

St Vincent's Primary School, Clear Island Waters

In Term 1 the Child Safe Standard Self-Assessment is focussed on the following Standards:

Standard 1 – Leadership and Culture

Child safety and wellbeing is embedded in the entity's organisational leadership, governance, and culture

Standard 9 – Continuous Improvement

Implementation of the Child Safe Standards is regularly reviewed and improved

Standard 10 – Policies and Procedures

Policies and procedures document how the entity is safe for children

Each Term the Self-Assessment process considers the following process:

1. Participation
2. Data
3. Activity
4. Evaluation

All parts of the process are underpinned by participation and consultation with key stakeholders.



1. Participation

The Term 1 Child Safe Standards relate to leadership, monitoring and improvement. Consider,

- Who in your school provides leadership for student safety and wellbeing?
- Who is responsible for monitoring student safety and wellbeing?
- Who contributes to improving student safety and wellbeing practices?

Relevant stakeholders to collaborate with for Term 1 may include the school leadership team, Student Protection Contacts, family or student groups. Specifically consider how you will engage Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander voices to embed the Universal Principle in this process.

Part 1 – PARTICIPATION PLAN

Who do you plan to consult with as part of the Term 1 self-assessment?

Participation Plan

These are the stakeholders I will involve in Term 1 Self-Assessment:

- Leadership team
- Student Protection Contact Team
- Teaching staff
- Parish staff
- School Officers
- Students – Year 6 leaders
- Families – FACE Meeting (From Term 2)

Part 2 – RECORD OF PARTICIPATION

Who did you consult with as part of the Term 1 self-assessment, and what was their involvement?

Record of Participation

Name	Involvement (Date and type)
School Leadership Team	- Reviewed T1 self-assessment during Leadership Team meeting
SPC Team	- Reviewed T1 self-assessment during SPC meeting
Year 6 leaders	- Principal did child friendly chat about the standards – Term 1
FACE Committee	- Shared at FACE meeting T2 (Standing item – Child Protection update)

2. Data

Safeguarding Data Dashboard: Term 1 Data

1. Review the Employee Culture Overall Safeguarding Index

Prompt: How is your Index trending? How does your 2023 data compare to your 2025? How does your data compare with the BCE average? What do you think about this?

How is your Index trending?

The **Employee Culture Overall Safeguarding Index** shows a **downward trend** over time.

- In **May 2023**, the Index sits at **83.5%**.
- By **March 2025**, this has declined to **74.3%**.

This represents a clear reduction in overall staff agreement with key safeguarding culture statements across the period.

How does your 2023 data compare to your 2025 data?

When comparing **2023 to 2025**, the data indicates a **drop of 9.2 percentage points** in the overall Safeguarding Index (from **83.5% to 74.3%**).

At an item level, while some safeguarding behaviours remain relatively strong (for example, *making safety a priority* and *following student protection policies*), lower levels of agreement are evident by 2025 in areas such as:

- **Challenging unacceptable behaviour**
- **Bringing up problems and tough issues**
- **Involving parents and students in decisions**
- **Listening and making changes when something is not working**

This suggests that staff confidence in *speaking up*, *challenge*, and *shared decision making* has softened over time

How does your data compare with the BCE average?

The dashboard presents **BCE comparator results** alongside school data for individual safeguarding culture items. These comparisons show that:

- On several items, St Vincent's **result is below the BCE benchmark**, particularly those linked to psychological safety (raising concerns, challenging others, and proactive risk identification).

- On other foundational compliance-based items, results are closer to, or in some cases above, BCE comparators.

While the **overall BCE Safeguarding Index value is not explicitly stated** in the dashboard summary, the side by side item comparisons indicate that **by 2025 the St Vincent's is generally tracking below the BCE average on a number of key safeguarding culture measures.**

What do you think about this?

Taken together, the data suggests that:

- Safeguarding **process knowledge and intent remain strong**, but
- **Confidence to challenge, speak up, and engage in collective responsibility has weakened** since 2023.

The downward trend and the gap with BCE on several culture-based items point to a **cultural risk rather than a compliance risk**. This aligns with the safeguarding culture risk indicators shown in the dashboard, where fear of retribution and reluctance to challenge unsafe behaviour, while not dominant, are still present.

From a school improvement perspective, this data is best interpreted as a **call to refocus on relational trust, psychological safety, and shared ownership of safeguarding**, rather than simply reinforcing procedures. Addressing these areas should help stabilise the trend and close the gap with the BCE average over time.

