witnessed by teachers. The service made changes to the set-up of the outdoor area and improved their supervision plan. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns, including high staff turnover, inexperienced teaching staff, unsuitable food, and attendance sheets that potentially breached privacy.	The Ministry investigation found the service was actively managing high staff turnover and the food provided was suitable. The Ministry was satisfied with the changes the service made to their attendance sheets. They also addressed a number of unrelated breaches to the Ministry's satisfaction. The service received SELO PLD to build their teacher's professional practice and licence numbers were reduced to match current staff levels.	upheld
The complainant alleged there were no qualified teachers present at the service.	The Ministry investigation found an insufficient number of qualified teachers were employed. The service remedied this within two days. During the Ministry visit other concerns were identified, which resulted in a provisional licence. The service has since returned to a full licence.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was dissatisfied with the investigation into an incident involving their child. They were also concerned about inadequate adult:child ratios, the layout of the service not supporting effective supervision, the service not following their policies and lacking knowledge about the Privacy Act. The complainant alleged their child's enrolment had been cancelled due to their complaint.	As a result of the Ministry's investigation the service was required to review and update their incident management practices. There were no non-compliances found relating to all other aspects of the complaint.	upheld
The complainant was concerned the service did not notice and provide documentation about an injury around their child's genitalia. A second concern about failure to apply medication was also raised. The complainant notified Oranga Tamariki.	The Oranga Tamariki investigation concluded that the injury was accidental. The Ministry assessed the service's response to the situation and provided guidance to strengthen their policy and practice related to incident reporting, parent communication and medication administration. SELO PLD was initiated to support the leadership capability of the service's management.	upheld
The complainant alleged their child had been dropped off at the neighbour's home by the service and their teenage sibling was allowed to pick up the child on one occasion.	The Ministry investigation found the child was not dropped off at the neighbour's home and the complainant had asked for the teenage sibling to be allowed to pick up the child. The service strengthened their processes and practice around late pick-ups and authority to pick children up to the Ministry's satisfaction.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy with the service's evacuation processes after a child was able to return to the building during an evacuation.	The Ministry investigation confirmed that a child had re-entered the service during the evacuation but was found and taken outside by a teacher. The child had been in no danger. The service made improvements to their emergency procedures based on the learning from the incident. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant raised several concerns, including poor curriculum, a lack of resources which caused behaviour issues as well as safety issues with the premises and adult:child ratios not being met. The complainant alleged children were being yelled at, physical restraint was used and food was withheld from children.	The Ministry investigation into this and a similar complaint found numerous breaches, including regarding accident recording, behaviour management and employment practice. The service was issued a provisional licence and the Ministry supported a new team at the service to meet regulatory requirements. The service has since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant alleged food had been withheld from their child as a behaviour management strategy and that they had been left in wet pants for a long period of time while in time out.	The Ministry investigation did not confirm food was withheld but found the child had been left in wet pants for a substantive period. Non-compliances were identified and the service rectified these to the Ministry's satisfaction. The service received SELO PLD to strengthen positive guidance practices.	upheld
The complainant alleged adult:child ratios were not met, staff were not given adequate breaks and non-contact time, and that children had left the group on an excursion.	The Ministry investigation found the service had failed to adequately identify risks on the excursion and staff had not followed the service's behaviour guidance strategies. The service had already implemented changes to address this. No breaches of regulated requirements were found relating the other aspects of the complaint.	upheld
The complainant had concerns about a child's frequent accidents, a lack of information in their portfolio, no water offered to the child, and a lack of information about food, sleep and nappy changes.	The Ministry investigation found no concerning trends with accidents and information provided to parents met requirements. The service acknowledged the child's portfolio was unsatisfactory but other portfolios checked by the Ministry met requirements.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that a child had left the service unattended, was found by NZ Police and the service only noticed the child missing when a teacher saw them outside with NZ Police.	The Ministry investigation found the service had not followed their relevant processes, did not meet qualified teacher requirements and the fence had gaps. The service's licence was suspended while immediate concerns were addressed. SELO PLD was provided to support the service. The service was then issued a provisional licence while rectifying remaining breaches and have since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns about supervision, and behaviour management as their child had left the premises unattended. They were also concerned with the service's lack of communication with them as a separated parent.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches of regulatory requirements. However, the child had left the premises unattended. The service worked with Learning Support to update the child's safety plan to mitigate the risk.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about measures the service had taken in response to COVID-19.	The Ministry investigation found the measures were not in line with Ministry of Health requirements and the service had not consulted parents appropriately. The service made changes to their processes and resolved the issues with the complainant. No further action was required.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant alleged ill treatment of children by teachers, lack of supervision and inappropriate sharing of staffing information.	The Ministry required the service to investigate the complaint and issued a provisional licence while the investigation was undertaken. The service stood down the affected teachers during their investigation and notified NZ Police, Oranga Tamariki and the Teaching Council. The allegations of ill-treatment were not substantiated. The supervision and privacy aspects of the complaint were substantiated, and this was addressed by the service to the Ministry's satisfaction.	upheld
The complainant alleged a child had access to cleaning products at the service. They also raised a large number of other concerns ranging from health and safety to curriculum and employment practices and school-aged children attending the service.	The Ministry investigation found a large number of breaches, including access to cleaning products and many others relating to the complaint. The service was issued a provisional licence. This was consequently cancelled when they were unable to demonstrate compliance.	upheld
The complainant alleged their child was escorted to the neighbouring ECE premise by the family member of another child rather than a teacher.	The Ministry investigation substantiated the complaint as the service did not ensure children only left the premises with an authorised person. The service strengthened policies and processes for movement of children between the two premises.	upheld
The complainant alleged the curriculum provision at the service did not meet requirements.	The Ministry investigation confirmed curriculum requirements relating to cultural responsiveness were not met and identified unrelated breaches. The service decided to close and the licence was cancelled.	upheld
The complainant had numerous concerns including lack of safety checking of staff, the service not meeting adult:child ratios, lack of resources for children, insufficient cleaning and hazards not being addressed.	The Ministry investigation found the service provided insufficient quantity and variety of resources, hazards were not identified appropriately, premises were not clean and well maintained and equipment was not kept in good condition. As a result of these, and unrelated breaches, the service was issued a provisional licence then supported and monitored by the Ministry. They have since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant had concerns regarding a lack of quality indoor and outdoor equipment with no planning or budget for new equipment as well as issues with windows and leaking gutters.	The Ministry investigation found there was sufficient indoor and outdoor equipment available, but the premises required repairs and hazard checks were not completed. A provisional licence was issued for these breaches and others not related to the complaint. The Ministry continues to monitor and work with the service.	upheld
The complainant was concerned the service did not use the car seat the complainant provided for their child for an excursion and instead allegedly used a smaller seat that was not safe for the child.	The Ministry investigation upheld the complaint and required the service to improve their excursion policy, including risk management and worked with the service to ensure excursion procedures are in line with their policy. The service took prompt action to make the required changes.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with the service's hygiene practices as their child was in a soiled state at pick up. They were also unhappy with lack of support from teachers while the child was being assessed for autism.	The Ministry investigation found the child had not been changed as required and the service did not demonstrate open communication or support for the parent's decisions. The Ministry required the service to undertake a review of their policies and practices regarding curriculum and parents' aspirations.	upheld
The complainant was concerned they had not been advised of an accident where their child broke their arm.	The Ministry investigation found the accident had not been witnessed and there was no indication of injury while the child was at the service. The service reviewed their supervision plan for higher risk areas with input from parents. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant was unhappy their child had been excluded from an event at the service and with the service's management of that incident as well as an alleged lack of support for their child.	The service acknowledged that exclusion from the event had occurred and apologised to the complainant. The Ministry was satisfied the service implemented processes to prevent this from re-occurring and that sufficient support was provided to children with additional learning needs.	upheld
The complainant was concerned children were not being adequately supervised at the service. They gave examples where a child's hair was cut and marks were found on a child's neck, but no incident reports had been provided.	The Ministry investigation found incident reports were not completed for all events. The service reviewed their policy and processes with staff and supported staff to ensure compliance.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that a child was left unattended in the outside area for about 15 minutes.	The Ministry investigation upheld the complaint and found the layout of the outside area did not support effective supervision. The service subsequently mitigated the risks by installing a concave mirror and reviewing their supervision plan and policy. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about the administration of medicines and falsification of medication records the service. The concern had been raised with the service and the complainant was unhappy with their response.	The Ministry investigation found a breach of the requirements around medication records. The service provided evidence that the concern was addressed with staff and records were now kept correctly.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant alleged the service did not advise them of an accident their child had at the service and that children were being left in wet nappies. They were also concerned about supervision.	The Ministry investigation found the service's accident policy and nappy changing procedure to be compliant but required the service to improve their induction process to ensure practice reflects their policies. No non-compliance relating to supervision was identified.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service had not noticed their child was unwell despite being advised of the child's medical condition, which required additional vigilance. They were not happy with the service response when they raised their concern.	The Ministry investigation found the service had not followed their illness procedure. The service resolved the concerns with the complainant and trained staff and a health plan was developed for the child.	upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns, including a broken gate, room heating, health and safety, supervision and person responsible requirements.	