



Summary Table – 2019 Licensed Early Learning Service Complaints

The table attached summarises the complaints the Ministry of Education received about licensed early learning services in 2019.

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 we, a service, or another agency may have taken.

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

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 can be 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- could not be investigated due to lack of information provided by the complainant or were withdrawn by the complainant and it didn't indicate a risk to participating children
- 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 whose child had been removed from the service and their concerns were resolved by the early learning service).

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was unhappy with how a service responded to their child leaving the premises unaccompanied by an adult.	The Ministry investigation found that improvements could be made to the perimeter fence, which were carried out to the Ministry's satisfaction.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that the Ministry was not notified of a temporary relocation. In addition two school-aged children attended the service some days during school holidays.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had breached requirements. The service was reminded that an application for a temporary relocation is required and that school-aged children cannot participate in the early learning programme. The service changed its attendance practice. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant had removed their child from the service as they were concerned with high staff turnover, poor transition between rooms, inadequate supervision, lack of food and poor management and communication around incidents.	The Ministry investigation found a number of issues at the service. The service was required to develop transition plans for children when moving between rooms and individual development plans for children with additional learning needs. Relevant policies and procedures were reviewed and updated. SELO PLD was also provided and changes to practice monitored.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned after their child was given medication when it was not required.	The Ministry investigation requested the service to review relevant policies and procedures. No further action was required.	Upheld
The complainant had a number of concerns, including the behaviour of a child at the service, who repeatedly injured another child, and that school-aged children attended the service during school holidays.	The Ministry investigation found a breach of the regulations as school-aged children cannot participate in an early learning programme. No other breaches were identified. However, the Ministry required the service to undertake a self-review. SELO PLD support was also provided. The service was reminded that school-aged children cannot attend the service.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the service's fee structure.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the service amending its published fee structure to provide clarity around fees charged.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with a service's response to a complaint about fees charged, including an optional charge that was not communicated to parents.	The Ministry investigation and subsequent audit showed that the optional charge did breach funding rules. The enrolment form was amended and the service put processes to ensure parents were notified of any changes to fees.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about high temperatures at the service.	The Ministry investigation, informed by a health report, considered that the temperature during an identified heatwave was too high at the service. The service was advised to follow recommendations from a Health Protection Officer to lower temperatures at the service. A site visit confirmed that these recommendations were followed and successfully lowered the temperature to acceptable levels. At the site visit the Ministry identified a number of other concerns which resulted in a provisional licence. The Ministry continues to monitor the service through the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that the service did not notify appropriate agencies after dismissing a teacher for rough handling of a child. The complainant was also concerned with the service's assessment, planning, and evaluation.	The Ministry investigation found the service had notified the Teaching Council and NZ Police, but failed to notify the Ministry. As a result, the service was reminded of its reporting obligations as part of its child protection policy. Concerns with curriculum delivery were identified and subsequently supported and monitored through SELO PLD which was already in place through an existing provisional licence. The service has since returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy about how the service communicated with them about their child.	The Ministry investigation required the service to review its policies around children with shared care arrangements and communication with parents.	Upheld
Complainant expressed concern about unclean play spaces and alleged the children's toilet and nappy changing area was unhygienic.	The Ministry investigation found that, in response to the complaint, the service reviewed its cleaning procedures and identified areas for upgrade. The Ministry was satisfied that policies and procedures were followed. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how a staff member spoke to them following an incident of sexualised behaviour by their child at the service. The complainant withdrew their child from the service.	Following the Ministry investigation the service implemented a performance improvement plan for the staff member and made a notification to the Teaching Council and Oranga Tamariki. The complainant's child returned to the service following a meeting between the parent and the service.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant alleged that there were more children attending the service than the licence maximum.	The Ministry investigated and found that the service had exceeded the licence maximum on one occasion. The service provider was required to update its policies and procedures and was reminded of its responsibilities.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a child had left the service unaccompanied by an adult.	The Ministry investigation found that the service made improvements to secure the gate and reviewed the supervision of the outside area. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about a lack of appropriate security systems, a broken entry gate, children being able to open external doors and the service's reception being left unattended when parents visit. They were also concerned that the service had not adequately responded to their concerns.	The Ministry investigated and the service was required to fix the fence and entry gate, include gates and entry points in its hazard register, and raise the height of door handles. The Ministry was satisfied that the service had mitigated the risk.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about the safety of children as the main door of the service was hard to close and was often left open.	The Ministry investigation required the door to be fixed and found that the risk of children leaving the premises was mitigated by an external gate that prevented children from leaving the premises unaccompanied by an adult. Through the investigation other concerns with nappy changing and the sleep room were identified and resolved by the service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant had concerns about the safety and suitability of equipment at the service after their child fell and injured their eye on the corner of a table.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had mitigated any future risk by installing corner protectors on its tables and setting furniture to allow ample space for children to initiate movement. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about child safety, the service's response to incidents and the service's complaints procedure.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service was required to make improvements to its incident management processes and child protection policy.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a service remained open despite paint fumes in the centre. The service was mitigating this by requiring all children and teachers to remain in the outdoor space.	The Ministry required the service to close until the centre was safe for children and teachers to re-enter the centre.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a service remained open despite paint fumes in the centre. The service was mitigating this by requiring all children and teachers to remain in the outdoor space.	The Ministry required the service to close until the centre was safe for children and teachers to re-enter the centre. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about sleep and nappy changing facilities at the service due to a burst pipe flooding parts of the service.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was unable to meet regulatory requirements while repairs were being carried out and was required to close. The Ministry conducted a follow up visit following the repairs and were satisfied with the service's response. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with the quality of education and care their child was receiving. The complainant was also concerned about the service not administering medicine as requested.	The Ministry investigation found that assessment and planning processes could be improved. SELO PLD was provided to support the service. The complainant resolved the issue about administering medicine with the service.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a van had been in an accident while on an excursion and that the car seats were no longer safe. No-one was injured in the accident.	The Ministry investigated and required the service to have the seats in the van assessed by Plunket or NZ Police before they used it for transportation. The service decided to no longer use the van. Other concerns identified during the investigation were rectified. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service was meeting their child's behavioural needs and that the service would only continue the child's enrolment if supported by a family member due to the child's needs.	The Ministry investigation required the service to review and update relevant policies and procedures. The service worked with the complainant to meet the child's needs and a referral was made to the Ministry's Learning Support team. PLD was also provided for staff. The Ministry was satisfied that the service had improved its practice and policies for children with additional learning needs.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned after their child was injured while in the sleep room. The child's hip was broken after being caught in the bars of a stacker cot and the cot guard rail hit the child's head. The broken hip was identified when the complainant took their child to the hospital.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the service being placed on a provisional licence. The service was required to make improvements to its incident notification processes, child protection and sleep policies in relation to the use of stacker cots. The Ministry notified Oranga Tamariki and NZ Police	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
	who decided not to progress an investigation. The service returned to a full licence once all conditions on the provisional licence were met. The child did not return to the service.	
Complainant considered that the service had behaved inappropriately towards them and their child, including name calling, not being responsive to their child's needs, sending their child home for hitting other children, asking them to move their child to another service and breaching privacy.	The Ministry investigation found there were areas for improvement. The service arranged mentoring and PLD for the staff member, agreed a development plan for the child and apologised for breaching privacy. However, while the complainant was happy with the outcome, they moved their child to another service.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about changes at the service which resulted in staff resignations and a lack of communication with parents.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches. However, SELO PLD was provided to strengthen management practice.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about the service's hazard management and notification processes following an incident where a child became tangled in fabric.	The Ministry investigation found that the hazard was immediately removed following the incident, but a number of breaches were identified resulting in a full licence assessment of the service. The breaches identified had been remedied prior to the assessment. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was scratched by another child at the service, wasn't eating and was allowed to play in the rain. They also felt that the service's practices were in conflict with its philosophy.	The Ministry investigated and required the service to review relevant policies. The service involved staff and parents in the review of the policies and ensured staff were familiar with positive guidance approaches when managing behaviour to keep children safe.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about their child's safety at the service after their child was hit and subjected to sexualised behaviour by another child.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of breaches and the service was placed on a provisional licence with conditions relating to supervision, incident management and the effective implementation of development plans. A notification was made to Oranga Tamariki but it did not meet their threshold for investigation. SELO PLD was provided to support the service. The service returned to a full licence once conditions were met.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service managed an incident where their child left the premises unaccompanied by an adult.	The Ministry investigation found concerns with the service's policies and procedures. The concerns raised fed into a wider investigation that resulted in the service's licence being suspended. The licence was subsequently cancelled when the suspension conditions were not met.	Upheld
Complainant alleged unprofessional conduct and behaviour by the service provider, shortage of staff, use of unqualified staff, and that staff are not aware of policies or procedures.	The Ministry investigation identified concerns with person responsible requirements, which were subsequently complied with. No other regulatory breaches were identified.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about supervision for under-twos, behaviour management practices for crying infants and teacher wellbeing.	The Ministry investigation identified concerns. Actions for improvement were agreed and the service continues to be monitored.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that a service had failed to notify them of a number of incidents involving sexualised play.	The service had notified Oranga Tamariki and NZ Police of these incidents. A notification was also made to the Teaching Council. As a result of the Ministry's investigation the service was placed on a provisional licence. The service was required to strengthen child protection and supervision policies and procedures and engaged in child protection training. The service was subsequently returned to a full licence after showing non-compliance had been remedied. Oranga Tamariki and NZ Police's investigation were subsequently closed. However, advice and guidance was provided to the service to improve practice.	Upheld
Complainant raised concerns about behaviour management strategies used by staff after hearing children crying at the service.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any breach of the regulatory requirements. However, improvements in behaviour management strategies were identified. The service reviewed its positive guidance policy and practices and has strengthened practice in this area.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the service's management of a child's medical needs.	The Ministry investigation found the service had made changes to address the complainant's concerns. The Ministry worked with the service to further strengthen processes around the documentation and sharing of individual health needs. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how an incident of sexualised behaviour by another child was handled by the service. The complainant had removed their child from the service.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the service's licence being reclassified as provisional and SELO PLD was provided. Oranga Tamariki was notified and required no further action, but did provide advice and guidance to the complainant.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant alleged that the service did not respond adequately to an accident where their child tripped on the edge of a sandpit resulting in a graze across their face. The complainant removed their child from the service.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service was required to review its incident procedures and engagement with parents, as well as provide staff training and induction. The service also made improvements to the sandpit area to mitigate future accidents.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that the service had not referred their child for learning support in a timely manner and that there was poor communication from the service.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service reviewed its communication with parents. The service also provided PLD for teachers to improve practice and undertook to work alongside the complainant on agreed learning plans, including referring the child for specialist support. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service managed optional charges.	An investigation found that the service breached funding rules. The enrolment form was updated to meet requirements and parents were informed.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service managed optional charges.	A Ministry investigation found the service breached funding rules. The enrolment form was updated to meet requirements and parents were informed. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that the food provided at the service was not meeting nutritional needs and that food served did not meet the service's policy.	The Ministry sought advice from Public Health on the service's menu. The complainant was also advised to raise their concerns directly with the service. The Ministry met with the service to confirm that the updated menu met children's needs. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service managed their child's toilet training. They alleged the service was not meeting the child's and family's needs and was not following policies and procedures.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was not following policies and procedures. A number of other concerns were also identified and as a result the service was placed on a provisional licence. SELO PLD was provided to provide governance support. The service has since returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant was dissatisfied with service's response to an incident where a child received scratches and bruising from another child. The complainant alleged that the service did not follow its incident procedure.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had identified gaps in its systems and processes relating to communication with parents, as well as teachers' capacity when dealing with children with additional learning needs. Improvements were made to the induction process for new teachers.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service managed optional charges.	An investigation found that the service breached funding rules. The enrolment form was updated to meet requirements and parents were informed.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with the wellbeing of children at the service due to how staff were rostered and assigned roles and responsibilities. They were also concerned with how this impacted on curriculum delivery and that there was poor communication with parents.	The Ministry investigation resulted in improvements to rostering and clarification of roles and responsibilities. PLD was provided to strengthen leadership and processes were put in place to improve communication with parents. The service was put on a provisional licence due to other breaches identified during the investigation. The service continues to be monitored through the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that their child was left in the outside area unsupervised when all other children were having food inside.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service was required to review and make changes to its supervision policies and procedures to ensure all children are accounted for. A development plan was agreed for the child. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that the service, which was located in a public building, did not have sufficient security to prevent non-authorized adults with criminal convictions from accessing the service. The complainant also notified NZ Police.	