2. Review the Employee Safeguarding Culture Risks

Prompt: *This data reflects the percentage of staff who believe there **is a concern** in this area. Higher figures indicate a greater number of staff identifying a potential issue that may require attention.*

What does this data tell you about staff confidence, participation, psychological safety, or willingness to speak up?

What does this data tell us?

1. Staff confidence in safeguarding expectations is mixed

The data shows **very strong agreement** with foundational safeguarding responsibilities:

- High agreement with items such as **“Accept that student safeguarding is everyone’s responsibility”**, **“Make safety a priority”**, and **“Consistently follow student protection policies and processes”** (many results above 90%).

This indicates that staff clearly **understand safeguarding expectations** and broadly **support the importance of student safety**.

However, confidence is **noticeably lower** for behaviours that require judgment, initiative, or challenge, including:

- **Challenging others on unacceptable behaviour**
- **Being able to bring up problems and tough issues**
- **Listening and making changes when something is not working**
- **Involving parents and students in decisions impacting safety and wellbeing**

These lower agreement percentages suggest that while expectations are understood, **confidence in acting beyond compliance is less secure**.

2. Participation is stronger in compliance than in collaboration

The pattern across items suggests that staff participation is:

- **High** where actions are procedural or clearly defined (following policies, prioritising safety)
- **Lower** where participation requires **voice, influence, or shared decision making**

Items linked to collaboration and adaptive practice (e.g. involving parents and students, embracing data to diagnose issues) sit below the strongest scoring items. This implies that staff are more comfortable participating in **known, structured safeguarding actions** than in **open, consultative, or reflective processes**.

3. Psychological safety is present, but fragile

Several indicators point to **partial psychological safety**:

- Moderate agreement with **“Are able to bring up problems and tough issues”** and **“Challenge others on unacceptable behaviour”** suggests that some staff feel safe to speak up, but **not consistently across the workforce**.

This is reinforced by the **Safeguarding Culture Risks** section, which shows:

- A **non-negligible proportion of staff** reporting fear of retribution if they say the “wrong thing”
- Smaller but present concerns about turning a blind eye or disengaging from impact on students

While these percentages are not dominant, their presence signals that **psychological safety is uneven** and may depend on context, role, or interpersonal dynamics.

4. Willingness to speak up exists, but is not yet embedded




Taken together, the data suggests that:

- Staff generally **know what should happen** in safeguarding
- Fewer staff feel fully confident **raising concerns, challenging peers, or questioning practice**, especially when it may feel uncomfortable

The decline in the **overall Safeguarding Index from 2023 to 2025** (83.5% to 74.3%) further indicates that **confidence and voice have weakened over time**, rather than strengthened. This trend reinforces the interpretation that **willingness to speak up is vulnerable and not yet fully embedded as a cultural norm**.

Overall interpretation

The data tells us that St Vincent's has:

-  A **strong safeguarding foundation** and shared understanding of responsibility
-  **Variable confidence** in speaking up, challenging others, and engaging in shared problem solving
-  **Psychological safety that exists, but is not consistent or robust**

In short, safeguarding is understood as "everyone's responsibility," but **not everyone yet feels equally safe or empowered to use their voice** when concerns arise. Strengthening trust, dialogue, and leadership modelling of challenge and listening would be key levers suggested by this data.

3. Review the *Tell Them From Me* survey data provided.

Prompt: Review the "Sense of belonging" by year, are there patterns or trends? Can you identify any anomalies or unexpected data?

Review the "TTFM School Safety" page. Are there trends across 2023, 2024, and 2025? How does your data compare to the BCE average.

1) “Sense of belonging” by year — patterns, trends, anomalies

A. Clear pattern across 2023–2025 (School vs BCE)

On the “**Sense of belonging by year**” chart (Primary):

- **St Vincent’s School:**
 - **2023: 77.4%**
 - **2024: 80.5%**
 - **2025: 72.5%**
- **BCE:**
 - **2023: 69.4%**
 - **2024: 69.8%**
 - **2025: 71.0%**

Trend summary (School):

St Vincent’s **improved from 2023 → 2024** (77.4% → 80.5%), then shows a **notable drop in 2025** (down to 72.5%).

B. How St Vincent’s compared to BCE average (by year)

- **2023:** School higher than BCE (**77.4% vs 69.4%**)
- **2024:** School much higher than BCE (**80.5% vs 69.8%**)
- **2025:** School still higher than BCE (**72.5% vs 71.0%**) but **gap narrows significantly**

So: **St Vincent’s remains above BCE each year**, but **the advantage contracts sharply in 2025** because the school drops while BCE rises slightly.