The Ministry undertook an unannounced visit to the service which confirmed many of the complainant's concerns. All issues identified were resolved by the service to the Ministry's satisfaction within 2 days.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with the service's management of an incident of sexualised play involving their child. They alleged the service did not provide an incident report and offered no support to the child or the complainant. Their child no longer attends the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service had notified Oranga Tamariki and ensured Learning Support worked with the child who instigated the sexualised play. The service reviewed their child protection policy with support through SELO PLD. The Ministry continues to monitor the service through a provisional licence, which was issued in relation to other matters.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about supervision and safety of the premises after a child had twice been found outside the licensed space. The temporary gates installed by the service had not prevented a further incident of a child being found in the foyer.	The Ministry investigation found the service had made changes to mitigate the risk, including rearranging furniture to support supervision, a teacher being present in the foyer during pick up and drop off times and signage to remind adults of door safety. New permanent doors were installed as a result of the complainant.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with supervision and accident management at the service as their child allegedly sustained multiple, unwitnessed and unreported injuries at the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service met supervision and adult:child ratio requirements. The service conducted a self-review of their accident management and their communication processes and made changes to the Ministry's satisfaction.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that a child's biting of others was not being managed appropriately by the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service had plans and processes in place to manage the behaviour, but management of challenging behaviour could be improved. The service was supported with SELO PLD in this area.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that a taonga worn by a child was removed for sleeping without discussion with the family. They had tried to resolve the issue but were unhappy with the cultural responsiveness of the service and that a change had been made to sleep procedures without parental consultation.	The Ministry investigation upheld the complaint. The service provided evidence they had subsequently engaged with the family regarding the service's operational policies. The service received SELO PLD to support cultural responsiveness.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about supervision and behaviour guidance strategies at the service. They alleged children were left for long periods in highchairs, older children were climbing over immobile children and a teacher had told a child to shut up. They were dissatisfied with the service's response to their complaint.	The Ministry investigation upheld the allegations related to overuse of highchairs and teacher interactions. The service had already created a safer space for non-mobile children. The highchairs were replaced with low chairs and the service initiated a review of teaching practices. The Ministry provided support to the service to further strengthen practice and procedures.	upheld
The complainant alleged their child, who suffered from seizures, had a knock to the head and the service did not inform them of the incident.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure and undertook an investigation. The service provided evidence they had informed the complainant's partner of the incident and the child's seizures were not recorded at enrolment. The Ministry recommended the service review their policies and procedures for medical assistance and incident management.	upheld
The complainant was concerned that staff had not been paid and the service no longer met qualified teacher requirements due to teachers leaving.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not meet minimum qualified teacher requirements and suspended the licence. The service made the decision to close permanently and the licence was cancelled.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about the safety of the outdoor area due to hazards, especially the metal door on the playhouse, surfacing and lack of soft fall, distance between swings and broken bikes. They also felt children should have better quality resources.	The Ministry confirmed some of the issues raised by the complainant in a site visit, some had already been addressed by the service. The service developed an action plan to address all issues and was supported by the Ministry to implement the action plan.	upheld
The complainant made a number of allegations about employment practices, including insufficient safety checking, a lack of qualified teachers and insufficient adult:child ratios.	The Ministry investigation found the number of under-twos attending the service exceed the licensed number. Adult:child ratios and qualified teacher requirements were not met, and safety checking was not completed for new staff. The service's licence was suspended, and they have since returned first to a provisional and then to a full licence.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was concerned about a lack of maintenance of the building and outdoor area, which they felt may have impacted on the health and safety of children and staff.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of breaches, including unsafe storage, lack of soft fall and safety glass, broken equipment and general lack of maintenance. The service was able to address all issues to the Ministry's satisfaction. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant reported a number of concerns, including the safety of car seats in the service van, children attending when sick, a lack of appropriate resources, the quality of care and education and communication with the van driver. A complaint had been made to the service, but the complainant was unhappy with the outcome.	As a result of the Ministry investigation, the service was issued a provisional licence, including for breaches relating to car seats in the van, sickness procedures, a lack of resources and curriculum practices. The Ministry supported the service to resolve issues and they were able to return to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant was concerned with the lack of communication from the service regarding accidents and incidents involving their child and with a lack of learning stories for their children.	The Ministry investigation found the service met regulatory requirements but recommended the service review and update their communication plan for parents.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service planned to continue to provide care for four children during a voluntary temporary closure.	The Ministry contacted the service and advised them of the legal requirements. The service confirmed the arrangement would not go ahead.	upheld
The complainant alleged poor management of a child's asthma attack by the service. The complainant also alleged unprofessional treatment by staff and that the service did not meet adult:child ratios. The child no longer attends the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not meet adult:child ratios. Interim measures were implemented to address this while the service recruited additional staff. The service was also required to update their illness related policies and procedures, including their enrolment process to ensure children with medical conditions have a management plan in place before they attend. No further action was required.	upheld
Complainant was concerned about their child's frequent accidents and being hurt by another child at the service. They had removed their child from the service as they were unhappy with responses to their complaints.	The Ministry investigation found the service had addressed concerns raised by the complainant by improving their policies and practices regarding accidents and managing challenging behaviours.	upheld
The complainant raised a number of concerns, including that children were allegedly yelled at and rough-handled on numerous occasions, a lack of support to manage accidents and poor treatment of staff.	The Ministry investigation into this and a similar complaint found numerous breaches, including accident recording, behaviour management and employment practice. The service was issued a provisional licence and the Ministry supported a new team at the service to meet regulatory requirements. The service has since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant alleged the service requested they fraudulently sign timesheets to be used for funding claims.	The Ministry investigation found the service breached adult:child ratios at the beginning of days, which was immediately rectified by the service. A funding audit found over-claiming and this was subsequently recovered by the Ministry. The Ministry supported the service to ensure compliance with all funding rules in the future.	upheld
The complainant was concerned about the service meeting regulated standards during renovations to the outside area.	The Ministry investigation found the service had mitigated health and safety concerns around the construction satisfactorily. However, the service did not meet the minimum requirements for outside activity space for the duration of work. As the construction had been concluded, the service received a formal warning and no further action was required.	upheld
The complainant alleged a child was restrained after an altercation with another child, that teachers regularly yelled at and used inappropriate language in front of children and adult:child ratios were not met.	The Ministry investigation confirmed the service maintained adult:child ratios. The allegation of teachers yelling and using inappropriate language was not substantiated. It was confirmed a child was restrained in a highchair on one occasion, which was not in keeping with the service's processes. The service was issued a provisional licence while they improved their staff's adherence to their positive guidance policy. The service was also required to update their supervision plan to ensure adequate supervision both indoors and outdoors. They have since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complaint was concerned about a lack of supervision and unsafe practice around use of carpentry tools by children.	The Ministry investigation found supervision was adequate but reminded the service that adult:child ratios need to be maintained at all times. The service was also reminded to follow health and safety procedures when using carpentry tools. No further action was required.	upheld
The complainant was concerned they are being over-charged fees for hours outside of 20 Hours ECE.	The Ministry investigation found the service met regulatory requirements and funding rules. The Ministry worked with the service to improve clarity of fee structure information, enrolment forms and their parent handbook. No further action was required.	upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant alleged their child had been smacked by an unqualified teacher at the service. They were also concerned about lack of opportunity for children to develop knowledge and an understanding of the cultural heritage of both parties to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.	The Ministry investigation found that while the teacher was stood down for the duration of the investigation the service had not followed their child protection policy. The policy also did not meet regulated requirements. The allegation of ill-treatment was substantiated and NZ Police and Oranga Tamariki were notified. The service also did not meet curriculum requirements, including in regard to biculturalism. Due to these and unrelated breaches the service's licence was suspended and the service was supported with SELO PLD. The service has since returned to a full licence.	upheld
The complainant was concerned the service had not notified parents of a person in the community who might pose a risk to children and had not responded to incidents involving that person adequately.	The Ministry investigation found the service was managing the risk appropriately. This included ensuring all staff were aware of the emergency procedures and that these were included in the induction for relievers. A newsletter was sent to all parents.	not upheld