The Ministry investigation required the service to amend its systems and process for visitors entering the service. The NZ Police did not take any further action.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that a child was not given prescribed medication as requested. They were also unsatisfied with the subsequent response from the service.	The Ministry's investigation resulted in the service reviewing its medication policy and complaints procedures. The Ministry was satisfied with the actions taken by the service and no further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a teacher at the service had yelled at children and pushed them numerous times.	The Ministry investigation found that the teacher was stood down while an investigation was undertaken. A mandatory report was made to the Teaching Council, and SELO PLD was provided. The service developed an improvement plan to better meet the needs of children and families. During the Ministry investigation other breaches were identified and the service was placed on a provisional licence. The service continues to be monitored through the provisional licence.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant alleged poor communication with parents about the suspension of the service's licence, including alternative services in the area. The complainant was also concerned that money raised through regular fundraising was not spent on equipment, and families were not advised what it was spent on.	The Ministry provided information to the complainant regarding the availability of other services in the area. Once the suspension conditions were met the service was placed on a provisional licence to manage other concerns.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy about changes made to the service's medication policy without consultation with parents.	The Ministry investigation found that correct processes were not in place. The service was required to review its policies and practices to ensure correct procedures were followed. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about the food policy at the service. Their child would not eat the service's food and the service would not allow the child to eat the food supplied by the family.	The Ministry investigation found the parents and service reached an understanding. However, the parent withdrew their child from the service. As a result of the complaint the service reviewed its menu and invited all parents to complete a survey about the food provided.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with the length of time the service took to contact them after their child was injured. They were also unhappy with the measures put in place by the service to prevent further injuries.	The Ministry investigation required the service to implement new safety measures to mitigate future incidents. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant alleged a teacher was under the influence of drugs and alcohol while at the service.	The Ministry investigation found that the teacher was stood down while an investigation was undertaken resulting in a mandatory report being made to the Teaching Council. The Ministry investigation identified other concerns and the service was placed on a provisional licence. The Ministry continues to monitor the service through the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with a staff member's interaction with their child and considered that there was an unhappy and difficult environment at the service.	The Ministry investigation did not find any regulatory breaches but found staff could better manage children's behaviour. SELO PLD was provided to support and strengthen staff competency.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about behaviour management strategies used by staff, including the rough handling of a child by a staff member and the service's complaints procedure.	The Ministry investigation identified concerns relating to child protection and behaviour management practices. Concerns were also identified with the service's management of the allegations of ill-treatment against a staff member. A mandatory report was filed with the Teaching Council. NZ Police and Oranga Tamariki were notified. The allegation of ill-treatment against the staff member was unable to be substantiated. However, a number of other breaches were identified and the licence was suspended. The service has since been returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned when their child came home with a bruise on their face and the service was unable to confirm what had happened. The complainant withdrew their child from the service.	The Ministry investigation found the service had reviewed the incident and made improvements. The service also met with the complainant who was happy with the outcome. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a teacher had withheld food as a behaviour management strategy.	The Ministry investigation found that a teacher had delayed giving food to a child as a behaviour management strategy. The service raised its concerns with the teacher and provided further support, including PLD. The Ministry continues to work with the service.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned at how a service that was closing disposed of photos of children without consultation with parents.	The Ministry investigation found that while the service had closed contact had been made with the service provider who apologised to the complainant.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a notification was not made to the Teaching Council about a teacher who was dismissed following an investigation.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had made a report to the Teaching Council, but failed to advise the Ministry of the notification. The service was reminded of its responsibilities and continues to be monitored by the Ministry.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that the service was not following the child's food plan and was serving food the child was allergic to on a number of occasions.	The Ministry investigation required the service to review and update food policies and training was provided to all staff. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant alleged the manager of the service was not police vetted.	The Ministry investigation found a number of breaches, including safety checking. The service was placed on a provisional licence. The Ministry continues to monitor the service.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service managed an incident where their child broke their collarbone. The incident was not witnessed.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the service being issued a provisional licence. The Ministry continues to monitor the service to strengthen practice around supervision and incident management.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned that their child was being bullied by other children and the complainant was unhappy with how the service was managing their concerns.	The Ministry investigation identified that the service was not supporting the child's social competence. The service was placed on a provisional licence and SELO PLD was provided to strengthen teacher's knowledge and skills relating to children's learning needs. The child was removed from the service. The Ministry continues to monitor the service through the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy about the exclusion of their child from the service.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service was supported to improve its practices around communicating with parents and to ensure documented plans are in place for children with additional needs. The service was already putting all staff through the Incredible Years programme. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy about being asked to collect their child when their temperature was under 38 degrees.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the service reviewing its policies and practices relating to child illness, which they consulted on with parents. The child was removed from the service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a gate at the service did not close properly creating potential for children to leave the service unsupervised by an adult.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service put in place a number of mitigations to ensure children didn't leave the service unsupervised until the gate was replaced. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy after their child left the service unaccompanied by an adult.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had contacted the NZ Police after noticing the child was missing. The child was found unharmed at their home. The service installed improved gates, made layout changes to equipment and furniture, reviewed its supervision plan, and amended the roster to improve supervision. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that the service's roof was leaking and water was being collected in a bucket. The complainant was unhappy with the service's response when the concern was raised.	Following an investigation the Ministry required the service to fix the leak and the work was completed. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the service's recording and reporting of incidents after their child received a skull fracture from a fall.	The Ministry investigation found a breach of regulatory requirements around accident and incident recording. The service reviewed teacher practice and reinforced expectations for staff around recording of accidents and informing parents.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned when they went to collect their child and found them outside the service's premises, unsupervised.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had put in place measures to mitigate the gate being left open. The service worked with the Ministry's learning support team to put in provide additional support for the child. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about the behaviour of a child with additional learning needs towards other children, and the level of support provided for that child.	The Ministry investigated and identified that further support for the child was required. This support was put in place for the child at the service, and to support their transition to school.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that their child was hurt when they fell down stairs while in their wheelchair. The complainant was concerned that the service did not seek medical treatment and that their child was not being supervised.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the service being placed on a provisional licence. Oranga Tamariki, WorkSafe and the Teaching Council were notified. The complainant had previously notified NZ Police. The service was required to review its incident management procedures and provide all staff with professional development on responding to incidents. The service was returned to a full licence when the Ministry was satisfied that the service had put processes in place to mitigate any similar incidents. The child did not return to the service.	Upheld
Complainant raised concerns about the service's privacy policy in terms of sharing photographs of children.	The Ministry investigated and, while no regulatory breach was identified, the service was required to undertake a review of its privacy policy. The service continued to be monitored through an existing provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant notified the Ministry that a home-based service was operating without adequate fencing to prevent children leaving the premises.	The Ministry immediately contacted the service provider who suspended education and care in this home. The service was placed on a provisional licence and was subject to ongoing monitoring by the Ministry. The service received SELO PLD and has been returned to a full licence.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned about an educator leaving children unsupervised, sharing private information, and animal hygiene. They were also unhappy with the service's response to their concerns.	The Ministry investigation upheld the complaint and the educator was subject to increased monitoring visits from the service to ensure they were managing supervision and hygiene requirements. The service provided privacy PLD for all educators at the service.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about the level of support provided by a coordinator and the support provided by the service to that coordinator.	The Ministry investigation found that there were breaches of the regulatory requirements. As the service was already on a provisional licence these additional breaches were monitored alongside the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a home based service was operating with approximately 10 children.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had been breaching ratios during the transition between two sessions each day. The Ministry required the service to amend enrolment hours so that no further breach would occur. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's response.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that the service failed to safety check staff, committed fraud and had poor employment practices.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service's licence was suspended. When the suspension conditions were not met the licence was cancelled. An audit confirmed that the service was not compliant with funding rules.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that the service failed to safety check staff, committed fraud and had poor employment practices.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service's licence was suspended. When the suspension conditions were not met the licence was cancelled. An audit confirmed that the service was not compliant with funding rules.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a service was exceeding adult:child ratios.	The service confirmed with the Ministry that there had been instances of children being collected late when sessional care was being undertaken. The service also confirmed that changes had been made to prevent further instances occurring. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's response. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about water pooling in an old sandpit in the play area at a service.	The Ministry investigation found the service was actively managing and mitigating risk of "pooling" water whilst working on a more permanent solution with the neighbouring property. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that teachers were openly smoking around children on an excursion.	The Ministry investigation found that the teachers involved were given written warnings and the service's smoking and excursion policies were reviewed. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's response. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a child had been severely scratched and bitten by another child while in the sleep room. The child received significant injuries which required medical treatment.	The service made a number of improvements to mitigate future incidents, including ensuring a staff member is present in the sleep room while children are sleeping. The service had notified Oranga Tamariki and sought support for the child who did the biting and scratching. The injured child was removed from the service and now attends another service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns, including that their child was sent home sick in conflict with the service's policy, no incident form was completed when their child grazed their arm, children at the service were often sick, children were playing roughly with each other without proper supervision and children playing outside in the rain.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service reviewed its health and safety policies and held professional learning and development sessions with its staff.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that a child's food plan was not being implemented, that children were being excluded from excursions and celebrations and that the service opened in the mornings without a qualified person responsible.	The Ministry investigation found the service had incorrectly thought a teacher in training could be a person responsible. Practice was changed when the service realised this was incorrect. The other allegations could not be substantiated. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy they found their child unsupervised in the locker room of the service. The child was not able to leave this area.	The Ministry investigation found that the child was in the space for a short time after the door had been closed by another parent. The service was required to make changes to the door leading to the locker room, including inserting an additional latch to mitigate the risk of the door being accidentally closed. It also installed a mirror to enable staff to better monitor children in the future.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of issues with a service, including health and safety concerns, poor employment practices, falsification of records and misuse of government funding.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of concerns and proposed a full licence assessment. Due to this, and other management issues, the service provider decided to close prior to the assessment. The licence was subsequently cancelled.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned about how sexualised play between children was being managed, including concerns about supervision. The complainant made a notification to Oranga Tamariki and NZ Police.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was managing the concern consistent with regulations. While there were no breaches in terms of supervision, changes were made to ensure all areas in the service could be easily supervised, and to the inside environment to make it more engaging for older children. Policies were reviewed and staff training provided. The complaint did not meet NZ Police's threshold for investigation. Oranga Tamariki visited the service and arranged professional learning and development for staff.	Upheld
Complainant witnessed a staff member yell, restrain and push children. The complainant also raised concerns about curriculum and a lack of appropriate resources.	The Ministry investigated and required the service to improve positive behaviour management practices. The service was also required to make improvements to hazard management practices. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was being bullied by another child and the service was not responsive when the complainant raised concerns.	The Ministry investigation resulted in additional support being provided to the child who was bullying. SELO PLD was provided to support staff in positive behaviour guidance. The child's behaviour improved as a result of the support.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how a service managed an enrolment process which resulted in the service refusing to enrol their child.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had not breached the regulations, but were reminded about the importance of clear communication with parents. The Ministry supported the parent to find an alternative service for their child.	Upheld
Complainant was not happy with how the service implemented its policy around head lice. Concerns around cleanliness and supervision were also raised.	The Ministry investigation found that the service's policy was appropriately implemented. In response to the concern about cleanliness, the service reviewed its practices around keeping learning spaces tidy throughout the day. The supervision concern could not be substantiated. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant had multiple concerns about the service, including poor management, ill treatment of children including force-feeding, children being left unsupervised, ratios and concerns over the safety checking of staff.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the suspension of the licence. The service's licence was later cancelled as the service provider failed to meet the conditions of the suspension. Concerns were referred to Oranga Tamariki and NZ Police. The allegations did not reach the agencies' threshold for investigation.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that their child was left to sleep on the service's outside deck on a hot day. The child required medical treatment for the effects of heat.	As a result of the Ministry investigation staff undertook PLD, reviewed relevant policies and procedures and the staff involved underwent a disciplinary process. The child was moved to another service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant had concerns about the way a change of management process was managed especially regarding communication with parents and induction of new staff. The complainant was concerned that staff had not been police checked and qualifications were not displayed at the service.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of concerns with the new service provider and the service was placed on a provisional licence. The service met all conditions of the provisional licence and was returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns, including alleged hygiene breaches, ratios, staff turnover and lack of mentoring for newly registered teachers.	The Ministry investigation identified some areas for improvement which were remedied immediately. The Ministry monitored the service until satisfied that changes had been satisfactorily implemented.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about the nappy changing procedure and lack of permanent staff at the service.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of areas that needed improvement. The service was on a provisional licence when the complaint was received and continues to be monitored to address these areas.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the lack of learning stories about their child, poor communication with parents around a biting incident and staff changes at the service.	The Ministry investigation found a number of concerns with the service following a restructure, including complex employment issues. The Ministry provided governance support and there was a subsequent change of service provider. The Ministry continued to provide support to the service.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns, including confirming attendance, the food provided, fees and high staff turnover.	The Ministry investigated and found that the service was meeting requirements. However, the Ministry discussed the need for clear and transparent communication with parents.	Upheld