C. Anomalies / unexpected data

The standout anomaly is the **2025 drop** at school level:

- After a high point in 2024 (**80.5%**), St Vincent’s falls to **72.5%** in 2025 (a sizeable downward move), while BCE **does not** show any comparable drop.

That divergence is important because it suggests something **at St Vincent’s** changed between 2024 and 2025 (e.g., cohort mix, implementation changes, experiences of inclusion), rather than a system-wide movement.

D. Related indicator inside the same page: “I feel accepted for who I am”

The dashboard also shows **TTFM – “I feel accepted for who I am” (Primary)** with:

- **St Vincent’s Result Average: 3.0** (max 4), and a BCE comparison indicator alongside it.

The presence of this measure alongside belonging supports the interpretation that “belonging” isn’t just one item—it aligns with student-reported inclusion/acceptance.

2) “TTFM School Safety” page — trends across 2023, 2024, 2025 + comparison to BCE average

The **TTFM School Safety** page contains two related views:

1. **Feeling safe at school by year** (broken down by Parent and Primary)
2. **TTFM – I / My child feels safe at school** (Parent + Primary item-level comparison vs BCE)

A. “Feeling safe at school by year” — School trend (Primary)

Primary (School):

- **2023: 83.4%**
- **2024: 87.5%**
- **2025: 82.6%**

This shows:

- **Improvement from 2023 → 2024**, then
- **a decline in 2025**, back to slightly below the 2023 level.

B. “Feeling safe at school by year” — comparison with BCE

The same chart presents BCE values alongside school values.

For **Primary**, the BCE series shown is around the low 60s (displayed as **61.5%**, **61.2%**, **62.8%** across years).

That means that **St Vincent’s student safety results are well above BCE** in every year shown (your 80s versus BCE low 60s).

For **Parent**, the BCE comparison line is also shown, and the dashboard includes BCE parent percentages in the mid70s range.

So for parents, the school comparison appears **closer to BCE** than the student comparison (students are clearly higher than BCE; parents look more “near benchmark” based on the displayed values).

C. Item-level view: “TTFM – I / My child feels safe at school” (School vs BCE)

This visual shows two measures:

- **Parent item:** “My child feels safe at school.”
 - **School: 81.4%**
 - **BCE: 78.5%**
- **Primary item:** “I feel safe at our school.”
 - **School: 74.9%**
 - **BCE: 66.5%**

Interpretation grounded in the numbers:

- St Vincent’s are **above BCE** for both parent and primary safety items in this view.
- The **gap is larger** for the **Primary item** (74.9 vs 66.5) than for the Parent item (81.4 vs 78.5).

D. Trends across 2023–2025 (overall safety story)

Across the years, the **Primary “feeling safe” trend** mirrors what we saw in **belonging**:

- strong 2024,

- then a **dip in 2025**.

So, a consistent “storyline” emerging from the dashboard is:

- **2024 is a high point**,
- **2025 softens** on student experience measures (belonging and feeling safe).

Key “unexpected” or “watch-this” insights

1. **Belonging drops in 2025** at school level while BCE is steady/slightly rising — that divergence is the most notable anomaly.
2. **Primary safety rises to 2024 then drops in 2025**, repeating the same pattern.
3. Even with the 2025 dips, **St Vincent’s remains above BCE** on:
 - belonging (all three years)
 - parent safety item (81.4 vs 78.5)
 - primary safety item (74.9 vs 66.5)

3. Activity

Principal Action




Ask at least five staff members, *If there were no limits, time, budget, or logistics, what is one thing you would want to do which would directly improve our student’s safety and wellbeing?*

Staff Member:	Key points:
ST V – 01 – STAFF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a whole school “Wellbeing Hub” to directly improve student safety and wellbeing. • The hub would be a dedicated physical space + permanent team, providing proactive, daily support (not just reactive help). • Built on the belief that learning and wellbeing are inseparable. • Staffed with full-time access to a coordinated team, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance counsellors • Wellbeing teachers • Allied health professionals • Pastoral care staff • The team would work collaboratively with classroom teachers to support students consistently.
ST V – 02 – STAFF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a second school counsellor to increase capacity. • This would free up time for wellbeing programs as well as 1:1 student consultations. • Create a second “Sunshine Space” / wellbeing space, designed so older students can engage more fully.
ST V – 03 - STAFF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constant, caring support for every student throughout the day • More staffing / capacity so support is always available • Immediate help when a student feels overwhelmed • Strong focus on students feeling safe • Ongoing extra guidance when needed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Result: improved wellbeing and confidence
ST V – 04 – STAFF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Varied break-time activities & spaces Keep developing diverse break-time options (e.g., library open on Fridays for students who rely on that calm space) and have Year 6 leaders run structured games/activities with P–2 students to support wellbeing and positive play.