The complainant alleged their child with additional learning needs had been excluded from the service, staff were not qualified to meet the child's needs and the child had been discriminated against by the service.	The Ministry investigation found that the child had not been discriminated against or excluded from the service. However, there had been miscommunication about the time frames for their transition to school. The Ministry recommended the service review their communication policy and evaluate inclusive practices to identify opportunities for improvement.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service did not take appropriate action regarding a custody order and had not made a notification to Oranga Tamariki regarding potential abuse of a child when not in the service's care.	The Ministry investigation found the service's child protection policy and other relevant documentation met regulatory requirements. The service had not noted any concerns about the treatment of the child outside of the service and followed the parenting order for the child. The Ministry recommended the service revisit their child protection policy and consider developing a separated parents policy.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy that when they tried to drop their child off early they were asked to stay until their booked time.	The Ministry investigation found the service had received a change of enrolment from the family which would address the issue. The service re-engaged with the complainant to restore the relationship. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service was exceeding the number of children they were licensed for.	The Ministry investigation found the service was operating within their licence and no further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about changes to the sign-in and sign-out process due to COVID-19, which required writing an address and phone number. They were concerned this caused delays for parents.	Following discussion with the Ministry the service amended their process to only require names and time of drop-off or pick-up as other details were already on file.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned they had received very short notice from the service advising they would not open under COVID-19 Alert Level 2.	The Ministry contacted the service and the service advised they were unable to safely meet Alert Level 2 requirements. The service supported families to transition to care under a different provider. No breach of regulatory requirements was identified.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned with the service's communication about the management of an incident where their child was hurt by another child at the service.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had appropriate complaints, social competency and accident policies and practices in place and that these are reviewed regularly and are available for parental feedback. The service updated their social competency policy and define responding to minor injuries as recommended by the Ministry.	not upheld
The complainant had concerns about behaviour management and supervision. They alleged the service was unresponsive to incidents of sexualised play and not ensuring children's safety.	The Ministry investigation found the service had implemented a specific supervision plan to ensure the safety of children and made a notification to Oranga Tamariki. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged that unprofessional conduct by staff was not managed by the service. They also expressed concerns about supervision of children and health and safety.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegations. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged that their child was ill-treated by a teacher and that the service had excluded the child due to the complainant's alleged threatening behaviour.	The service stood down the teacher for the duration of the investigation. Oranga Tamariki were notified. The allegations were not substantiated. The service confirmed that they had cancelled the child's enrolment as they were concerned for the safety of children in their care due to the complainant's threatening behaviour. The Ministry was satisfied the service met all related regulatory requirements.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned that the service's senior management was not addressing staff concerns about adult:child ratios and safety of children in mixed age spaces. They were also concerned about employment practices.	The Ministry supported the service to resolve the concern in consultation with teachers and parents and ensure safety and wellbeing of children. This included putting a special condition on the licence and continued monitoring of the service.	not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant alleged being verbally attacked by a staff member in front of children.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the complaint and the Ministry was satisfied with the policies of the service.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy with the service's response to allegations of inappropriate behaviour by a non-teaching staff member. The complainant also raised concerns about health and safety, reporting of incidents and falsification of records.	The Ministry required the service to undertake a full investigation of the allegation of inappropriate behaviour and advised NZ Police and Oranga Tamariki. The report found the allegations unsubstantiated and the service provided evidence that safety protocols were followed at all times.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service had allowed an unauthorised person to pick up their child. They were also unhappy with a lack of communication from the service, including delays in being informed of a hair cutting incident involving their child.	The Ministry investigation found the person picking up the child had been authorised and the child's other parent had been informed of the hair cutting incident. However, the Ministry required the service to review injury, illness and incident procedures and to take measures to ensure all incidents are recorded and there is evidence a parent has been notified. The Ministry recommended the service work to strengthen communication of key information to parents.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about the noise from a home-based service and requested information about the requirements to operate.	The Ministry provided the requested information. They also discussed the matter with the service who confirmed they monitor noise levels when children are outside.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a teacher struck a child with a stick.	The Ministry prompted the service to investigate the allegation and notify the matter to NZ Police and Oranga Tamariki. The teacher was initially in non-contact and then returned to work supported by a safety plan. The service was able to provide CCTV footage and the NZ Police investigation did not substantiate the allegation. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant had concerns about an interaction with the service manager, lack of farewell for children's last day and failure of the service to pass on children's portfolios when leaving the service.	The Ministry discussed the concerns with the service. There had been a misunderstanding between the complainant and the service, and an apology was given to the complainant. The portfolios were passed on.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service was not able to adequately supervise the high number of children with additional learning needs at the service. They were also concerned a child had recently been bitten as a result of this.	The Ministry investigation found the service was meeting all regulatory requirements. The service was supported by Learning Support through professional development and additional support worker hours.	not upheld
The complainant raised a number of concerns, including that children were allegedly yelled at and rough-handled on numerous occasions, a lack of support to manage accidents and poor treatment of staff.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegation. As a result of the complaint, the service worked to ensure regular teacher observations are conducted and teaching practice is strengthened.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service's practices for confirmation of enrolment and frequent absence rules were not in line with funding rules.	The Ministry investigation found the service was complying with regulated requirements and funding rules.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service was cancelling the enrolment of their child who had additional learning needs and had an education support worker in place.	The Ministry contacted the service who advised that they could not support the child adequately and the child's high level of learning need impacted other children at the service. The family relocated.	not upheld
The complainant alleged they had only received one learning story for their child in over five months. The parent raised this with the service and did not receive a satisfactory response.	The Ministry investigation found that additional learning stories for the child had been available online and that the service's complaints procedure met requirements. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a teacher at the service had smacked their child and the service did not respond appropriately to the incident. The child no longer attends the service.	The Ministry was satisfied with the service's investigation of the allegation, including standing down the teacher and notifying NZ Police, Oranga Tamariki and the Teaching Council. The allegation was not substantiated. The service ensured all staff were aware of their child protection and complaints procedures. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service claimed funding for a teacher when they were absent from the service.	The Ministry investigation did not confirm the specific case of inaccurate claiming but found concerns with staffing and attendance record keeping. An audit confirmed a small over-claim, which was recovered by the Ministry.	not upheld
The complainant alleged their child had been hurt at the service but did not provide many details of the injury or accident.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegation. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about the presence of international students at the service during the COVID-19 pandemic.	The Ministry contacted the service and viewed documentation demonstrating that safety and health checks were undertaken for all international work experience students. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy their school-aged child was no longer allowed to attend the service.	The Ministry advised the complainant that, under regulations, children over the age of six are unable to attend services. The service worked with the complainant to find alternative care for the child.	not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was unhappy with fees charged by the service as other families seem to be charged less.	The Ministry investigation found that the service's fee schedule met requirements and funding rules. The service advised they had implemented a short-term programme supporting some families with fee free access above 20 hours ECE, which may have led to the concern raised.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about an incident their child had witnessed at the service and the impact this might have on their mental and emotional wellbeing. The service had informed the complainant of the incident and had arranged a meeting.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaint procedures and supported the service to ensure their investigation followed correct procedures. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about enrolment procedures and the receipt of an account for a day the child had not attended due to COVID-19 Alert Level restrictions.	As a result of the Ministry's investigation the service was advised to ensure enrolment forms are completed accurately and completely. The account had been generated electronically in error and was cancelled. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service was not working with them to manage their child's recently diagnosed medical condition. They were also unhappy the service had not reimbursed fees paid during the COVID-19 Alert Level 3 period when their child did not attend.	The Ministry found there had been a misunderstanding between the service and the complainant. The service worked with the complainant to facilitate reduced attendance hours and the development of a transition plan to return to full time attendance. The over-paid fees were reimbursed. The complainant was satisfied with the resolution.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy after several educators in a homebased setting were not meeting their family's needs. They were also concerned about some processes, including delays in care plans being put in place.	The Ministry investigation did not find any breaches to regulatory requirements. The service provider had regularly communicated and worked with the complainant to meet their needs.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned that pictures of their child were used by the service on public digital platforms. They had not given parental permission and were concerned that staff had advised verbal permission was sufficient.	The Ministry confirmed with the service that no image of the child was used. The service's privacy policy states images are only used after obtaining written consent from parents. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about the frequency of nappy changing, an alleged choking incident, heating of breast milk, expired food being provided to children and a child being injured when falling of a chair.	The Ministry investigation found the service had compliant policies and procedures regarding nappy changing, bottle feeding and accidents. No choking incident was recorded by the service, but the service reviewed their food related policies and procedures and ensured all staff were aware of these.	not upheld