Complainant had multiple concerns about a service, including poor teacher behaviour, not helping with toilet training and behaviour management practices. Complainant was also unhappy with how the staff spoke to them.	The Ministry investigation identified areas of non-compliance. The service was placed on a provisional licence and was subject to ongoing monitoring by the Ministry. The service received SELO PLD and have been returned to a full licence.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was unhappy with the lack of communication around a child's transition between rooms, food provided by the service and how fees were calculated.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service was required to undertake an internal evaluation of its communication with parents. The fees issue was resolved between the service and the complainant. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was dissatisfied with the service's response to an incident where a child climbed a boundary fence near a busy road.	The Ministry investigation required the service to review the outdoor supervision procedure. The service agreed to increase ratios to support supervision at the service.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns, including alleged fraud, ratios and some staff swearing.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches to the regulations. However, recommendations were made to improve record keeping.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned their child had been isolated in the sleep room and potentially mistreated. They also alleged that when they approached the service about their concern they were threatened with police action.	The Ministry investigation found the child had not been isolated and was sleeping in the sleep room with other children. The service was required to make improvements to its complaints procedure. SELO PLD was put in place to support teaching practice on building social competency strategies.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with ratios, a lack of professional development, and high staff turnover. They also alleged that staff swore at children and acted inappropriately towards a parent.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of concerns, including supervision and child protection breaches. The service was already on a provisional licence. The Ministry worked with the service provider to put in place immediate improvements, including additional staff to support the layout of the service and PLD for staff on obligations under the Children's Act. The Ministry continued to monitor the service until it was returned to a full licence. Mandatory reports were made to the Teaching Council.	Upheld
Complainant had numerous concerns about a service that had recently undergone a change of management. Concerns included supervision, sleep provisions, nappy changing procedure, bottle fed children not being supported while being fed, hygiene, safety checking concerns, access to water, teachers and children being bitten and hit and high noise levels.	The Ministry investigation found some of the allegations to be upheld. The service was placed on a provisional licence, subsequently remedied all concerns and were returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child had been hurt by other children on a number of occasions. The complainant questioned whether supervision at the service was appropriate and was unhappy with the service's communication about their child.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service was required to review its complaints procedure and positive guidance policy.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns, including the lack of a culturally responsive curriculum, privacy, concerns around permission to collect children, a notification that was made to Oranga Tamariki, shoes being taken off and children with wet and dirty clothes. The complainant was also concerned the complaints policy was not visible.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any breaches to the regulations. However, there were areas identified that could be improved. This included consultation with families and inclusion of parent aspirations in decision making.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns about the service, including children being exposed to secondary smoke, teachers and children being yelled at, concerns over the outside environment, insufficient resources for children and that the service was dirty.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service was placed on a provisional licence. The service subsequently met all the conditions of the provisional licence and was returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about the management of the service, including teachers using poor behaviour management strategies, concerns with procedures for children's sleep and staff being unable to take breaks due to insufficient staffing.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of concerns and proposed a full licence assessment. Due to this and other management issues the service provider decided to close prior to the assessment. The licence was subsequently cancelled.	Upheld
Complainant had multiple concerns about a number of issues, including ratios, communication with parents, privacy and supervision at the service.	The Ministry investigated and identified a number of concerns. The service rectified all concerns immediately and no further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant raised concerns about teacher behaviour and complaint management at the service.	The Ministry investigation found improvements were needed in the service's communication with parents. The service made improvements to the relationship management policy and procedures.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that their child had been held down on the floor and on another occasion had been locked outside.	The Ministry investigated and found that the service was using appropriate behaviour management strategies. The child was already receiving Ministry Learning Support. The Ministry required the	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
	service to review relevant policies and procedures, develop a supervision plan and undertake professional development.	
Complainant alleged that the service did not report a number of accidents to them and that a teacher pinched their child. The complainant also raised concerns about the service's complaints procedure.	The Ministry investigated and, while the allegations were not substantiated, improvements were identified for the complaints process. The Ministry worked with the service to improve communication with parents in response to complaints.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about the quality of a service following a change of management. Concerns included their child being hurt by other children, nappy changing, insufficient food and drink provided, supervision, and concerns about the complaints procedure.	The Ministry investigation found some non-compliance related to the complaint. During the investigation a number of other concerns were also identified resulting in the service being placed on a provisional licence. The service subsequently remedied all concerns and was returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was able to leave the premises unaccompanied by an adult by climbing a tree beside the fence. The child was returned to the service by a member of the public. The complainant was concerned about inadequate supervision and hazard management.	The Ministry investigation required changes be made to the outside environment and a review of relevant policies, including incident management. SELO PLD was provided to support improvements to health and safety requirements.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about supervision while children ate, the administration of medicine and communication with parents. The complainant was also unhappy with the service's response to their complaint.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the service reviewing policies, including supervision, health and safety and communication with parents. SELO PLD was also provided to support governance and management.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about supervision while children ate, bottle cleaning, administration of medicine and communication with parents.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the service reviewing policies, including supervision, health and safety and communication with parents. SELO PLD was also provided to support governance and management.	Upheld
Complainant concerned that CCTV cameras had been installed at the service without parental permission and one camera was directly facing a nappy changing table.	The Ministry investigated and found that the camera was not facing the nappy changing area. The Ministry recommended the service seek parental permission prior to the placement of any cameras at the service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with the number of accidents their child had been involved in while attending the service. The complainant was also concerned with the level of supervision at the service.	The Ministry investigated and the service was required to amend its incidents policy in relation to parent communication and involvement. The Ministry was satisfied that the service was meeting requirements.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that CCTV cameras had been installed at the service without parental permission and one camera was directly facing a nappy changing table.	The Ministry investigated and found that the camera was not facing the nappy changing area. The Ministry recommended the service seek parental permission prior to the placement of any cameras at the service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with the service's incident management processes after their child left the premises unaccompanied by an adult. The complainant was unhappy with the service's response to their complaint.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service made improvements to its incident management processes. The investigation found that a gate had been left open. The service ensured the gate was checked daily through the hazard checklist and that there was better signage on the gate. The child was enrolled in another service.	Upheld
Complainant had multiple concerns about ratios, communication with parents particularly following an incident, privacy relating to CCTV footage, and employment practices.	The Ministry investigated and found that the service was meeting ratio and parent notification requirements. The Ministry recommended the service seek parental permission prior to the placement of any cameras at the service. The complainant was referred to the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) in response to employment issues as the concerns aligned more directly with MBIE's role.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a teacher used restraint on a child on multiple occasions. The complainant felt that the service did not respond appropriately to their concerns.	The Ministry investigation could not determine if undue force was used. However, the service was reminded of its responsibilities when allegations of this nature are made. The service reviewed its policies and procedures and put PLD in place to better support teachers' behaviour management practices. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that an adult, who they believed had not been safety-checked, was being counted in adult:child ratios and had unsupervised access to children at the service.	The Ministry investigated and determined the appropriate checks had been undertaken and that this person was not counted in adult:child ratios, or left alone with children. The Ministry required updates to the service's child protection and safety checking policies.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned about the service remaining open during two separate events of a water outage and a power cut. They also alleged that children attending the service were restricted from accessing the outside space at certain times of the day and practicum students were counted in ratio.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was meeting ratios, however other concerns were identified resulting in SELO PLD being provided. A subsequent licensing assessment resulted in the service moving from a probationary to a full licence as all concerns had been addressed. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant raised concerns following an accident where a child tripped and cut their finger, which required medical treatment at hospital. The complainant also raised concerns regarding the health and safety of children at the service and believed there was a lack of first aid training among staff.	The Ministry investigation found the service had responded appropriately to the accident, including taking the child to hospital immediately and notifying WorkSafe. No breaches to regulations were identified, although the daily hazard checklist was strengthened to include tripping hazards. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns, including children fighting and throwing objects, ratios and not meeting person responsible requirements.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of the service breaching ratio requirements but the person responsible requirement had not been met on the occasion noted. The Ministry required changes to processes to ensure this was not repeated. SELO PLD was provided to support children's social competence. Development plans were reviewed and the Ministry's Learning Support team helped staff develop strategies to better support children with additional needs.	Upheld
Complainant was unsatisfied with a staff member's interaction with their children, felt that parent aspirations were not being met, and was concerned with the high use of relievers. The complainant withdrew their children from the service.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the allegations against the staff member, but did find that improvements could be made to the induction and mentoring of staff. The service reviewed its processes and the Ministry was satisfied with the improvements made.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a staff member was under the influence of drugs while at the service.	The Ministry investigation found the allegation to be unsubstantiated. However, the Ministry required the service provider to make improvements to its safety checking procedures. The Ministry was satisfied with the actions taken by the service provider to address the complaint.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that the service was breaching ratios and leaving children unsupervised. They were also concerned about hazards at the service and the cleanliness of the kitchen.	The Ministry investigation found evidence of breaches in relation to hazards and person responsible requirements. The service provided evidence to show that these breaches had been remedied. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about incident procedures, supervision and safety of the outdoor space after their child was concussed when they fell from outdoor play equipment. The complainant also made a notification to WorkSafe.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had not responded appropriately to the incident and was placed on a provisional licence. The Ministry worked with the service to update policies and procedures. Breaches were rectified and the service was returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant alleged numerous concerns about the governance of the service including bullying, high staff turnover, lack of response to serious allegations and failure to provide a mandatory report to the Teaching Council.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had followed appropriate processes in responding to allegations of ill treatment and had sought independent advice to guide them. A notification was made to the Teaching Council. The service also contracted external support for governance issues.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a child was suspended from the service due to their behaviour towards other children and that the child was not adequately supervised while attending the service.	The Ministry investigated and could not substantiate the allegations of suspension, however identified improvements were needed in managing child behaviour. SELO PLD was provided to the service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant raised a number of concerns about their child being hurt by other children, ratios, teacher turnover, unsafe play equipment, health and safety, poor communication and poor behaviour management practices. The complainant removed their child from the service. The complainant was also concerned that a notification was made to Oranga Tamariki about a child in their care following their complaint to the service.	The Ministry investigation did not find any regulatory breaches. However, improvements were made to the complaints procedure, a potential hazard was removed from the playground and wet weather gear was provided for children. The notification to Oranga Tamariki was in line with the service's child protection policy.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that their child had several accidents in a short period of time. They were also concerned with high staff turnover, a lack of communication about their child's transition to the over-2 room and with how the service managed their concerns.	The Ministry investigation found that, while no regulatory breaches were identified, the service was required to review and strengthen its incident reporting and management policies and procedures.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a child left a service unaccompanied by an adult, and was not happy with the service's response when they followed up with the service with their concerns.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of breaches which resulted in the service's licence being suspended. The licence was subsequently cancelled when the suspension conditions were not met.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant had concerns about staff turnover, supervision, toileting, incidents resulting in injury, unhygienic play equipment, privacy and how food is served. The concerns were raised to the service but there was no response. The complainant noted they had also contacted Oranga Tamariki.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of breaches around identifying hazards and managing incidents, which the service resolved. The notification to Oranga Tamariki did not meet the threshold for investigation. SELO PLD was also provided to strengthen practice.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a child was bitten numerous times and that the service had poor incident management processes. The child was removed from the service.	The Ministry provided advice and guidance to the complainant about the process. The concerns raised fed into a wider investigation that resulted in the service's licence being suspended. The licence was subsequently cancelled when the suspension conditions were not met.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a child received bruises and scratches from another child on a number of occasions. They were unsatisfied with the service's response to their concerns and behaviour management procedures.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had implemented improvements to ensure the safety of all children. The service was on a waitlist for Ministry Learning Support to address the needs of the child who inflicted the injuries. The complainant withdrew their child from the service. No further action was taken.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about how the service responded to incidents of sexualised play, including a lack of communication with parents.	The Ministry investigation found that the service sought advice from the Ministry's Learning Support team about positive guidance. The service was required to review its supervision strategies and made changes to the outdoor environment in response to the incidents. The Ministry was satisfied with the actions taken by the service.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns following a service restructure, including person responsible, curriculum, administration of medicine, health and safety, and governance and management.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of other concerns and as a result the service was issued with a provisional licence. SELO PLD was put in place to support curriculum and governance. The service has now returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that staff members falsified attendance records and the service breached ratios related to the operation of a van service. The complainant also alleged there was bullying of staff and was not happy with the service's response to concerns raised.	The Ministry investigation identified recent breaches of ratios, person responsible requirements and other concerns. The service updated systems and processes to ensure ongoing compliance with these regulations. The complaints process was updated and an audit was carried out, which found a small over-claim. The service was reminded of the relevant funding rules. The Ministry continues to monitor the service.	Upheld