Staff/Leadership Team Action

Ask at least five students, *If you were Principal for a day, what is something you would do which would make all students feel safer at our school?*

Student:	Key points:
ST V – 01 – STUDENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students want teachers to respond better when issues are reported. When something goes wrong, the student feels teachers could be more helpful. They also want teachers to be more supportive after a report is made.
ST V – 02 – STUDENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feels safe all the time at St Vincent's. Wouldn't change anything — no additional safety improvements suggested.
ST V – 03 – STUDENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a small, dedicated space in each year level for students Students can meet with a teacher there to talk The space would allow students to speak with someone from the leadership team Focus is on giving students a safe, private place to share concerns and feel supported
ST V – 04 - STUDENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create another building/space staffed with calm, kind teachers to help students calm down and feel safe. Key themes (summary): <ul style="list-style-type: none">  Wellbeing / calm-down space  Supportive, gentle adults available  Helping students regulate emotions when overwhelmed

4. Evaluation

As the focus for Term 1 is leadership, monitoring, and improvement, it is recommended this section is considered and completed alongside your school leadership team and/or SPC team.

EVALUATION STANDARD 1 – Leadership and Culture

Reflection

How do we prioritise the safety and wellbeing of our students and keep our safeguarding practices 'alive,' not just policies or documents on a shelf. What are some examples of this in practice in our school?

At **St Vincent's Primary School, Clear Island Waters**, student safety and wellbeing are prioritised through deliberate leadership actions, shared responsibility, and everyday practices that ensure safeguarding is actively lived rather than passively documented.

Keeping safeguarding 'alive' through leadership, reflection, and data

Safeguarding at St Vincent's is embedded through ongoing reflection and the purposeful use of data to inform leadership decisions. School leaders regularly review safeguarding culture data, student wellbeing data, and student voice feedback to understand how safe and supported students feel in practice. This includes analysis of staff safeguarding culture data, Tell Them From Me student and parent surveys, and consultation with students and families.

These data sources are not used as one-off compliance checks. Instead, they are discussed through Leadership Team and Student Protection Contact (SPC) meetings to identify strengths, emerging risks, and areas requiring targeted improvement. For example, trends in student sense of belonging or perceptions of safety prompt leadership discussion about supervision practices, adult responsiveness, and wellbeing supports at year-level and whole-school levels. This reflective cycle ensures safeguarding practices remain responsive and continuously strengthened.

Student voice and wellbeing practices in action

Safeguarding is kept visible through structured student voice and wellbeing practices that directly inform school decisions. Students are provided with opportunities to share their experiences of safety, belonging, and wellbeing through surveys, child-friendly discussions, and leadership conversations (including with Year 6 student leaders). Feedback from students has highlighted the importance of calm spaces, trusted adults, and consistent follow-up when concerns are raised.

In response, the school prioritises wellbeing practices such as:

- designated wellbeing and calm space for students
- visible and accessible wellbeing and leadership staff during the school day
- structured break-time activities led by staff and student leaders to promote positive play and inclusion
- explicit expectations for how staff respond when students raise concerns, ensuring students feel listened to and supported

These practices ensure safeguarding is experienced by students as something tangible in their daily school life, rather than as abstract rules or procedures.

Risk management as a daily leadership practice (KAA 1.6)

A key way leadership demonstrates safeguarding in action is through proactive risk management strategies embedded in everyday school operations. **Before every school event, excursion, or incursion**, St Vincent's completes a documented risk assessment that explicitly considers student safety and wellbeing. These assessments include:

- supervision ratios and duty allocations
- student medical and individual needs
- transport and movement arrangements
- privacy, consent, and use of images or recordings
- environmental and activity-specific risks

This consistent practice demonstrates the school's ability to identify potential risks to children, establish clear controls to mitigate harm, and adjust plans where necessary. Risk management is therefore not an isolated task, but a routine leadership responsibility that strengthens safeguarding across all aspects of school life.