The complainant alleged that during a ceremony staff were partaking of a legal substance which could affect their behaviour while children were in their care.	The service provided evidence to the Ministry that the alleged substance had been replaced with a product that did not affect behaviour. The Ministry provided advice to the service regarding clear communication with families.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about child safety at the service after a child was bitten by another child.	The Ministry investigation found that the service met regulated requirements. The service received assistance from Learning Support to implement effective social competence strategies for all children at the service.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service stopped allowing their child to be picked up early or be collected by an older sibling. They were also concerned about an unreported injury to the child and that the service was operating outside its licence with more children present than permitted.	The Ministry investigation found the changes to drop-off and pick-up was in line with a parenting order and did not substantiate the other concerns. However, the Ministry worked with the service to review a number of related policies and procedures to strengthen practice.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service was not meeting adult:child ratio requirements. They had tried to raise the issue with the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service met adult:child ratios. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a service used educators and documentation from another service to obtain their licence from the Ministry.	The Ministry investigated and found no evidence to suggest documentation from another licence was assessed for this licence. The service was advised that, although an educator can work for more than one service, they may not operate simultaneously. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant had concerns relating to a child with additional needs transitioning into the service. They alleged the service advised the child was not a good fit for the service. They were also concerned about the settling in process and unprofessional communication of the teaching team. The child was withdrawn from the service.	The Ministry investigation found that differences in philosophy between the service and the family had contributed to a breakdown in the relationship. The Ministry recommended the service review their induction processes and positive guidance strategies with reference to He Māpuna te Tamaiti. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned with a lack of management of aggressive behaviour of a child. This followed an incident where their child had been pushed off a climbing box and dislocated their shoulder. The complainant had removed their child from the service.	The Ministry investigation found appropriate policies and procedures were in place to protect children from harm, including sufficient support for staff and the child.	not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was concerned with the service's response to sexualised play involving their child. The parent removed their child from the service.	The Ministry investigated and found the service proactively responded to the concern raised and that observations were completed. The service actively engaged with the parents concerned around the service's process to address the children's behaviour.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy about the level of noise from the service. They were concerned children were not engaged in activities by teachers to calm them down and did not have a good learning environment. They had made previous complaints to the local council regarding the noise level.	The Ministry investigation found the service did not exceed the noise level approved in the resource consent, a noise management plan was in place and curriculum provision met regulatory requirements. No further action was required.	not upheld
Complainant was concerned about adult:child ratios and bullying of staff.	The Ministry conducted an unannounced visit and found that the service met adult:child ratios. They were following their HR process regarding staffing issues. The Ministry continued to monitor the service due to unrelated concerns and provided SELO PLD.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about the service's application of 20 Hours ECE and an optional charge at the service.	The Ministry referred the complainant to information in the Funding Handbook and asked them to follow the service's complaints procedures. The service consequently requested advice on the requirements from the Ministry. The Ministry supported the service to make changes to the fees and enrolment information to comply with the funding rules.	not upheld
The complainant alleged an adult at the service had rough-handled two children but could not identify the children or the adult. They also made a report to NZ Police.	The Ministry and NZ police investigated and did not substantiate the allegation. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about the application of 20 Hours ECE and service fees.	The Ministry reviewed the enrolment agreement for the child and the service's enrolment policy and fees schedule. The service was advised to review the wording of the fees schedule to clearly show no fee is charged for 20 Hours ECE.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about adult:child ratios and behaviour guidance at the service. They had raised their concerns with the service but were unhappy with the response.	The Ministry investigation found the service met regulated requirements. No further action as required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service was unresponsive to complaints, did not meet adult:child ratios on excursions, had a dog on the premises and that their sandpit had no cover and was regularly soiled.	The Ministry investigation found the service met all regulated requirements, including appropriate mitigation of health and safety risks.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy the service and associated school did not transition the child to school when they turned five.	The Ministry investigated and found no breaches to the regulations. The parent handbook clearly outlined the enrolment process for children and their transition to school in clusters. The Ministry recommended the service develop an enrolment policy in consultation with parents.	not upheld
The complainant alleged ill-treatment of a child by a teacher at the service and that the teacher had left the premises alone with the child. The complainant also notified NZ Police.	The service investigated and the allegations were not substantiated. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's investigation, including standing down the teacher and informing Oranga Tamariki. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant's child disclosed they were accused of stealing by a teacher and the complainant was unhappy with the teacher's presumed management of the situation. The child no longer attends the service.	The Ministry investigation found the accusation of stealing had come from another child and the service had records of communicating this to the complainant. The Ministry reviewed the service's positive guidance policy, which was found to be compliant.	not upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns primarily about the way the service managed their child's behaviour and responded to sexualised play. They also alleged that an unqualified teacher at the service had rough-handled their child. The child was no longer attending the service.	The Ministry investigation found incidents of sexualised play were managed appropriately. The service investigated the allegation of rough handling but did not follow their procedures and did not stand down the teacher. The allegation was not substantiated. Staff were supported to understand the procedures and improve their practice. The Ministry required the child protection policy to be amended as they did not notify the Ministry when they notified Oranga Tamariki. The Ministry notified NZ Police and the Teaching Council.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about high fees charged by the service for the hours outside of 20 Hours ECE.	The Ministry investigation found the fees charged were in line with the service's fee schedule and confirmed no fees applied for 20 Hours ECE.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned that a teacher spoke in an aggressive and condescending manner to a child. They had complained to the service and were unhappy with the response and forwarded a complaint to the Teaching Council.	The Ministry investigation did not determine any breach of regulations. The service supported the teacher to improve their professional practice.	not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant alleged an administration staff member at the service may be misusing prescription medication whilst at the service.	The Ministry investigation found the employee was not in regular contact with children and requested the service provider undertake an investigation into the allegation. No concerns about the use of medication were identified. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service employed a teacher who had allegedly ill-treated children in the past.	The Ministry investigation substantiated there had been a previous incident where the teacher had been given a warning. The service developed a support and mentoring programme for the teacher and the Ministry was satisfied appropriate procedures had been followed.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy after being charged an unexpected fee for food provision by the service.	The Ministry investigated and found the fees charged were in line with fee structure that had been signed by the complainant.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned her child's educator was not funded during COVID-19 Alert Level 3 and that they may have to retrospectively pay the educator.	The Ministry provided advice on funding for home-based services and funding under COVID-19 Alert Levels. The educator confirmed they had been paid wage subsidy for the period in question and payment from the complainant would not be required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned that scratches their child sustained at the service were not witnessed by a member of staff. The child no longer attends the service.	The Ministry investigation found no non-compliances regarding supervision or accident and incident management. However, the service strengthened their Supervision plan and Complaints procedure.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about a lack of supervision and adult:child ratios at the service after a child had cut their fingers on a food tin.	The Ministry investigation found the service met adult:child ratios and had implemented changes following the accident to mitigate the risk of similar accidents. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about the safety of children in mixed age spaces due to proposed changes to the service's premises and facilities.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service provider liaised with concerned parties to ensure that any proposed changes maintained the wellbeing, health and safety of all children and staff involved.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a staff member spoke to them inappropriately and their child was excluded from the service after a pre-visit.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegation about the staff member's behaviour or exclusion of the child. The service reviewed their transition process to ensure clarity of information.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service did not meet minimum space requirements for the number of children attending.	The Ministry investigation found the service to be compliant with regulations. No further action was required.	not upheld
Complainant alleged that during COVID-19 Alert Level 1 children were not directed to wash their hands before lunch and there was no hand sanitiser available at the entrance for adults.	The Ministry investigation found that even though hand sanitiser was not required in COVID Alert Level 1, it was readily available at the service. The service reminded all teachers to ensure children wash their hands before eating as per their policy.	not upheld
Complainant alleged rough handling of their child by a teacher.	The Ministry investigation found that the allegations were not substantiated. No further action required.	not upheld
The complainant had been unable to resolve concerns around their child falling sick often with the service. They were also concerned about private information being shared with staff.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches of the regulated requirements. The Ministry recommended the service make changes to their complaints procedure to strengthen the process for complaints about management, to remind staff of the importance of confidentiality and to arrange a mediation meeting with the complainant.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about the manner and lack of communication from the staff at the service about reopening after COVID-19 lockdown and restrictions to child attendance.	The Ministry discussed the concerns with the service. The service provided support to the staff regarding responsive practices and staff were asked to apologise to the complainant.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned that despite asking the service several times for a copy of their emergency plan they had not received it.	The Ministry investigation found the service met emergency plan requirements, including the plan being available for parents online. The emergency plan was shared with the complainant and no further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned with the service's behaviour management strategies, including alleging use of restraint.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegation of restraint and found the service had adequate behaviour management policies and processes. However, the Ministry recommended the service seek PLD in this area.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned that children seemed to occasionally not be supervised in the outdoor areas.	The Ministry investigation found the service was meeting supervision and adult:child ratios requirements. The complainant was advised to come back to the Ministry if further incidents arise.	not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was concerned about high staff turn-over, upset children and a lack of nappy changing. They also alleged the service operates under minimum adult:child ratios and that teachers felt bullied by the service owner.	The Ministry conducted an unannounced visit, which did not substantiate the allegations. The service acknowledged high staff turn-over caused strain on staff, but this had now stabilised.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service was unresponsive to cultural needs and no support was provided for teacher registration.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegations. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged staff at the service told others they were an unfit parent and as a result breached their privacy.	The Ministry discussed the allegation with the service and were advised this occurred in the parent community and did not involve staff. The service worked with the parent community to resolve the issue. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged bullying and unethical behaviour of the service in relation to fees when their usual educator was not available during COVID-19 lockdown.	The Ministry investigation found that charging fees was in line with the contract between the service and the complainant and that the complainant had been offered an alternative educator. The service waived the advance notice fees.	not upheld