Complainant raised a number of concerns about the service, including employment practices, insufficient number of qualified teachers, poor and possibly fraudulent record keeping, fundraising funds not contributing to service resources, unsafe premises and facilities. The complainant also alleged that the centre manager lives onsite.	The Ministry investigation found a number of breaches, including safety checking. The service's licence was suspended until it met safety checking requirements and subsequently had the licence amended to provisional. SELO PLD support was also put in place to support improvements. The service continues to be monitored through the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about the lack of restraints used by the service when transporting children, ratios in the centre and during excursions and that teachers did not follow the service's sleep policies. They also alleged ill treatment of a child.	As a result of the Ministry's investigation the service was placed on a provisional licence. The service was subsequently returned to a full licence after demonstrating compliance.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about a staff member's inappropriate communication with children, other staff and parents and their lack of meaningful relationships with children. The complainant was also concerned with the number of staff resignations and that incidents were not appropriately managed.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the complaint about the teacher, but did find concerns with incident management and other issues that resulted in the service's licence being amended to provisional. The licence was subsequently suspended and, when the suspension conditions were not met, the licence was cancelled.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that their child's enrolment was cancelled due to the child's additional needs.	The Ministry investigation, and concerns raised through a separate complaint, resulted in the service's licence being reclassified as provisional. SELO PLD support was provided to the service. The service's licence was returned to full once the conditions on the provisional licence were met.	Upheld
Complainant alleged rough handling of a child by a staff member as well as other inappropriate behaviour management practices.	The Ministry investigation found that the staff member was stood down while an investigation took place. NZ Police and Oranga Tamariki were notified. The NZ Police investigation resulted in a formal warning, which will show on any vetting of the staff member for a role involving the care of children. The Ministry continues to monitor the service.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was unhappy with how the service managed an incident where a child's leg was broken. The complainant was also concerned with the safety of play equipment and supervision at the service.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service and then investigated when the complainant was unhappy with the service's response. The Ministry was satisfied that no breaches had occurred, but required the service to review its communication procedures. The service also reviewed its supervision plan and developed guidelines for the safe use of play equipment.	Upheld
Complainant alleged ill-treatment of children at a service by a teacher, including shouting and rough handling of children. The complainant was also unhappy with the service's response when concerns were raised.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the service being placed on a provisional licence and SELO PLD provided. The service was reminded of its child protection obligations and a notification was made to the Teaching Council. The service has subsequently returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about children throwing toys from the second floor of the premises to a shared public driveway.	The Ministry investigation required the service to improve supervision at the service to ensure items were not thrown on to the neighbouring driveway.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was bitten by another child on a number of occasions and was unhappy with how the service was managing the behaviour.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had put in place appropriate processes to manage the behaviour. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that their child received an ice burn from the use of an icepack to treat a bite from another child. The incident report was not provided to the complainant. The complainant was also unhappy that their child had been roughly handled by a volunteer.	As a result of the Ministry investigation changes were made to the service's first aid training. The investigation into the rough handling of the child found that the child was moved to prevent the child hurting another child and undue force was not used. The service undertook to strengthen induction, the role of volunteers, and to remind staff of positive behaviour management. The volunteer did not return to the service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was dissatisfied with a change to the service's hours of operation, and a change to fees.	The complainant was referred back to the service. The Ministry also contacted the service to ensure it completed the process to request an amendment to the service's licensed hours.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that they were unfairly stood down, bullied by management and subject to a performance review with false allegations. The complainant was also concerned that children were being left in soiled nappies when sleeping.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate employment related allegations. However, improvements were required to be made to supervision practices, including monitoring sleeping children.	Upheld
Complainant alleged physical ill treatment of a child by a staff member and bullying among children.	The Ministry investigated and found that the service did not follow its complaints procedure or child protection policy. However, the ill treatment by staff could not be substantiated. The service worked to ensure staff were familiar with the complaints procedure and child protection policies. The Ministry was satisfied and no further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about how the service managed the behaviour of their child who had additional learning needs. They also alleged that teachers held the child down and yelled at them. The child was no longer attending the service.	The Ministry investigation was unable to substantiate the allegations of restraint. However, improvements were required to be made to policies and practices relating to children with additional learning needs. SELO PLD was initiated to support the service review and improve practice in this area.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about supervision following an incident where a child was found by staff with an unexplained head injury. No staff members witnessed the accident and were unable to explain what happened.	The Ministry investigation found staff had responded appropriately to the accident once the child was found, including accessing medical attention and notifying WorkSafe. The service put in place additional measures to improve supervision processes and practices. The service was on a provisional licence at the time of the incident. The Ministry continues to monitor the service through the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how a service managed their child's needs, including not following the child's food plan, inappropriate clothing being used, activities that were unsuitable for children's developmental stage, safety and comfort and a lack of documented learning. Their child was removed from the service. The complainant was also unhappy with how the service managed the complaint.	The Ministry's investigation did not substantiate the concerns. However, improvements were required to the service's complaints procedure. The Ministry was satisfied that no further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a teacher restrained their child and another teacher yelled at the child. The complainant was also concerned that the service was not being responsive to the child's needs. There were also concerns with nappy changing, children being left in wet clothes and teachers shouting at children.	The Ministry investigation found that the allegations of ill treatment were unable to be substantiated. A number of other concerns were identified resulting in the service being placed on a provisional licence. SELO PD support was provided. The Ministry continues to monitor the service through the provisional licence.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant alleged that the service withheld food from a child as a form of behaviour management. They also raised concerns about teacher behaviour.	The Ministry investigation found the service had reviewed and improved policies and practices on managing child behaviour and complaints as well as communication with parents. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with a number of issues at a service relating to employment practices, adult:child ratios and policies not being updated.	The Ministry investigation found a number of governance and health and safety concerns, which the service remedied promptly. SELO PLD was provided to support better governance.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with the use of resources that were choking hazards. They were also unhappy with the service's response to their concerns.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service undertook a risk assessment and implemented controls to manage the risk. The Ministry was satisfied with the response from the service.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about a lack of supervision in the outside space, poor communication with parents and that their child was being bullied by other children. The child was removed from the service.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the issuing of a provisional licence. The service was required to improve its supervision plan and mitigate any risks relating to the layout of the service and provide staff PLD on positive behaviour practices. The service continues to be monitored by the Ministry through the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about the number of bruises their child sustained while at the service. They also alleged the service was not supervising children adequately and teachers were aggressive towards children. A notification was made to NZ Police and Oranga Tamariki. The complainant withdrew their child from the service.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the allegations. However, the service was required to review relevant policies. Due to other breaches the service was placed on a provisional licence. The licence was returned to full when all breaches were addressed. NZ Police and Oranga Tamariki did not investigate.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with bullying of staff, lack of support for high needs children, ratios, health and safety and HR matters. The complaint was also sent to the Teaching Council and ERO.	The Ministry investigation did not find any regulatory breaches. SELO PLD was provided to support governance and the service was working with staff on managing children's complex needs and behaviours. The complaint did not reach the Teaching Council's threshold for investigation.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child's face was sunburnt while at the service and considered that the service did not apply sunblock according to their sun safe policy. The complainant was also concerned about inconsistent communication between the service and complainant.	The service acknowledged that the policy was not followed and apologised to the complainant. The Ministry investigation was satisfied with the relevant policies and reminded the service to discuss its sun safe policy with all staff.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about supervision, poor teacher interactions with children and inappropriate behaviour management practices. This included, withholding food for bad behaviour, using threatening voices and rough handling of a child.	The Ministry investigation found the service could not substantiate the allegation of rough handling. However, other concerns were identified, including inadequate supervision and that staff do not have an understanding of the service's child protection policy. The service was issued with a provisional licence and continues to be monitored by the Ministry.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns, including that children were left outside and not able to get back in and were being left in wet clothes. The complainant was also concerned about how often the service was cleaned.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was managing the concerns with the complainant and had implemented changes to address the concerns. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a teacher dragged a child across the floor and was unhappy with the service's complaints process.	The Ministry's investigation identified a number of concerns with the service's incident management and child protection policy and processes. The service was placed on a provisional licence and required to make a mandatory report to the Teaching Council. The service subsequently met all the conditions of the provisional licence and was returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the way they, and their children, were treated on a transition visit and that their enrolments were later cancelled.	The Ministry investigation found the service had not followed its own processes. The service was supported to review its transition policy and practice.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns in relation to governance and teaching practices. Concerns included inappropriate governance decision making, lack of consultation with parents on curriculum, including removal of karakia from daily routines and no acknowledgement of Te Wiki o te Reo Māori, poor employment and recruitment practices and allegations of ill-treatment of children.	The Ministry investigation found that the allegation of ill treatment was not substantiated. However, other areas of non-compliance were identified which resulted in the suspension of the licence. The licence was amended to provisional once the suspension conditions were met. The service continues to be monitored through the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns about the service, including cleanliness, ratios, the service not making referrals for learning support and children's enrolments being cancelled. The complainant was not happy with the service's response to their concerns.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service's licence was suspended. Once immediate concerns were addressed the service was placed on a provisional licence. The Ministry continues to monitor the service through the provisional licence. The complainant withdrew their children from the service.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned that the service's fee structure was not clear, resulting in an outstanding debt. The complainant was also unhappy with the behaviour of a staff member who advised of the debt.	The Ministry investigation required the service to review relevant policies. The complainant withdrew their child from the service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service managed two separate incidents, one where their child's hair was cut, and another where their child cut their lip but no staff witnessed the incident.	The Ministry investigation found that the first incident had been resolved at the time. As a result of the Ministry investigation into the second concern the service undertook a self-review of its accident and incident management procedure and made improvements to how they communicate with parents. The child was enrolled in another service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy that a teacher was pulling their child's ear as punishment and that other children were bullying their child. The complainant was also concerned with the lack of response from the service when they raised their concerns.	The Ministry investigation found there was insufficient evidence to substantiate the allegations rough handling. However, the service had failed to adhere to its own complaints policy. The service was required to review complaints and improve their processes. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's actions. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant raised concerns about ratios and supervision after they witnessed a child hitting other children. The complainant was concerned that staff were not managing the situation appropriately.	The Ministry investigation required the service to review its positive behaviour guidance to better support children's safety. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was hurt and received scratches and bruising to their face that could not be explained by staff. The complainant was also concerned that the service was breaching ratios.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of concerns relating to supervision as well as accident and incident management and reporting. A significant number of other breaches were also identified resulting in the service's licence being amended to provisional. The Ministry continues to monitor the service on the provisional licence	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that children's enrolments were cancelled after raising complaints and concerns with the service about nappy changing, fees, food and sleep.	The Ministry investigation identified concerns in the management of complaints and communication with parents. The service was required to review all relevant policies and develop a third party communication plan to ensure an agreed communications process between agencies, parents and the service.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about how an incident, where their child hurt their mouth, was managed. The complainant was also unhappy with supervision and staff turnover.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service made improvements to policies and procedures, including supervision. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was bitten and bruised on a number of occasions while at the service. The complainant also considered that the service breached ratios and was not providing adequate supervision.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the service strengthening its supervision and incident management procedures. There were no concerns with ratios. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns about the care their child received at the service, including nappy changing procedures, sleep routine, frequent scratches and bruises with no incident notifications, loss of clothing and notification of fees owing. The complainant also considered that their privacy was breached when information was shared with their ex-partner.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches but required the service to review relevant policies and procedures, including communication with parents with shared custody arrangements. The child was withdrawn from the service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the nutritional value of the service's meals and the hygiene in the bathrooms.	The Ministry investigation found improvements were needed to documented records on food served and required changes to related systems and processes.	Upheld
Complainant alleged a service did not provide their child with enough formula and water and that the child became dehydrated with a high temperature.	The Ministry investigation found that there was confusion over the parent's requirements. The service made changes to its policies and procedures to mitigate the risk of this happening again. The child was removed from the service. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a child was roughly handled and shouted at by a teacher. The complainant was also unhappy with how the service responded to their concerns when this was raised.	The Ministry investigation found the service had responded appropriately to the allegations. Oranga Tamariki, NZ Police, and the Teaching Council were all notified. Oranga Tamariki's investigation did not identify any matters that needed to be taken further. However, the teacher was provided with PLD to support their management of child behaviour. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that a service was not meeting ratios, which put stress on teachers. They also alleged that a teacher had yelled at a child.	The Ministry investigation was not able to substantiate the yelling incident. As a result of the complaint the service made improvements to staffing levels and processes. The Ministry was	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
	satisfied with the improvements and continues to monitor the service to ensure the changes are sustained.	
