

Appendix C: Recommendations and outcomes of the first pilot test

Recommendation	CSDWG response
<i>Collection methodology</i>	
1 That electronic forms are made available to service providers involved in the next phase of the pilot test.	Not endorsed
2 Forms based on three main types of delivery mode (centre-based, family day care/in-home care, and mobile services) has worked well for the pilot test and should continue to be used in the next phase of the pilot test.	Endorsed
<i>Scope – services and activities</i>	
3 That the term ‘outlet’ be changed to ‘service’ and ‘service’ to ‘service activity’.	Endorsed
4 That government funding refers to ‘receive ongoing government funding and/or approved for Child Care Benefit’.	Endorsed
5 That for family day care services, the scope specifically states ‘including caring for children occupying an in-home care place’.	Endorsed
6 Funded service activity type data element be included for future data collection.	Endorsed
7 That ‘primary school education’ is not referred to specifically as exclusion.	Endorsed
<i>Scope – children</i>	
8 To include children who are absent for the entire collection week where a place has been kept vacant for that child, or their place has been paid for or will be paid for, or where the child has a ‘permanent booking’.	Endorsed
9 That all absent children as defined above should be recorded using the ‘child absent’ tick-boxes on days where they would normally attend.	Endorsed

(continued)

Recommendation	CSDWG response
<i>Scope – children continued</i>	
10 That child characteristics should be collected in order to ascertain whether certain defined groups of children account for a higher proportion of absences.	Endorsed
<i>Scope – workers</i>	
11 Workers who are absent from the service for the entire collection week should be included in the scope of the collection.	Endorsed
12 Relief workers who are employed during the collection week to replace workers who are sick, or otherwise absent, should be identified as such.	Endorsed
13 The second phase of the CSNMDS scope on ‘workers’ include all paid, unpaid (volunteers) and contract workers delivering child care and preschool services.	Endorsed
14 Additional data elements on workers be tested in the second phase of the CSNMDS.	Endorsed
<i>Specific items – service related</i>	
15 For a full, objective electronic matching of services between data sets to take place, some steps need to be taken in regards to data items on FaCS and state and territory administrative databases. Given that the final CSNMDS collection will not be in place for a few more years, database administrators have time to make any alterations necessary to allow the service-matching process required.	Endorsed
16 For family day care caregivers/in-home caregivers, put the relevant guiding information alongside the question in the collection form.	Endorsed
17 This data item be expanded to allow recording of the maximum number of children for the various activities the service may offer.	Not endorsed
18 Including a question on number of ‘licensed places’ would help to clarify the distinction between ‘places offered’ and ‘licensed places’.	Not endorsed

(continued)

Recommendation	CSDWG response
19 Change the wording of the question for caregivers to 'how many children are you registered with your scheme as being able to care for'.	Endorsed
20 Structure this question so that services are able to answer for each activity type they offer.	Not endorsed
21 Give mobile services the option of recording the number of weeks in the year in which they offer each session.	Endorsed
22 For centre-based services, structure the question so that services are able to answer for each activity type they offer.	Not endorsed
23 Give mobile services the option of recording a two-weekly schedule.	Endorsed
24 For centre-based services, the structure of this question to be changed so services can record start and finish times for the various activities that the service may offer.	Not endorsed
25 Provide an alternative wording for caregivers: 'what times are you registered with your coordinating unit as being available'.	Endorsed
26 May need to give mobile services the option of recording a two-weekly schedule.	Endorsed
<i>Specific items – child related</i>	
27 Where service providers do not know the exact eight-digit date of birth of a child, the estimation of the child's date of birth to the nearest three months and year will provide more accurate information.	Endorsed
28 Service providers should be requested to include the ABS standard Indigenous status question on enrolment forms and they should receive assistance on how to ask the question.	Endorsed
29 Most jurisdictions will require changes to their systems and data-recording practices to obtain accurate and comparable information on Indigenous status.	Endorsed
30 To clearly identify the purpose for which information on the arrival and departure times of children who attend during the collection week is obtained.	Endorsed

(continued)

Recommendation	CSDWG response
<i>Specific items – worker related</i>	
31 For consistency purposes for child care and preschool qualifications, jurisdictions should develop a common list of relevant qualifications. The categories of worker qualifications need to be revised in line with current practice.	Endorsed
32 The Children’s Services National Minimum Data Set data manual currently includes a data item for workers that is a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ indicator of whether a worker has worked in the children’s services sector for more than 3 years. It is recommended that the data item be made a more general question asking for the number of years of experience in the children’s services field.	Endorsed
<i>Additional data elements</i>	
33 The next phase of development of the CSNMDS should include more data items on services, children and workers.	Endorsed