Complainant had several concerns, mainly around treatment of children, including forcing a child to eat, adult:child ratios, sleep practice and record keeping.	The Ministry conducted an unannounced visit to the service to investigate the allegations. The allegation of forcing a child to eat was not substantiated and no concerns regarding sleep practice were identified. Sleep records and documented adult:child ratios met regulated requirements. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns, including access to drinking water, the number of relievers, wet clothing not being changed, children accessing outdoors in cold weather and communication with parents.	The Ministry investigation found the service met regulated requirements. The complainant was provided with information about other services in the area as they did not want their child to remain at the service.	not upheld
The complainant requested a health and safety review of a service's premises and the introduction of drug testing for staff without providing any details of their concerns leading to this request.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure but also followed up with the service. The service completed a review of their health and safety processes and practice to the Ministry's satisfaction. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the food provided by the service did not cater for a plant-based diet and did not allow parents to provide a lunch box.	The service provided evidence to the Ministry's satisfaction that their food provision met regulated requirements, including catering for different dietary requirements and food allergies.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy about a lack of communication of a notice period to unenroll a child.	The Ministry investigation found the service outlined the notice period on both the enrolment form and the service's fee schedule. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a registered teacher at the service used marijuana during their workday.	The Ministry required the service to investigate the allegation and make proactive changes to their drug and alcohol policy. The allegation of drug use was not substantiated.	not upheld
The complainant alleged ill-treatment of children by two teachers, unprofessional teacher behaviour around children and teachers removing food from children's lunchboxes.	The Ministry required the service to investigate the allegations against the two teachers and reviewed relevant documentation. The allegations were not substantiated but the service provided positive guidance training for the teachers as a precaution. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's investigation process and found policies met regulatory requirements.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned with the service's hygiene practices and the management of child illness. In particular, not sending sick children home, sick children not being effectively isolated from other children and a lack of hand sanitiser. They had raised their concerns with the service but had not received a response.	The Ministry investigation included a review of relevant policies and procedures and a visit to the service. While no non-compliances were identified, the Ministry recommended amending the infectious illness policy to ensure clarity.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about the service's supervision and accident management. They alleged that two incidents of unexplained injuries had occurred and incident reports had not been provided.	The service acknowledged a lack of communication had led to the complaint. They addressed the issues to the Ministry's satisfaction by reviewing their accident policy with staff and introducing supports to improve staff communication.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service was not providing mentoring and support for teacher registration.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the complaint. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned that a staff member, who they alleged use to abuse children, was working at the service. They alleged the service was aware of the teacher's history.	The Ministry reviewed the service's investigation of the original allegation of abuse. The service had investigated appropriately but did not substantiate the allegation. No further action was required.	not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant alleged the service incorrectly claimed funding. They also raised a number of other concerns, including no curriculum planning, a lack of supervision of children, ineffective behaviour management strategies and inefficient hygiene practices used prevent the spread of COVID-19.	The Ministry investigation found the service to be compliant with regulatory requirements.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service charged 80% fees over the COVID-19 lockdown. They were told that the service would provide online learning but this was very limited.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a teacher rough-handled a child and that staff had arguments in front of children.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegations. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about the use of restraint by a teacher and bullying by senior staff. They had raised concerns with the service but no change to the behaviours had occurred.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegations. However, the Ministry supported the service to provide professional development to staff on positive social competence strategies.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy with the hygiene of the premise, not being asked to sign a form for collecting a child and that a teacher allegedly slept on the floor around children.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure but checked supervision, sign out sheets and the premises' hygiene at an already planned visit to the service. No breaches of regulatory requirements were found.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service did not meet the required outdoor play space for the number of children attending.	The Ministry investigation confirmed there was more than adequate outdoor play space for the number of children on the service's licence.	not upheld
The complainant had concerns about adult:child ratios, supervision, engagement with children and access to the outdoor area.	The Ministry visited the service to observe practice and premises and review documentation. The service was found to meet regulated requirements. Advice and support were provided to the service to monitor and mitigate staff voices and noise levels, which were noted as a concern at the visit.	not upheld
Complainant alleged manhandling of children and speaking aggressively and in an uncaring manner to and around children.	The Ministry conducted an unannounced visit to observe teaching practice and review related policies and procedures. The allegations were not substantiated. Learning Support remains engaged with the service to support practice.	not upheld
The complainant had concerns about a lack of positive interactions between teachers and children and lack of supervision in the outdoor activity space.	The Ministry investigation, which included a visit to observe practices and supervision, found the service met regulated requirements. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service did not met adult:child ratios.	The Ministry's investigation found the service met adult:child ratios. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant expressed concerns about the quality of care impacting children's wellbeing, supervision and the service's response to parental requests. They had tried to resolve the concerns with the service without success.	The Ministry investigation found no concerns with the quality of care or supervision. The service had communicated consistently with the complainant and had made changes to practices to meet their requests.	not upheld
The complainant alleged staff were using illegal substances on the premises outside of licensed hours. They were concerned for the safety of children.	The Ministry discussed the allegation with the service and reviewed their child protection, and drug and alcohol policies. While staff had access to the premises outside of operating hours, the Ministry found there was no evidence to substantiate the allegation.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about appointment procedures at the service and staff members allegedly using the service resources at home.	The Ministry did not identify any non-compliances but SELO PLD was provided to strengthen the service's understanding of governance and administration requirements related to human resources.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned they were charged fees for times when their child did not attend. They had enrolled the child in a different service.	The Ministry advised the complainant that fees were charged in line with the signed enrolment form. The Ministry advised the service what funding they could claim.	not upheld
The complainant alleged their child had sustained an injury at the service and the service denied this. There were also some communication issues around CCTV footage not being available.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegations and found the service to be compliant with regulatory requirements. The Ministry was satisfied with the rationale why CCTV footage was not available. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant raised a number of concerns about the service, including an allegation that a child was forcibly moved, poor management of potential choking, unsafe outdoor equipment and the service's complaints procedure.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the incident of a child being forcibly moved, complaints procedure and management of choking hazards. The outdoor equipment in question was added to the supervision plan. The service reviewed their complaints procedure to improve practice.	not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was concerned staff had not witnessed and injury to their child and that no accident report had been provided. They had not been able to resolve their concerns with the service. The complainant removed their child from the service.	The Ministry investigation found no regulatory breaches, but the Ministry recommended a review of procedures to strengthen practice.	not upheld
The complainant was alleged that the service had not implemented the cancellation of their child's enrolment. The service had insisted the child remain enrolled during COVID-19 Alert Level 2, even though the family had relocated and were delaying final invoices.	The service acknowledged there had been delays due them following up with WINZ. The final invoice and refund were provided to the complainant. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned their child had been subjected to sexualised behaviour by another child. They were not happy with the procedure the service followed to manage the incident. The complainant removed their child from the service.	The Ministry was satisfied with the service's response to mitigate risks. This included notifying Oranga Tamariki, changes to supervision practice, removal of playground equipment and a review of their child protection policy. The Ministry continued to monitor the service through an existing provisional licence to ensure teaching practice supported development of understanding of appropriate behaviour.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the fee structure and enrolment policies of the service made it difficult to access 20 Hours ECE.	The Ministry investigation found no concerns with the fee structure and enrolment policy. However, the service reviewed and made changes to the fee schedule to make it clearer, removed the hourly rate information and established a new casual hourly rate.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the provider allowed care to be provided in homes not safety checked and did not reimburse for the cost of a first aid course.	The Ministry investigation found the complaint to be unsubstantiated. Not reimbursing for the first aid course was in line with the service's process.	not upheld