Complainant was unhappy with the service's response and management of a number of incidents. This included an allegation that a teacher hit their child, that a string was tangled around their child's neck, and they were not notified. They removed their child from the service.	The Ministry investigation resulted in the service reviewing and making improvements to its incident management processes, hazard management and child protection policy. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's response. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about noise, limited space, not meeting ratios, children with additional learning needs not being adequately assessed for support, allegations of rough handling of children, lack of adequate food options, and a lack of resources and te ao Māori practices.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of breaches and the service was placed on a provisional licence. The Ministry continues to monitor the service on the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about supervision, health and safety, hazard management and the general governance and management of the service.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of breaches. The service was placed on a provisional licence. SELO PLD was provided to the service which continues to be monitored through the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a service was not meeting ratios, had failed to communicate with families about illnesses, struggled to retain staff and had no manager for 6 months.	The Ministry investigation found the service was meeting ratios and had reviewed relevant policies and procedures in relation to the complaint. The service also strengthened its communication with families and more staff were hired, including a manager. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's response and no further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with a number of issues at a service, including falsifying attendance records, lack of food and a poor work environment.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegation of a lack of food, but did identify system improvements were needed in the level of detail recorded of food served. A minor anomaly was identified in attendance records but this appeared to be a one-off error as opposed to a systematic issue. No other breaches were identified.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with the lack of qualified staff, and employment practices at the service.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was in breach of person responsible requirements on a few occasions. The Ministry required the service to reduce licence numbers to match the number of children attending to support the service through the recruitment of additional staff. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with supervision at the service after their child was involved in a number of accidents over a month, including cutting their mouth on broken glass. The complainant was also unhappy with the communication from the service.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of a breach. The service had processes in place and had made changes to practice after the complainant had raised concerns. Historic glass deposits at the service were mitigated by removing the affected soil. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns including rough handling of their child, not following agreed nappy changing procedures, poor communication about a referral to learning support, and the child not being changed into their own clothes following wet play. The complainant was also concerned about a referral the service made to Oranga Tamariki.	The Ministry investigation required the service to update its child protection policy, including the requirement to notify the Ministry when a notification is made to another agency. The investigation found that the service was meeting the child's needs and had put though a referral to the Ministry's learning support team. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant alleged rough handling of children. The complainant was unhappy with the service's response to the allegation, was concerned that appropriate agencies had not been notified and that processes had not been followed. They were also concerned that staff had not been safety checked and incidents were not notified to parents. The complainant made a notification to NZ Police.	The Ministry required the service to stand down the teacher while the investigation took place. The Ministry investigation identified a number of concerns resulting in the service being placed on a provisional licence. SELO PLD was provided to the service and a notification was made to the Teaching Council. The Ministry continues to monitor the service through the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns with a service including supervision, hygiene, behaviour management, curriculum and assessment practices. They were also concerned with the management of the service due to high staff turnover and poor communication with parents.	The Ministry investigation found a number of breaches that resulted in a provisional licence. The Ministry continues to monitor the service.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a staff member had shared images/videos of children with people outside the service.	The Ministry investigation found that a video had inadvertently been shared with people outside the service. The staff member had been stood down while an investigation was carried out. In response	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
	the service updated their social media, child protection policies and procedures and required all staff to attend PLD.	
Complainant was unhappy the service had advised their child's enrolment would be cancelled due to frequent absences.	The Ministry investigated and required the service to provide clearer communication to parents about frequent absence rules. The child is now attending the service on a casual basis. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a child had received bruising and scratches while attending the service. They were also dissatisfied with how the service had responded to their concerns.	The Ministry investigation did not identify breaches to relevant policies and procedures. However, improvements were identified on staff's understanding of child protection policy and procedures, and engagement with external agencies. Improvements were also made to the daily hazard checklist.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that a service was committing fraud, co-ordinators weren't visiting homes and a number of homes were unsafe.	The Ministry investigation identified a number of concerns and the service's licence was suspended. The licence has subsequently returned to provisional. The Ministry continues to monitor the service through the provisional licence.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that the service was falsifying attendance and staff records, and that children were not attending regularly.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches in terms of attendance. However, an audit of the service found over-claiming, which was subsequently recovered by the Ministry.	Upheld
Complainant alleged an educator had used inappropriate behaviour management practices toward a child at a service, including pushing and isolating a child. They were also concerned the educator was now employed at another service.	The Ministry investigation found that a notification was made to the Teaching Council but that the service had not followed its child protection policy. The service provided child protection training for all staff. The Ministry followed up with the other service and was satisfied with its policies, procedures and documentation. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that the educator was not providing adequate care and supervision to their children.	Following the Ministry investigation the service put in provisions to monitor the educator, organised a workshop for educators to improve their practice and provided additional information to educators around good practice.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the education and care provided by an educator. The complainant was concerned at the lack of knowledge and experience of the educator and the support provided by the service to the educator.	The Ministry investigated and identified a number of health, safety and curriculum concerns and, as a result, suspended the service's licence. The service demonstrated compliance with the suspension conditions and was subsequently issued a provisional licence to ensure further improvements were made. The service has since returned to a full licence. The complainant removed their child from the service.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned about how many homes the coordinator was responsible for.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of a breach, but required documentation to be strengthened. The Ministry continues to monitor the service to ensure changes are embedded into practice.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that an educator had smacked children in their care at a previous service.	The service stood down the educator pending investigation. The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the complaint. The educator returned to work with a management plan and progress was reported to the Ministry. As part of the investigation the service was reminded of police vetting requirements.	Upheld
Complainant alleged that educators were falsifying attendance records. The complainant was unhappy with the service's response to their concerns.	The Ministry investigation found anomalies in attendance records and identified other concerns relating to curriculum and health and safety requirements. The licence is in the process of being reclassified to Provisional and will continue to be monitored through this process. A full audit of their attendance data has also been scheduled.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned with an educator's supervision of children and poor injury notification documentation. They were also concerned about the educator's suitability to care for children.	The service determined there was no risk to children. As a result of the Ministry investigation the service was required to update its child protection policy and procedures. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service managed an incident where the complainant witnessed a child strangling their child. The complainant was also unhappy about the response to their request for details about the complaints procedure.	The Ministry investigation resulted in a meeting between the service, the complainant and the other child's family at which all concerns were resolved. The service's complaints procedure was reviewed. The service was referred to the Incredible Years Teacher's course.	Upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was unhappy with the response of the service to an incident where a child was bitten by another child while in the sleep room.	The Ministry investigation found the service had followed all policies and procedures. The service made changes to prevent future incidents such as installing a monitor in the sleep room and ensuring a staff member is present at all times. No further action was required.	Upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was taken on an excursion without parental permission and was unhappy with how a staff member spoke to them regarding the incident.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service was placed on a provisional licence. After meeting the required conditions the service was returned to a full licence.	Upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns about the service's communication with parents including incident notifications. There was also concern about how the service was supporting their child with additional needs.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the complaint. However, the Ministry provided SELO PLD to the service to support its practice.	Not upheld
Complainant raised concerns about behaviour management strategies used by staff after hearing children crying at the service on a number of occasions. The complainant was not happy with the service's response when their concerns were raised.	The Ministry investigation did not find any breaches to the regulations. The child heard crying was in the process of settling in to the service. The service has reviewed related policies. The complainant was happy with the outcome.	Not upheld
Complainant had concerns that the service would not be able to maintain adult:child ratios in the coming months due to staff turnover.	The Ministry investigation established that the service could maintain ratios. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy that the service required a minimum attendance for their child who had severe allergies.	The Ministry investigation identified that, while the service was not in breach of regulatory standards, there were improvements that could be made. The Ministry requested the service review its individual medical plan procedure, the information provided to parents on enrolment, and the fees policy.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how a service managed an incident in which their child received an electric shock from a newly opened light box.	The Ministry investigated and found the service had sound incident procedures in place and had responded appropriately. No regulatory breaches were identified. The service made contact with the lightbox manufacturer and advised them of the faulty product.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about their child being bullied by another child at the service, inadequate supervision and dissatisfaction with the response of the service to a complaint.	The Ministry investigation found that the service managed the situation appropriately. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was injured while at the service and that they were not informed. They were also concerned children were being deprived of food and were unhappy with the service's management of complaints. The complainant removed their child from the service.	The Ministry investigated and reviewed relevant documentation. There was no evidence of a regulatory breach. No further action was required.	Not upheld
The complainant raised concerns about adult:child ratios and that school-aged children were present at a service during the school holidays.	The Ministry could not substantiate the complainant's concerns and no breaches were identified.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service was managing the behaviour of a teacher in response to the separation of the child's parents. Concerns included the sharing of private information.	The Ministry investigation did not uphold the complaint. The service worked with the complainant to ensure all relevant details relating to altered custody arrangements were reflected on the enrolment.	Not upheld
Complaint about fees charged for 20 hours ECE.	The Ministry investigation found that no breach was evident.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about inappropriate behaviour from staff when a parent was discussing withdrawing their child from the service.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the incident, but reminded the service that such conversations should be held in the office rather than in the licensed space.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about the service operating under minimum adult:child ratios, supervision and the frequency of accidents.	The Ministry investigated and was satisfied that the service was meeting requirements.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged the service had more children than its licence allowed for.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was not in breach of licence maximums.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that children were not wearing sunhats on an outdoor excursion.	The Ministry investigation found that relevant policies and excursion forms, including risk assessment, were compliant. The service had decided to protect the children with sunscreen only as there was considerable wind on that day.	Not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant alleged that a teacher at the service was coming to work under the influence of drugs. The complainant had made a notification to Oranga Tamariki.	The Ministry investigation found that the allegations were not substantiated. There was a personal issue between the complainant and the teacher. The service made a trespass order against the complainant and spoke with Oranga Tamariki. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that the service was not protecting children at the service from a child who was repeatedly biting other children. The complainant had removed their child from the service.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had followed appropriate procedures. The service put in place additional support to manage the child's behaviour.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged ill treatment of children at the service, including children being dragged, held down and yelled at.	The Ministry investigation was not able to substantiate the allegations. SELO PLD was already in place at the service. The service continues to be monitored and supported by the Ministry.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about the service's van driver texting while driving and having a near accident.	The Ministry investigation found that appropriate policies and procedures were in place. As a result of the complaint the service installed tracking devices in its vehicles to better monitor the vans.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child had been hurt a number of times while attending the service.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches of regulatory requirements. The service reviewed the child's development plan to better support the child's needs. The Ministry supported a meeting between the complainant and the service to resolve any issues.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that the service had breached funding requirements, particularly over holiday periods and statutory holidays.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any breaches, but made recommendations for the service to improve its related administration process and practice.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about high staff turnover at the service, inadequate induction policies, that the service was operating without enough qualified teachers and had failed to implement its complaints procedure. The complainant also raised safety concerns about the premises.	The Ministry investigated and no regulatory breaches were identified. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that the service was charging for hours claimed under 20 Hours ECE.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of a breach.	Not upheld
Complaint about fees charged for 20 Hours ECE.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of a breach.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy that the service's fee structure had changed and alleged that their child was hurt by a teacher and another child.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the allegation against the teacher and found that the service provided adequate notice of the change to its enrolment policy. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was dissatisfied with the service's response to their complaint alleging their child was sunburnt and received bruises and scratches while attending the service. They were also concerned about nappy changing procedures, lack of shade and provision of water in summer months and the number of qualified staff working in the service.	The Ministry investigated and found no breaches. However, it was recommended that the service make minor changes to strengthen its hazard, incident and staffing policies and procedures.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the service's fees schedule, including optional charges.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches. However, the service acknowledged that the enrolment form could be clearer and amended it. The Ministry facilitated communication between the service and the complainant and the fees issue was resolved.	Not upheld
Complainant made allegations about unprofessional behaviour of the service provider, including shouting at children, racist comments, bullying, the service not following parents' food requests and rough handling of children. The complainant was concerned that safety checks had not been completed for all staff.	The Ministry investigation was unable to substantiate any of the allegations. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Concerns were raised about nappy changing procedures undertaken during a lock down.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any breaches and no further action required.	Not upheld
Complainant raised a number of concerns about racial discrimination during meal times and excursions. Complainant also alleged that ratios were not met on a particular day.	The Ministry investigation found the service was providing an inclusive learning environment following an internal evaluation and the service was meeting ratios on the day in question. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that a teacher at the service pushed their child.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegation. The service stood the teacher down during an investigation. The teacher subsequently left the service.	Not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was unhappy with the service's response to their request to not use nail polish on their child and to not allow their child to use the sandpit.	The Ministry investigation found the service responded appropriately to the complainant's concerns. Nail polish was no longer used at the service and a plan had been put in place regarding sand play for the child.	Not upheld
Complainant raised concerns that the service did not contact them when their child was unwell while at the service. The child was subsequently hospitalised for a few days with norovirus symptoms	The Ministry found the service had managed the incident appropriately. The child experienced symptoms just prior to being collected by the complainant. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about a service's incident notification policy and processes. The complainant was also concerned about privacy of information and medication not being administered as required.	The Ministry investigation did not find evidence of non-compliance. Incident notification and medical administration were consistent with regulatory requirements. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that a post on social media stated that their child had been roughly handled by a teacher and the complainant was concerned that the teacher was not stood down pending the investigation.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the allegation and found the service had followed appropriate processes. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that the service was withholding learning stories and invoiced for fees that they were previously unaware of.	The Ministry investigation found that learning stories were available online and the invoice was for outstanding fees.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that the service had not administered medication as requested. They also believed that a person had been added to the enrolment form to collect children without permission.	The Ministry investigated and found no evidence to support the allegation. The child was the subject of a joint custody arrangement. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that a child had disclosed that a teacher had hit children.	The Ministry investigation was unable to substantiate the allegations. While no breaches were identified, the service reviewed all relevant policies and made changes. Oranga Tamariki was notified of the allegation and no further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service was managing a child's behaviour.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches. The service sought advice from the Ministry's Learning Support staff and had implemented changes that were making positive changes to the child's behaviour.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was bullied by other children, high teacher turnover and a lack of teacher responsiveness to children. The complainant was also unhappy with the service's HR practices.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of any breaches, but required the service to review its behaviour management practices. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged a teacher restrained a child.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches. The service sought support for the child as well as advice and guidance on how the service could best support the needs of the child.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with a number of incidents at the service and particularly how the service managed an incident where their child broke their wrist.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had managed the incident appropriately. The child had tripped with no hazards. A notification was made to WorkSafe, but the incident did not meet WorkSafe's threshold for investigation. The child was enrolled in another service. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned there was a high turnover of committee members and the service was not being managed effectively.	The Ministry investigation found appropriate governance and management processes in place and no regulatory breach. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy that a teacher made a notification to Oranga Tamariki about a child.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the service reviewed its child protection policy and provided training for staff on child protection and reporting procedures. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy about how the service had managed optional fees and refunds.	The Ministry investigated the service and found no breaches. However, changes were made to the enrolment form to make information clearer.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy a child's image was used on the service's website without parental consent.	The Ministry investigated and found no evidence of non-compliance. However, the photograph was removed from the website. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that their child was not allowed to enrol in a service due to an argument with a staff member.	The Ministry investigated and found that the service had not enrolled the child as they were unable to cater for the parent's requirements.	Not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned with a number of issues relating to sleep checks, administering medicine and inappropriate conversations in the play area.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence to uphold the allegations. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about how the service was managing incidents involving a child biting other children.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was managing supervision and support for the child appropriately. The complainant withdrew their child from the service. No further action needed.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that the service was incorrectly claiming funding for a child that had a regular pattern of non-attendance.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was claiming funding in accordance with the requirements of the Funding Handbook.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about health and safety practices at the service, and felt there was a lack of communication between staff and parents.	The Ministry investigation did not identify non-compliance. However, the Ministry discussed the need for clear communication with parents.	Not upheld
Complainant witnessed a teacher restraining their child who was transitioning into another room at the service. The complainant wasn't happy with the service's response to their complaint.	The Ministry investigation found that the teacher was settling the child appropriately. However, as a result of the complaint the service has strengthened its transition programme and reviewed its incident procedures. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's response.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy about fees charged by the service and children attending on days they were not enrolled.	The Ministry investigation found that the service's fee structure did not breach funding rules. However, the service agreed to make its fees structure clearer to parents.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about teachers' responsiveness to children who were crying.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was using appropriate practices with the children. The service committed to review its communication procedures with parents.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy that the service had made changes to policies around food served at the service and had removed tree climbing from the daily curriculum without consultation with parents.	The Ministry investigation found that the menu had been changed based on Ministry of Health guidance and the service was preparing a wider consultation. While some trees had been removed due to health and safety risks there were other trees available for climbing. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about inadequate supervision during an excursion.	The Ministry investigated and considered that the service managed supervision and risk on the excursion appropriately. However, the service used this opportunity to make improvements to its excursion policy.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was continually being hurt by another child. The complainant was not happy with how the service managed this and were also unhappy they had not been notified of a recent injury.	The Ministry investigated and found no breach of the regulations. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with a service ending their child's enrolment two weeks earlier than requested.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any regulatory breaches. The service was advised to review its systems and processes for communicating with parents.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was bitten by another child on a number of occasions and not all of these were notified to the complainant. The complainant considered that the plan the service had in place to manage these incidents was not working.	The Ministry investigated and was satisfied that the service was managing the biting incidents appropriately. The service reported that biting incidents had decreased with the implementation of the plan and additional staff were on duty to support staff and children. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how a service managed ongoing bullying at the service and considered that their child's needs were not being met. The complainant considered that the service's actions resulted in the child being excluded from the service.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the complainant's concerns and the service confirmed that the child was welcome to attend the service. The Ministry provided advice to the service on communication and engagement with parents.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that the service was operating without required qualified teachers, placing the children's health and safety at risk.	The Ministry investigation found the service was meeting all requirements. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy the service did not enrol their child and felt that this was discrimination.	The Ministry investigation found that the child did not meet the service's criteria for enrolment. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about 20 Hours ECE and fees charged.	The Ministry investigated and was satisfied that the service met requirements.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that a child was excluded from a service following absence due to illness.	The Ministry investigation found that the child's enrolment was cancelled shortly after first attending as the complainant did not follow the service's settling process. The service agreed to refund the fees paid.	Not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned about the behaviour of a child at the service and the teachers ongoing ability to manage the behaviour.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any breaches to regulations. Ministry Learning Support staff were already working to support the service and the child. Additional training for staff had been scheduled to support strategies for managing the child's behaviour with other children. The complainant was advised to come back to the Ministry if they were not satisfied by the service's response. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy that a child's enrolment had been terminated due to an unpaid debt.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had followed documented processes in relation to outstanding debt. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's response. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about how sexualised play was managed at a service two years prior. The service is now under new management.	The Ministry investigation found the concerns had been managed appropriately at the time under the previous service provider, including notifying appropriate agencies.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the service's response to an incident, which resulted in a child's arm being broken when they fell on outside play equipment.	The Ministry supported the complainant and service to resolve the issue. The Ministry investigation found the service followed appropriate procedures. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned with how the service was managing a child's behaviour and learning support needs, including transitioning their child to school before they were ready and had changed the child's enrolment without approval. They also alleged the service had overclaimed attendance.	The Ministry investigation found no concerns with how the service was managing the child's learning support needs and behaviour. A review of funding documentation identified a small discrepancy in the records, but the service was able to produce other written documentation to explain this.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that a teacher had hurt their child and that their child's enrolment was cancelled after raising this concern.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the allegation. The complainant had also contacted NZ Police who decided not to pursue an investigation.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy when their child was excluded from the service after the child hurt a teacher and other children.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was working with the Ministry's learning support team to develop a plan to support the child's behaviour. However, the child did not return to the service. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy after noticing bruising on their child, which the service had no knowledge of. The complainant removed their child from the service and was unhappy when they were invoiced.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had no record of an injury at the service. The bill was paid once the contractual arrangements of the enrolment were explained.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that the service's investigation into an allegation of ill-treatment against a child was inadequate. The complainant also contacted NZ Police.	The Ministry was satisfied that the service responded appropriately. NZ Police did not pursue an investigation. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged sexualised behaviour towards a child by another child. The complainant was concerned by reports that this was regular behaviour for the child and reported the behaviour to Oranga Tamariki.	The Ministry investigation found that the service had responded appropriately by providing additional staff to work directly with the child and referred the child for further intervention. Oranga Tamariki did not undertake further action.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about the amount of screen time children experience at the service, especially on rainy days, and that parents weren't aware of the service's use of screen time.	The Ministry investigated and could not substantiate the allegations. The Ministry recommended that the service strengthen parent communication and supervision.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that a service encouraged parents to enrol for 30 hours but claimed 50 hours from Work and Income to avoid the parent paying fees.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the allegations and a recent audit did not identify any concerns. The service was reminded of the requirement to provide clear enrolment information to parents.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that the service was breaching its licence maximum.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of a breach but as a result of other concerns identified during the investigation the Ministry undertook an audit which resulted in a debt recovery. The Ministry continues to monitor the service.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy their child had been stuck in an overturned play box at a service and was unable to exit without help.	The Ministry investigation found that the play box was removed and the service had discussed supervision with the teachers involved. They had also notified the parent of the incident on the day it occurred. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's response and no further action was required.	Not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned about inadequate curriculum provision, employment issues and pay, lack of educational resources, inadequate supervision and teacher wellbeing.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any breach to regulatory requirements. The service provider addressed the employment issues directly and staff concerned were provided with details for external agencies.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that safety checking procedures had not been followed for a former staff member.	The Ministry investigation found that all staff had been safety checked. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with how the service communicated with them following a number of late pickups of their child. The complainant requested that the service's opening hours be extended.	The Ministry investigated and found that the service was meeting communication policy requirements. The complainant was advised of the impact of closing times on service staffing and availability.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned with how the service managed their child's return to the service following an incident in which the child's finger was injured. The complainant was also unhappy with the way their fee account had been communicated.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any breaches. The Ministry supported the complainant to enrol their child in a service that better met their needs.