The complainant had a range of concerns about the service's playground maintenance, adult:child ratios, incident management, fees charged and property allegedly stolen from children.	The Ministry investigation identified no regulatory breaches regarding playground maintenance, adult:child ratios or incident management. The remaining concerns were resolved between the service and the complainant. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy about fees charged during the COVID-19 lockdown and alleged the service unenrolled their child after they had raised questions about the charges.	The Ministry investigation found the service's fees met funding requirements. The service had not unenrolled the child but acknowledged a breakdown of communication. The Ministry supported the service to clarify wording in the fee schedule and enrolment agreement.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service had not been in contact throughout the COVID-19 lockdown period and no indication was given when the service would re-open in Alert Level 2.	The Ministry investigation found the service held a meeting for all families to discuss reopening and the complainant had been invited. The service had been in temporary premises, which were no longer available to them. At the meeting the decision was made not to reopen until the permanent premises were available.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy with the service's management of sexualised behaviour of a child at the service.	The Ministry investigated and found the service had taken immediate and appropriate action to assess and mitigate the risk, including reviewing their supervision plan and child protection policy. The service also provided information to the complainant on the actions taken and provided opportunities to discuss their concerns.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service did not meet adult:child ratios and person responsible requirements and had high staff turn-over.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegations regarding adult:child ratios and person responsible. Recent staff turn-over was a concern for the service and existing SELO PLD was provided to support in this area.	not upheld
The complainant raised concerns about the service's employment practices. In particular, moving staff from permanent to casual contracts.	The Ministry investigation found the service had since implemented clear employment practices with legal support. The Ministry referred the complainant to the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) for advice on employment issues.	not upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns, including a teacher who had travelled overseas allegedly being asked to return to work before the end of their required quarantine for COVID-19, sleep checks not being completed during lunch hours and food provided that did not meet children's needs.	The Ministry investigation found the service was compliant with food provision and sleep management requirements. The teacher's return from overseas pre-dated the introduction of quarantine requirements. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant raised a number of concerns, including lack of signatures on incident records, lack of qualified teachers, fraud and staff not being able to raise concerns.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the complainant's concerns. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a service had inadequate adult:child ratios. They were also concerned about high staff turn-over.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegations. No further action was required	not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant alleged a teacher at the service had rough-handled children.	The Ministry investigation found the service had followed appropriate child protection policies and processes when investigating the incident. The allegation was not substantiated but the service took steps to improve teaching practice. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns, including health and safety at the service, the under-twos area being too small with too little play opportunities and the available outdoor equipment and adult:child ratios.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any breaches of regulated requirements. However, SELO PLD was provided to strengthen teachers' knowledge and practice to enhance and extend learning and development. This included developing the outdoor environment with a focus on the needs of different age groups.	not upheld
The complainant alleged their child had developed a staph infection due to an injury sustained at the service. The service and complainant disagreed on what had caused an injury to the child's toe and whether this had caused the infection.	As a result of the complaint, the service implemented a new process for informing parents of injuries to children where an incident had not been observed. They also reviewed the use of soccer boots as the complainant believed them to be the source of the infection. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy the service asked for the child to be picked up after one incident of vomiting. They were also concerned with the way the child was soothed and the fees charged by the service.	The Ministry provided advice to the complainant about requirements in early learning services and referred them to the service's complaint procedures.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned that children were not always supervised and there appeared to be a lack of teacher engagement with unsettled children. The complainant had not received a satisfactory response to their concerns from the service.	The Ministry investigation, including an unannounced visit, found the service met supervision and curriculum requirements. However, the Ministry advised the service to include a focus on social and emotional wellbeing in their behaviour guidance policy. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant reported seeing a teacher throwing a glass of water at their child and that the child had said the teacher often teases him. The concern had been raised with the service, but the complainant was not confident concerns were taken seriously. The child was withdrawn from the service.	The Ministry was satisfied with the service's investigation process and actions, including staff review of the social competence and child protection policies as well as review of how the original complaint was responded to was carried out. The service provided information for context about the water incident. There was no evidence to support the allegation of teasing of children. SELO PLD was provided to support improved teaching practices when developing children's social competence.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a teacher at the service was unsuitable to work with children because they drink heavily and were mentally unstable.	The Ministry asked the service to investigate the allegation. The service investigation did not substantiate the allegation and the service advised the Ministry there had been no instance of concern regarding the teacher.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a teacher was under the influence of marijuana and alcohol whilst working with children. They also were concerned that during the COVID-19 lockdown children from the service were continuing to receive care at a teacher's home.	The Ministry requested the service to investigate allegations, which were not substantiated. The care provided during COVID-19 lockdown had been a private arrangement not related to the service.	not upheld
The complainant alleged unauthorised people had, on multiple occasions, entered the property and behaved threateningly, intimidating teachers.	The Ministry investigation found the unauthorised person had entered a separate part of the building not the service itself. The service had taken actions to further secure the premises and confirmed the reason for the person entering the building had been resolved. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service did not follow Ministry of Health's recommendation of a 48 hour stand down for children and adults who are unwell during COVID-19 Alert Level 1.	The Ministry found the service's practice compliant with current Ministry of Health advice shared with the sector. No changes to practice were required.	not upheld
The complainant reported their child had been hanging from a stilt rope entangled in climbing equipment at the service. The child suffered bruising.	The Ministry required the service to conduct a full investigation into the incident. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's investigation and the changes made to the environment to mitigate the risk. This included removing the stilts.	not upheld
Complainant was concerned that a service had not advised them of a number of injuries their child had sustained while at the service and had poor incident management processes.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any breach of regulatory requirements. As a result of the investigation the service initiated a review of the environment and of health, safety and wellbeing policies and processes to strengthen practice.	not upheld
The complainant had ongoing concerns about the ability of the teaching team to support their child's learning needs and manage their behaviour as well as lack of open communication and responsiveness to feedback. The child was withdrawn from the service.	The Ministry investigation found no concerns with the support provided to the child but found communication with parents should be improved. The service developed processes to ensure effective information sharing and provided communication PLD to teachers.	not upheld
The complainant alleged that staff had started work at the service without proper and complete safety checks.	The Ministry investigation found the service had processes, systems and records in place to ensure safety checking was completed for all children's workers. No further action was required	not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was concerned a teacher aide was assigned to tasks like food preparation rather than supporting children.	The service provided details of the teacher aide's role to the Ministry's satisfaction. No further action was required.	not upheld
Complainant was concerned the outdoor space was not available for children while it was under renovation. They also expressed concerns that ratios were not maintained throughout the day and the spacing of beds did not meet requirements.	The Ministry visited the service and confirmed the sleep space, outdoor play area and ratios met regulated requirements.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a child was left crying for long periods at a time. They were also concerned about the supervision of children.	The Ministry investigation, including a visit to the service and observation of practice, found no concerns. The Ministry continued to support the service in relation to their latest ERO report.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about the service being unsafe for children, after their child fell at the service and required to be airlifted to hospital due to a severe head injury. The complaint had concerns about supervision, adequate ratios of qualified teachers, safety of the outdoor environment and hazard checking.	The Ministry investigation found the service had met all regulatory requirements including supervision, qualified teacher ratios, set-up of the outdoor environment and hazard checking. WorkSafe conducted an investigation and found the service had met their duty of care and responded appropriately to the incident. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was dissatisfied with the service's response when their child was crying at collection time. The child disclosed a teacher had hurt their arm.	The Ministry requested the service investigate and was satisfied the service followed appropriate processes investigating the disclosure, including placing the teacher on non-contact for the duration of the investigation. The event which led to the allegation had been witnessed by another teacher and the disclosure was not substantiated.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service could not explain how their child sustained bite marks and an injury to their face. They were also concerned about the staff's alleged lack of empathy.	The Ministry investigation found compliant policies and procedures were in place. However, the service acknowledged room for improvement and conducted a self-review of the environment, supervision, hazard awareness and positive guidance strategies.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service was assigning a teacher aide to tasks not directly related to working with children. They were also concerned the number of incidents and injuries occurring to children.	The Ministry investigated and no breach of regulatory requirements was identified. The teacher aide's hours met the requirements for funding and the incident records did not show any concerning patterns of children being injured.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service expected staff to return to work at the service under COVID-19 Alert Level 3 or not be paid, not taking into consideration guidance and requirements from Ministry of Health and the Ministry for operating under Alert Level 3.	The Ministry confirmed with the service that they were aware of requirements under Alert Level 3. The service also advised that they had sought support from an external human resource specialist during this time. No further action was required by the Ministry.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service had cancelled their child's enrolment due to unpaid fees.	The Ministry investigation found the service's enrolment and fee policies met requirements. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned teachers were expected to complete tasks like food preparation and budget responsibility which they lack certifications and expertise in. They were also concerned that the service spent too little on resources for children.	The Ministry investigated and found a number of staff members had food safety certificates and staff were allocated budget responsibility to purchase resources based on children's interests and programme planning. The Ministry recommended the complainant seeks clarity about the resource budget from the service.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a teacher had smacked children at the service.	The service stood down the teacher while conducting an investigation. The allegation was not substantiated. The service also conducted a review of their child protection policy in consultation with parents.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a teacher had yelled at and forcibly moved a child for drawing on a table. The complainant removed their child from the service.	The Ministry requested the service investigate the allegations and was satisfied the service followed an appropriate process during the investigation, including removing the teacher from contact with children for the duration of the investigation. The service implemented a mentor programme to support the teacher to ensure their practice met all the service's policies, procedures and their philosophy.	not upheld