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned with the suitability of the outdoor area after their child broke their leg jumping from a retaining wall in the play area.	The Ministry investigation did not find any breaches in terms of incident management or with the outdoor space. The service reviewed its outdoor space and related policies and implemented changes to improve children's safety.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with a service's fees, stating that they were unclear. They were also concerned with the lack of communication about a referral to learning support and considered that the service was dismissive of their concerns.	The Ministry investigation found the service's policies relating to fees were clear, including its communication to parents. The service met with the complainant to address their concerns. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that a relieving teacher at the service roughly handled their child.	The Ministry investigation found that the agency had stood down the reliever and a mandatory report was made to the Teaching Council. The Ministry had no concerns with the service, but the service updated relevant policies. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant raised multiple concerns with the service, including children being isolated and roughly handled.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the allegations. The service responded appropriately to the needs of the child with the parent's agreement and under Ministry Learning Support guidance. However, the service has agreed to review positive guidance policy and personnel processes.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy that optional fees charged for 20 hours ECE were mandatory and that children were eating unsupervised.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches to the regulations and no further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned with a number of issues at a service relating to ratios and supervision. They were also unhappy with the service's complaints procedure as they felt their concerns were ignored.	The Ministry investigation found the service was meeting ratios. The Ministry provided advice on group size. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was dissatisfied that the service would not apply a natural balm to a child without a doctor's certificate and was concerned about the service's behaviour management practices.	The Ministry provided information to support the complainant to raise concerns with the service and later followed up with the service. The complainant subsequently removed their child from the service. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned with supervision, incident management and a general lack of care being provided. They were also concerned with their personal information being shared.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches to the regulations. The service had responded to incidents appropriately and were meeting supervision requirements. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that a service did not have a person responsible closing at the end of the day.	The service provided the Ministry with documentation confirming compliance with the regulations. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the noise levels coming from a service.	The Ministry investigation found that the noise levels were acceptable, which was supported by an independent acoustic assessment. The Local Council also found that noise levels were acceptable. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned with a service's response to a number of incidents where their child came home bruised. The child was also sent home with a large piece of fruit in their mouth, some time after meal time, which caused a choking	The service changed ownership shortly after the complaint was received and the Ministry investigation did not identify any concerns with the new provider. No further action was required.	Not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
concern. The complainant also passed on concerns from others relating to supervision, hygiene and injuries inflicted by other children.		
Complainant alleged that nappies were not being changed in a timely manner. They also had concerns about adult:child ratios.	The Ministry investigation found adult:child ratios were being met and that nappy change times had been adjusted to better meet children's needs. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about the safety of children at the service as a staff member was under investigation by the Teaching Council.	The Ministry confirmed that the teacher had a conditional agreement to teach. This was agreed between the Teaching Council, the service and the teacher. The Ministry investigation found no breaches to safety checking at the service.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that a teacher at the service bullied other teachers.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of a breach of the regulations. However, the service committed to review employment processes for managing conduct of staff as well as child protection, complaints policies and positive guidance policy. The Ministry continues to monitor the service.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that high turnover of staff at a service meant there were not enough qualified and first-aid trained teachers.	The Ministry investigation found there were appropriate levels of qualified and first-aid trained staff. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant had a number of concerns including ratios, managing children's behaviour, and high staff turnover.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any breaches, but found recent changes to staffing had not been communicated to parents as well as they could have been.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that the centre manager's behaviour was unprofessional and that they had been observed yelling in front of children. Complainant was also concerned with high staff turnover at the service.	The Ministry investigation found that no breaches had occurred. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy that a service did not enrol their child. They considered that this was because of the child's learning needs.	The Ministry investigation identified that this was a historical complaint and the service had undergone a change in ownership. There were no concerns with the policies and procedures under the new owners. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant considered that the service was not managing a child's bullying behaviour.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence to substantiate the complaint. The complainant removed their child from the service. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged the service was forging their signature on a change to their child's enrolment form.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the allegation. However, the service was required to make improvements to its record keeping. It was noted that there was no financial gain to the service. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about a teacher using inappropriate behaviour management practices.	The Ministry investigation was unable to substantiate the allegations. However, other concerns were identified and the service was placed on a provisional licence. SELO PLD was already being provided to the service for governance support. The service continues to be monitored through the provisional licence.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with a reliever's behaviour toward their child, which included carrying them around when they were capable of walking and cuddling the child when they wanted to play.	The Ministry investigation found the service had put in place an induction process for relievers and provided child protection PLD for all staff. The child was removed from the service. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that the service manager acted inappropriately in front of staff and children, there was falsification of attendance records, poor hazard management, inadequate supervision, and lack of notification to parents of accidents, injury or illness.	The Ministry investigation was unable to substantiate the allegations. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that the service was not responding appropriately to a child's food allergies, as the menu contained allergens and inappropriate foods for the child.	The Ministry investigation found no concerns with the food served or record keeping. Policies and procedures for children with special diets were strong. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy after being told that a notification would be made to Oranga Tamariki, alleging abuse at home.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any breaches but did assist to facilitate discussions between the complainant and the service. The service reviewed how it could better support the complainant when picking up the child.	Not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned about how the service managed an incident of sexualised play and was unhappy they were not notified.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches. However, the service made a number of changes to further strengthen supervision.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about an injury their child sustained, which went unnoticed. The complainant was told their child fell and hurt their hand, but later the parent found a bump on the child's head. They removed their child from the service and did not want to pay the remaining fees.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of any breaches. The complainant was given advice and guidance about the terms and conditions on enrolment forms. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged they witnessed a teacher rough handling a child and that another child had bruising on their face, but there was no injury or accident records. They were also concerned with the service's ability to meet ratios and supervision requirements.	The Ministry investigated and found the service had followed its policies and procedures and provided PLD to better support children with additional behavioural needs. The service also reviewed its positive guidance policy. No breach of regulatory requirements was identified. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant made an allegation that a service was not completing police vetting and did not consider a teacher's convictions in their suitability for employment.	The Ministry investigated and was satisfied with the service's safety checking documentation. No further action required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy about a service reducing hours over the Christmas period.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of a breach. The service had provided the information about the reduced hours at enrolment at another time during the year. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about the regular presence of a dog at the service.	As a result of the Ministry investigation the Ministry requested the service work with health authorities and parents to assess appropriateness of dogs on the service's premises. Health authorities recommended the dog be on a lead at all times. The service reviewed its practice to ensure the recommendations are followed. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was concussed after running into a sign outside the service.	The Ministry investigation found that the service put padding around the sign and reviewed its supervision plan. The Ministry was satisfied with the service's response. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy when they saw a teacher pull a child by the arm while on an excursion. They were also unsatisfied with the teacher's response when they questioned why the child was upset.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of ill treatment, but required improvements to be made child protection and excursion policies, including risk assessment. The child was removed from the service. No further action was required.	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. They also alleged the service was not meeting ratios.	The Ministry investigation found the service was meeting ratio requirements and following procedures in regard to accidents and injuries. The service implemented a monitoring plan for the child to reassure the parents. However, the child was subsequently removed from the service. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy after being told their child's enrolment would be cancelled if they failed to pay outstanding fees.	The Ministry investigation did not find any concerns with the service's actions. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant noted the smell of paint fumes when dropping a child off to the service and was concerned that ventilation was inadequate.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any concerns. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy that a service did not provide them with an accident report after their child allegedly bruised their elbow and knee at the service. They were concerned when they approached the service about the incident and staff were unable to provide any information.	The Ministry investigation found that the injury did not take place at the service. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about adult:child ratios and safety practices during an excursion.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of a breach. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child had a dry nappy as the service only served water or milk to children, not the child's preferred drink.	The Ministry investigation found that the service was following healthy food practices. The Ministry provided advice and guidance to the complainant and advised that the service log the volume of water drunk by the child. No further action was required.	Not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned with the service's response to a number of infectious illnesses at the service. They were also concerned that there was nowhere for children to be isolated.	The Ministry investigation found no concerns. The service had appropriate means to isolate children, as well as good incident management processes. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that a service with a number of high needs children was not providing the support needed due to a high number of continual relievers and lack of qualified staff.	The Ministry investigation found the service was compliant with the regulations. The Ministry continues to support the service regarding the number of children that display challenging behaviours. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the service's management of an outbreak of Verotoxin E. coli.	The Ministry investigation found that the Ministry of Health considered the service had managed the situation appropriately. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about hygiene practices, ratio breaches and human resource management practices.	The Ministry investigation found the service to be compliant with regulations. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about the service's emergency plan after a small fire occurred at the service.	The Ministry investigation found that the service's response to the event met regulations. The service initiated a review of its emergency plan and made improvements to the documentation of evacuation drills.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that they had seen cockroaches at the service. They were also unhappy that no action was taken when they informed the service.	The Ministry investigated and was satisfied with the mitigations the service had in place to deal with vermin and insects.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that a child's behaviour was not being managed appropriately by teachers, causing other children to feel unsafe and unsupported.	The Ministry investigation found the service supported all children and whānau at the service. Prior to the complaint being made the service had worked with the complainant to respond to concerns and ensure their child was safe and well looked after. However, the complainant withdrew their child from the service.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that inappropriate behaviour by children was not being managed appropriately. The behaviour included biting, scratching, hair pulling and hitting.	The Ministry investigation showed that the service was managing a number of children with additional needs. Teachers were well supported to promote children's social competence and manage difficult behaviours. Ministry Learning Support was provided to the service. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned with how children's behaviour was managed, fees, privacy, religious practice and the lack of response to their concerns.	The Ministry investigation required the service to review relevant policies and procedures. There was no evidence of any breaches. However, additional support was provided to staff on behaviour management practices. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that parents were not immediately notified after their child was injured at the service. They were also unhappy with the service's complaints procedure and had removed their child from the service.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service and offered support if concerns were unable to be resolved. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged a child was pushed by a teacher. When they raised their concerns with the service they alleged the service refused to communicate.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence to uphold the allegations. The teacher had been stood down while an investigation was carried out and the service had followed appropriate procedures, including notifying the Teaching Council. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that teachers were not meeting children's emotional needs and alleged that a teacher was seen rough handling a child.	The Ministry investigation did not substantiate the allegations. The service had appropriate policies in place and there were no concerns with teacher practice. Complainant had withdrawn their child from the service. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant raised concerns about the security of a service's premises as the gate was not self closing. They were also concerned about ratios in the outdoor area.	The Ministry investigation found that the service communicated to parents to ensure the gate was closed when entering and exiting the premises. The gate was supervised when children were in the outside area. There were no concerns with ratios. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned with the safety of water play and related supervision at the service. The complainant was not happy with the service's response to their concerns.	The Ministry investigated and was satisfied with the safety of the play equipment and supervision. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about incidents of sexualised play and the service's response to it.	The Ministry investigation found that the service made changes to the play areas to increase vision and improve supervision. The service communicated with parents about the improvements implemented. No further action was required.	Not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant alleged that more than four children were attending a home-based service.	The Ministry investigated and found no evidence to substantiate the complainant's concerns. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant expressed concerns that the service was not meeting person responsible requirements.	The Ministry investigated and found no evidence to substantiate the complainant's concerns. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant had concerns with the service's fee structure and use of Ministry funding. The complainant removed their child from the service and was unhappy with how the service responded.	The Ministry investigated and reviewed the service's policies and procedures and provided advice and guidance to the service to strengthen communication with parents. No regulatory breach was identified and no further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that the service was falsifying funding claims.	The Ministry investigated the allegations and found no breaches. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that the service was not meeting person responsible requirements and was falsifying records.	The Ministry investigation did not find evidence of non-compliance. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that someone from the service contacted them to commit fraudulent behaviour for mutual benefit.	The Ministry investigation did not find evidence of non-compliance. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about children leaving the premises unaccompanied by an adult, fraud, supervision, insufficient fencing, and poor management practices relating to staff.	The Ministry investigation found no breaches. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about the treatment of their child with additional learning needs and that their child's enrolment had been cancelled.	The Ministry investigated and found that the service had managed the situation appropriately. The service made a notification to Oranga Tamariki. The child's enrolment was cancelled due to the behaviour of the child's parent. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant considered that the level of documentation requested by their service to demonstrate children's learning was unreasonable. They felt they were not well supported by the service.	The Ministry investigation found that there was a misunderstanding between the service and the complainant. The service's requests were considered reasonable. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned after seeing an ad for a service they believed was operating illegally.	The Ministry investigated and confirmed that the service was licensed. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that a child was left unsupervised by the educator.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence that the child had been left alone in the home. The complaint was a result of a misunderstanding. The Ministry continued to monitor the service until satisfied there were no other concerns.	Not upheld
Complainant was unhappy with the enrolment process at a service after delays in the service placing their child with an educator.	The Ministry followed up with the service provider, who offered to arrange alternative care. The offer was declined as the child was enrolled in another service. The service had met requirements and no further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about a lack of support from the service, poor processes and systems, no documentation of learning and development and lack of concern for the safety of children.	The Ministry investigation found no evidence of a breach. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged parents were asked to claim more hours than they were attending.	The Ministry investigation could not substantiate the allegations and no further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that one of their educators had been approached by another service who attempted to get them to change service provider.	The complaint was not substantiated. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned about the lack of support their educator was receiving from the service to support their child's learning.	The Ministry investigation did not identify any concerns. The service was unable to accommodate complainant's demands and subsequently cancelled the child's enrolment.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that their child was regularly being sent home from the service.	The Ministry investigation found that Oranga Tamariki was involved with the child and was providing support. The Ministry made a referral for further support for the child. The service was meeting regularly with the family to best support the child. The Ministry was satisfied with how the service was managing the needs of the child.	Not upheld

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned with a teacher's behaviour towards children and parents. The alleged behaviour included drug use, swearing at the complainant and rough handling children.	A notification was made to NZ Police and Oranga Tamariki. Following an investigation both agencies closed the case. The Ministry investigation identified other concerns that resulted in the service being placed on a provisional licence. The Ministry continued to monitor the service through the provisional licence and has since returned it to a full licence.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that the service was not meeting ratios, that teachers were under the influence of drugs and that the service was unclean. They also alleged that the van timetable was inconsistent.	The Ministry investigated and was satisfied that none of the allegations were substantiated. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that children at the service had been roughly handled by staff.	The Ministry investigation was not able to substantiate the allegations of ill treatment. The child was withdrawn from the service. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant alleged that a person with convictions for sex offences was working in a service. The complainant made a notification to NZ Police. Oranga Tamariki were also notified.	The Ministry investigation found that the person was not employed at the service. The person had attended a monthly hui and was asked to stop attending. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant was concerned that children in the outside play area were not wearing sun hats and there was insufficient sun shade. Complainant also noted concerns over children crying and the rough handling of children.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure. The Ministry also followed up with the service and found no regulatory breaches. No further action was required.	Not upheld
Complainant raised general concerns about the quality of education at the service.	The Ministry contacted the service as the information provided by the complainant was not enough to warrant an investigation. The Ministry found that the service had received the same complaint and was actively managing the concern. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy about children having access to scissors, which resulted in an injury to their child.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service's complaints procedure for resolution. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy with the way a service managed bullying behaviour of children.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service. The Ministry followed up with the complainant who was happy with the service's response. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy with how the service responded to them taking their child's portfolio book home and not returning it.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service's complaints procedure. The Ministry supported a resolution between the service and complainant to ensure the child had a record of their learning.	Not investigated
Complainant raised concerns when their child received burns while using a glue gun at the carpentry table.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure for resolution. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant alleged that staff at the service were being bullied by the manager.	The complainant was advised to follow the service's complaints process. No further correspondence was received.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy that the service was not able to provide individual bills for separated parents.	The Ministry provided advice to the service on how to provide separate invoices. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant raised concerns about ratios and supervision practices at the service, as well as the provision of non-contact time and adequate cover for staff breaks.	The Ministry provided advice and guidance about ratios and referred the complainant back to the service regarding the employment matter.	Not investigated
Complainant alleged that their child was neglected at the service. The complainant withdrew their child from the service and the complainant is unhappy with paying outstanding fees.	The Ministry requested further information from the complainant to support an investigation and the complainant subsequently withdrew their complaint before further action could be taken.	Not investigated
Complainant alleged that they had been forced to resign following a request to change their work hours.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) as the complaint related more directly to an employment matter aligned with MBIE's role.	Not investigated
Complainant raised a number of concerns relating to ratios, the quality of curriculum being delivered and the supervision of children while eating.	Complainant was referred back to the service's complaints process. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant alleged that the service provider was arranging classrooms based on ethnicity.	Complainant was referred back to the service's complaints process. No further correspondence was received from the complainant.	Not investigated

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned that the service was not meeting curriculum aspirations for their child.	The complainant was referred back to the service and were invited to get back in touch with the Ministry if their concerns were unresolved.	Not investigated
Complainant raised a number of concerns regarding the bullying of staff and unprofessional behaviour by management towards staff.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service provider for resolution. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy that the service was reducing their child's hours to enable a fee paying parent to attend instead.	The complainant was referred back to the service's complaints procedure. The complainant was unhappy with the service's response and moved their child to another service, which better met their needs. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy with the behaviour of the teachers at the service who were not engaging with children.	The Ministry requested further information from the complainant, which was not provided. The Ministry was therefore unable to progress the investigation.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned that teachers had their own children attending the service and the complainant considered that other children at the service were neglected.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service's complaints policy. The Ministry followed up with the complainant and was informed that the issue was resolved.	Not investigated
Complainant had concerns about employment matters including privacy.	The Ministry referred the complainant to MBIE and the Privacy Commissioner as the complaint did not relate to ECE regulatory requirements.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy that a child's enrolment had been terminated suddenly.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service for resolution. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy with a change to the service's operating hours.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service for resolution. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy that their child's enrolment had been cancelled, believing this was due to a concern the complainant had raised about a staff member.	The Ministry provided advice and guidance and referred the complainant back to the service. The complainant and the service resolved this issue and the child returned to the service.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy with the focus the service gives to Māori culture.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service. The Ministry followed up with the service and the service agreed to work through the concern with the complainant. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned that a service was not following a parenting order.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service's complaints procedure to resolve the issue. The Ministry followed up with the complainant who was happy with the outcome and did not require any further support from the Ministry.	Not investigated
Complainant had a number of concerns linked to management of and decision to close the service.	The complainant was advised that the concerns raised were matters that fell outside of the Ministry's responsibilities and jurisdiction.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy that the service had changed their session times and fee structure. This meant that they would have to pay for more than 20 Hours ECE.	The Ministry provided advice and guidance on 20 Hours ECE.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned about the temporary closure of a service and the lack of consultation with parents and the community. The complainant was also concerned about the impact of a Ministry investigation on the service.	The Ministry provided advice and guidance to the complainant about the process and the conditions to be met.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned about lack of professionalism from the service and the high rate of staff turnover.	The complainant was referred to the service's complaints process and was provided details of external agencies that could assist with employment matters.	Not investigated
Complainant was dissatisfied with an optional charge for sun screen lotion and alleged that parents weren't consulted about the change.	The complainant was referred to the service's complaints procedure. The issues were resolved and no further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy that a service refused to let a child return to the service following illness, despite regional public health clearance. Complainant was also concerned that they were still charged a fee and that the service often opens later than advertised.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service and invited further contact if their concerns were not resolved. No further action was required by the Ministry.	Not investigated

Summary of Complaint	Summary of Action	Outcome of Investigation
Complainant was concerned a service was not responsive to a child's medical needs.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service and invited further contact if their concerns were not resolved. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned with the service's incident management process and believed the manager to be acting unprofessionally. They also had a number of queries relating to funding and other policies.	The Ministry provided advice and guidance and referred the complainant back to the service. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned that their child had been badly sunburnt at the service, and that there was no paperwork to inform them of the incident.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service. The service informed the Ministry that improvements had been made to its sunscreen procedure. The child was withdrawn from the service.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned about incomplete health and safety documentation and alleged the service was falsifying information provided to the Ministry.	The Ministry requested further information from the complainant which was not provided and the Ministry was unable to substantiate the allegations.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy about being invoiced for optional charges while on holiday and not attending the service.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure for resolution. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned about being charged fees while a child was absent from the service.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service's complaints process. The Ministry provided information to the complainant to support them raising their concerns with the service and also discussed with the service how the fee structure was communicated to families. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned that the service was looking at redundancies due to financial concerns.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service's complaints process. SELO PLD support was already being provided to the service. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy with enrolment policies and practices for 20 hours ECE.	The complainant was referred back to the service's complaint process. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant alleged that a teacher acted unprofessionally after they made a complaint about the service's transition practices.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure to seek further assurance that the transition policy is being followed. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned with a number of issues at a service, including a lack of positive behaviour management, insufficient food provided, a lack of support for children with additional needs, no cover for staff breaks, a shortage of permanent staff and inadequate support from the manager.	The service was on a provisional licence at the time of the complaint and the Ministry continues to monitor the service on the provisional licence.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned that the service was not providing required breaks for staff.	The Ministry referred the complainant to MBIE and reminded the service provider of employment law requirements.	Not investigated
Complainant alleged that children were pushed over by other children and drinking muddy water. When concerns were raised with staff they dismissed the allegations in a way that the complainant felt was unprofessional.	The Ministry referred the complainant back to the service and advised them to come back to the Ministry if their concerns were not resolved. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned that a service was not following proper employment practices for hiring staff.	The Ministry provided advice and guidance to support the complainant to raise their concerns directly with the service provider. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy with the service's treatment of a parent and child on their first day at the service.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints policy. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was concerned that the service was not managing their child's behaviour after the complainant was informed of an incident where their child hurt another child. The service was looking to exclude their child.	The Ministry referred the complainant to the service's complaints procedure. No further action was required.	Not investigated
Complainant was unhappy that the service's van driver tooted the horn and rolled cigarettes when picking up children. They also alleged the van staff were aggressive when confronted.	The complainant was referred back to the service. The Ministry followed up with the service and, while the complaint was not substantiated, the service met with the complainant to resolve concerns.	Not investigated