The complainant was unhappy with the service's management of an alleged incident of sexualised play, transition process to different rooms and their child coming home in soiled clothing on one occasion.	The Ministry investigation found the service fully investigated the alleged sexualised play, including seeking advice from Oranga Tamariki. The allegation was not substantiated. The service provided evidence that issues regarding the transition process were addressed satisfactory. Toileting policies and procedures met requirements. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a teacher forcefully restrained a child and another teacher used threatening language towards children. They did not provided details of when the alleged incidents occurred or who the teachers were.	The Ministry and the service's investigation, based on limited information provided by the complainant, did not substantiate the allegations.	not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was concerned about the service's application of 20 Hours ECE and a debt raised by the service. They alleged the service had declined to meet to discuss the debt further.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegation. However, the service was supported to review and amend their enrolment practices to ensure clarity for parents.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service gave short notice for a service closure for one day.	The service had been directed by health authorities to close due to a stomach bug outbreak, which made cleaning of the service necessary. The service had informed the complainant of the closure via text message.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned with the service's management of a Work and Income overpayment and their application of 20 Hours ECE which resulted in a debt owed by the complainant. The service provider also allegedly yelled at the complainant in their office. The complaint was also laid with the NZ Police. The complainant removed their child from the service.	The Ministry advised the complainant the service followed their processes as per the terms and conditions of the enrolment agreement. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged children were not given sufficient food at the service and food orders were not placed regularly.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegations. However, the Ministry recommended the service seek advice to explore a variety of healthy food ingredient options.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service was not completing daily hazard checks and protruding nails were present in the outdoor area. They were also concerned about accident records and hygiene practices.	The Ministry discussed the allegations with the service, reviewed documentation and undertook a visit to the service. The complaint was not substantiated.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned with the service's management of their child's aggressive behaviour.	The Ministry investigation found the service had followed policies and procedures, a referral had been made to Learning Support and additional support was put in place to support the child's transition to school. The service also strengthened their behaviour management practice.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service no longer allowed them to provide a lunch box for their child who has additional needs regarding food preparation. They were also concerned their child had not been transitioned to the preschool room with other children of their age.	The Ministry investigation found the service was able to cater for children's specific food related needs. The service committed to a timeline to develop indicators to support transition and a lunch box policy in consultation with parents. The complainant's concerns were addressed by the service to their satisfaction.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about the health and safety of children and staff at the service as unauthorised people had allegedly entered the property.	The Ministry undertook an investigation related to another complaint of similar nature. An unauthorised person had been on the property but not the on the premises of the service. The service secured the property further.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned the service asked parents via signage to use parking usually only used by staff during COVID-19 Alert Level 2. They were concerned the driveway was not safe for children. They also contacted the local council and WorkSafe.	The service informed the Ministry this had been an interim measure only for pregnant and new parents. Evidence the driveway was clear and the signage removed was sighted by the Ministry. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service was mismanaging funding administration and asking parents not to complete sign in and out times.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegation. Arrival and collection times were completed by most parents and matched funding claims. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about recurring illness in the service and withdrew their child.	The Ministry notified health authorities who provided advice to the service. The Ministry investigation found the services child health, illness and cleaning policies and procedures were compliant. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned about their children being bitten by another child at the service. The incidents had previously decreased but had become more frequent again after the COVID-19 lockdown.	The Ministry was satisfied the service had implemented appropriate strategies to manage the behaviour. The biting child no longer attended the service.	not upheld
The complainant queried the employment and curriculum practices of a service and what requirements there are for use of Ministry funding.	The Ministry reviewed policies and documents provided by the service and was satisfied they met regulated requirements. The complainant was advised to request these documents directly from the service.	not upheld
The complainant had concerns about behaviour of children attending the service, including bullying and physical attacks on a child. They requested further support for the children from the Ministry.	The Ministry investigation found the service had processes in place to support children to develop social competence and understanding of appropriate behaviour. Learning Support was working in the service and had no concerns with teacher practice however a referral for further Learning Support was made.	not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was dissatisfied with the service's fee structure.	The Ministry investigation found the fee structure complied with funding rules and adequate information had been provided to the complainant. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged wrongful dismissal, poor employment practices and discrimination of staff by the service. They also had concerns about adult:child ratios not being met and accidents not being recorded. The complainant also notified the Teaching Council.	The Ministry investigation found the service met adult:child ratios, health and safety processes were compliant and a staff dismissal had followed a clear process. The remaining HR concerns were outside of the Ministry's regulatory authority.	not upheld
The complainant alleged the service did not meet minimum space requirements for the number of children attending.	The Ministry investigation found the service to be compliant with regulations. No further action was required.	not upheld
The complainant alleged their child was ill-treated by an unqualified teacher at the service. They also made a report to NZ Police.	The Ministry found the service conducted their own investigation, notified Oranga Tamariki and reviewed their accident management, child protection and supervision policies to strengthen their practice. The teacher had resigned and was not in contact with children following the complaint. The NZ Police and Oranga Tamariki investigation did not substantiate the allegation of ill-treatment.	not upheld
The complainant alleged a child was ill-treated at the service and that staff often shout at children and each other.	The Ministry supported the service to undertake a full investigation of the allegations, which were not substantiated. However, the Ministry provided SELO PLD to the service to strengthen behaviour and social competence guidance and recording of incidents.	not upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns about the service, including not meeting adult:child ratios, children having access to cleaning products due to a broken latch, a lack of access to drinking water and infants not kept safe in mixed aged groups.	The Ministry conducted an investigation and found the service compliant with all regulated requirements.	not upheld
The complainant was concerned a child was left in the sleep room when the service held a fire drill.	The Ministry advised the complainant to follow the service's complaint procedure and contact the Ministry again if they are unsatisfied with the outcome. As there was no further contact from the complainant, no additional actions were required.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned the service did not provide regular learning stories to document children's learning and development.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure with the option to come back to the Ministry if no resolution could be achieved.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned the service was losing a number of teachers and the impact this may have on the children and remaining teachers.	The Ministry was already supporting the service through SELO PLD to improve governance and management practices. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned with the service's behaviour management of a child known to have challenging behaviour. They did not feel the level of care had been appropriate. The child no longer attends the service.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure and offered support if concerns were unable to be resolved.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned the service was investigating a complaint made to them about an incident that did not occur at the service.	The Ministry provided advice to the service. The service notified the complainant they were not following up with the complaint as the matter was not related to the service.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about the length of time it took the service to refund overpaid fees.	The Ministry contacted the service and the issue was resolved. The service apologised to the complainant. No further action required.	not investigated
The complainant was unhappy with how a staff member had spoken to them when they supported another member of the service's community.	The Ministry referred the complaint to the service's complaints procedure. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about the quality of education and care, adult:child ratios, behaviour management, staff changes and student management.	The Ministry had recently conducted a full licence assessment which confirmed the service met adult:child ratios and found no concerns with behaviour management at the service. However, the service had been put on a provisional licence for curriculum and other unrelated criteria and was monitored by the Ministry. The complainant was referred to service's complaints procedure to resolve their other concerns.	not investigated
The complainant was unhappy their child may have had access to a known allergen at the service. They were also concerned about not receiving an agreed fee refund from the service. They asked for advice with the selection of a new service for their child.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure, provided information about alternative services and advice on how to select a service.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned that information about a child had being shared by a staff member with a person outside of the service.	The complainant was advised to follow service's complaints procedure. The complainant has since advised that the matter has been resolved.	not investigated

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
Complainant sought advice on attendance restrictions placed on a child with additional learning needs.	The Ministry provided advice to the complainant and referred them to the service's complaints process.	not investigated
The complainant was unhappy the service did not allow their child to attend for partial sessions.	The Ministry advised the complainant to seek copies of the service's enrolment procedure and fee schedule and referred them to the service's complaints procedure.	not investigated
The complainant alleged the service had charged full fees during the COVID-19 lockdown.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaint procedures.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned the service would not use coconut oil for sun protection for their child.	The Ministry followed up with the service who advised they were working with the complainant to accommodate their wishes without compromising sun safety for the child. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned a teacher covered a child's face as a form of behaviour management, resulting in the child acting aggressively towards the teacher. They alleged a learning plan, which allowed restraint of the child, was implemented without consent from the family.	The complaint could not be resolved between the service and the child's parent without the Ministry's involvement. An individual learning plan for the child was developed in consultation with their parent. The complainant was satisfied with the outcome.	not investigated
The complainant was unhappy the service only notified their educators of the suspension of their licence on the day it took effect.	The Ministry confirmed the licence had been suspended with short notice due to concerns for the safety of children attending may be compromised. The licence was consequently cancelled.	not investigated
The complainant had a number of concerns with the communication by a support worker with the complainant. They were also concerned their child had a toileting accident that the service did not notice.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure and offered support if their concerns could not be resolved.	not investigated
The complainant alleged the service only paid teachers the minimum subsidy rather than 80% wages over the COVID-19 lockdown and were using the wage subsidy funding for other projects.	The service had worked with the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) as the complaint had also been referred to them. The Ministry recommended the information and advice provided by MBIE be shared with staff. No further action required.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about a home-based educator shouting. The complaint was also raised with the service provider.	As the complaint was raised with the service provider the Ministry asked the complainant to contact the Ministry again if they have ongoing concerns.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about unpaid students being counted in adult:child ratios.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service as the complaint related to employment practices and not regulatory requirements.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about access to, and supervision of, a carpentry table at the service.	The Ministry provided the complainant with information and advised to raise their concerns with the service.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned the service required additional fees to provide support to a child with additional learning needs during transition times.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints process and provided advice on what documentation and information to request from the service.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about bullying of staff, the manner of communication with parents and inadequate behaviour management.	The service's licence was suspended at the time the complaint was received and was cancelled shortly thereafter. Therefore, the complaint was not investigated. The complainant was advised of the licence cancellation.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about their child being bitten by another child on a number of occasions and the impact this had on their behaviour.	The Ministry did not receive further information and confirmation that they were happy to be identified to the service from the complainant. However, learning support staff were working in the service and confirmed there were no concerns with the teaching practice at the service.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about bullying of staff, staff turnover and communication with parents at the service. They had raised concerns with the service but did not feel this was adequately followed up.	The Ministry was not able to confirm the details of the complaint with the complainant and, therefore, no further action could be taken by the Ministry.	not investigated
The complainant had concerns about a lack of accident reporting, teachers not noticing a child's toileting accident and high staff turnover.	The Ministry advised the complainant that the service was already on a provisional licence to address similar issues identified following a previous complaint. Therefore, this complaint was not separately investigated. The service has since been able to return to a full licence.	not investigated

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant was concerned that children reported being hit by the manager in an unspecified service.	The Ministry contacted the complainant to specify the service, but no response was received. Two services that may have been the ones the complaint related to were monitored through provisional licences at the time. Apart from this monitoring no further action could be taken without further information from the complainant.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned with fees, the notice period and that they were denied additional hours for their child. The complainant had made a complaint to the service but were unhappy with their initial response.	The Ministry asked the complainant to escalate the complaint in line with the service's complaints procedure and to contact the Ministry again if they were unable to resolve the complaint satisfactory with the service.	not investigated
The complainant was unhappy the enrolment policies and practice of the service did not allow them to only access 20 hours ECE and not pay fees.	The complainant was referred to the service's complaints process. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant sought advice on the notice period for their child's enrolment and advice they were unhappy with the relationship with management, fee structure and staff interaction with children. They did not want the Ministry to follow up their concerns with the service.	The Ministry provided advice on the enrolment form and notice period and encouraged the complainant to contact the Ministry again if they wanted further action to be taken.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned a teacher been unfairly dismissed by a service.	The Ministry recommended to the complainant that the teacher seek legal advice regarding the employment issue. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant made a formal complaint about the chairperson of the service.	The complainant was referred to the service's complaints process. The service resolved the complaint to the complainant's satisfaction.	not investigated
The complainant alleged a staff member at the service bullied and harassed them and did not appropriately communicate an incident involving their child.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure and recommended they request a copy of the staff behaviour policy to understand the service's expectations. The Ministry offered further support if concerns were not resolved with the service.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned the service was not permitting parents to enter the inside play space. They were also concerned the service required a medical note to confirm the child did not have COVID-19 before they could return to the service following a bacterial infection.	The service made changes to their illness policy and COVID-19 response with advice from the Ministry on COVID-19 Alert level requirements and guidance. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned the cultural and language needs of children enrolled at the service were not met due to an alleged lack of resources specific to the Pacific Islands.	The Ministry advised the complainant to follow the service's complaint procedure.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned that the service was losing a number of teachers and the impact this may have on the children and remaining teachers.	The service was already supported through SELO PLD for governance and management. The complainant was referred to the service's complaints procedure. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant alleged their child had not been given the food out of their lunch box, was not put down to sleep and warm clothing was not removed. The complainant was waiting for a response from the service.	The complainant was advised to continue with the service's complaints procedure and provide more detail to the Ministry. No further contact was made by the complainant.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about redundancies and resignations at the service and that this may be disruptive for children.	The Ministry was already supporting the service through SELO PLD to improve governance and management practices. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about the low temperature in a number of services they visited and enquired how the Ministry monitors services.	The Ministry provided the complainant with information about the regulatory requirements and how the Ministry monitors these. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about staff wellbeing and the service's ability to maintain adult:child ratios when staff were sick.	The complainant was referred back to the service's complaints process and the service addressed the concerns to the complainant's satisfaction.	not investigated
The complainant alleged they were asked by the service to fill out timesheets incorrectly and give false account for an investigation. They were also concerned the service was unable to monitor compliance with regulatory requirements and the quality of educators.	The Ministry had previously investigated a similar complainant and the breaches identified in that investigation had been addressed by the service. The complainant confirmed their concerned related to the same time period of the previous complainant. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about the child's school check information and small number of learning stories.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaint process.	not investigated

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome
The complainant alleged the service was claiming funding for children who did not attend during COVID-19 Alert Level restrictions. They agreed to send further details about their concern to the Ministry so that an investigation could be initiated.	No further details were received by the Ministry and, therefore, this complaint was unable to be investigated.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned with the number of staff leaving the service and that it was disruptive for children.	The Ministry referred the complaint to the service's complaints procedure.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned that the benefits of 20 Hours ECE was not passed on to parents.	The Ministry supplied information to the complainant and referred them to the service's complaints process. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about a lack of engagement with the family of a child with learning support needs. They alleged there was no contact regarding education, learning stories or health and safety. They also alleged the service did not organise any connection between families or educators during COVID-19 lockdown.	The Ministry informed the complainant that a change of management occurred when the complaint was received. The new provider was expected to be more responsive to concerns and inclusion. The complainant noticed an improvement in recent engagement and was happy not take the concerns further. No further action required.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned about fees charged by the service.	The complainant was referred to the service's complaints process. The service resolved the complaint to the Ministry's satisfaction.	not investigated
The complainant was unhappy the service would only enrol their child if the child did not attend any other early learning services on other days.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure and asked them to contact the Ministry again should their concerns not be resolved by the service.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned with the service's response to a child repeatedly being hurt by another child at the service.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure. The service and complainant were able to resolve the concerns.	not investigated
The complainant was unhappy the service misrepresented their employment relationship when requesting police vetting for the complainant.	The Ministry explained the police vetting requirements an early learning service must adhere to and referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure.	not investigated
The complainant was concerned the service charged fees when a child did not attend during COVID-19 Alert Level 3.	The service provided evidence of communication to all families that fees were only charged in Alert Level 3 if the child attends. The information was provided to the complainant.	not investigated
The complainant was unhappy the service had given parents short notice they would not reopen after the COVID-19 lockdown as they were permanently closed.	The Ministry had not been informed by the service of the planned permanent closure and worked with the service to ensure the process for cancelling their licence was followed.	not investigated
The complainant sought advice on curriculum requirements and reporting to parents in early childhood education. They were concerned that parents were not permitted to enter the play space.	The Ministry provided the complainant with information and referred them to the service's complaints process.	not investigated
The complainant alleged being treated unprofessionally by the service's management following their resignation.	The Ministry advised the complainant to seek advice on the employment issues from Citizens Advice Bureau or community law. No further action was required.	not investigated
The complainant had concerns about the service's communication with parents, adult:child ratios, not meeting the nutritional needs of a child and teacher engagement with children at the beginning and end of the day.	After unsuccessful attempts to receive further information from the complainant on their concerns the Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure. The Ministry confirmed that adult:child ratios were met.	not investigated
The complainant alleged a staff member at the service yelled at them in front of children and teachers.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure. The complainant received an apology from the staff member.	not investigated