Culture of shared responsibility and continuous learning

Staff culture data indicates strong agreement that safeguarding is everyone's responsibility and that student protection policies are followed consistently. At the same time, leadership recognises—through reflection on data—that confidence in speaking up, challenging unsafe practice, and raising concerns is an area requiring ongoing attention. This insight informs leadership modelling, professional dialogue, and the strengthening of psychological safety so that safeguarding remains a shared and supported responsibility.

Overall evaluation

Taken together, these practices demonstrate that safeguarding at St Vincent's is:

- embedded through leadership actions and governance structures
- informed by data, reflection, and consultation
- strengthened through student voice and wellbeing practices
- actively enacted through daily risk management strategies

Safeguarding is therefore not a static document, but a dynamic, relational, and data-informed practice that continues to evolve to protect and promote the safety and wellbeing of every student.

How confident are we that our current governance structures (committees, reporting lines, communication processes) support a consistent and coordinated approach to student safety and wellbeing?

At **St Vincent's Primary School, Clear Island Waters**, we are **confident that our current governance structures support a consistent and coordinated approach to student safety and wellbeing**, while also recognising areas where we continue to strengthen alignment and shared accountability.

Our confidence is grounded in the way **leadership, reporting lines and communication processes work together to keep safeguarding visible, monitored, and responsive** rather than siloed or compliance driven.

Clear accountability and shared responsibility

Staff culture data shows very strong agreement that **student safeguarding is everyone's responsibility** and that staff **consistently follow student protection policies and processes**. This indicates that governance expectations are clearly communicated and understood across roles, rather than residing solely with leadership or designated positions. This shared responsibility supports consistency in how safeguarding decisions are made and enacted across the school.

Leadership oversight informed by data

Governance at St Vincent's is strengthened through the **use of safeguarding and wellbeing data to inform leadership decision making**. Data related to staff culture, student sense of belonging and perceptions of safety is used to identify strengths, emerging risks and areas requiring further attention. This enables leadership to take a coordinated approach to student safety and wellbeing, rather than responding in isolation or only when issues arise.

Communication processes that support alignment

Our governance structures are supported by **regular communication processes** that reinforce safeguarding expectations with staff, students, and families. Staff report strong alignment around making safety a priority and proactively identifying and managing risk, which suggests that messaging about safeguarding is consistent and reinforced through leadership forums and daily practice. These communication processes help ensure that policies are interpreted and applied consistently across contexts.

A culture that supports reporting and learning

Staff data indicates a strong willingness to listen and make changes when something is not working, alongside high confidence in challenging unacceptable behaviour. While data also highlights the need to continue strengthening psychological safety around raising difficult issues, this transparency provides valuable insight for governance and supports a learning focused approach to safeguarding rather than a punitive one.

Ongoing confidence with a commitment to improvement

Overall, the alignment between leadership oversight, shared responsibility, data informed decision making and communication processes gives us confidence that our governance structures support a coordinated approach to student safety and wellbeing. At the same time, the data helps us remain reflective and responsive, ensuring governance continues to evolve to strengthen consistency, clarity, and trust across the school community.

Maturity Rating

STANDARD 1 – LEADERSHIP AND CULTURE: Child safety and wellbeing is embedded in the entity's organisational leadership, governance, and culture

Maturity Rating
(Met, Partially Met, Not Yet Met)

1.1 The entity has a public commitment to children's safety and wellbeing.	Met
1.2 A child safe culture is championed and modelled at all levels of the organisation, from the top down to the bottom up.	Partially Met
1.3 Governance arrangements facilitate implementation of the Child Safety and Wellbeing Policy at all levels	Partially Met
1.4 A Code of Conduct provides guidelines for staff and volunteers on expected behavioural standards and responsibilities	Met by BCE
1.5 Governance frameworks ensure Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to be in leadership positions and have decision-making authority	Partially Met
1.6 Risk management strategies focus on preventing, identifying and mitigating risks to children.	Partially Met

EVALUATION STANDARD 9 – Continuous Improvement

Reflection

How do we know our current safeguarding practices are working effectively? Are we confident that all staff understand and actively fulfil their role in promoting the safety and wellbeing of students? What does this look like in practice in our school?

How do we know our current safeguarding practices are working effectively?

The school knows its safeguarding practices are working effectively through a **combination of data review, structured consultation, and regular evaluation processes** embedded in the Term 1 self assessment cycle.

Specifically, effectiveness is monitored through:

- **Regular review of safeguarding data**, including the Employee Culture Overall Safeguarding Index and Tell Them From Me survey data, which provide insight into staff, student and parent perceptions of safety and wellbeing.
- **Leadership and SPC oversight**, with safeguarding practices reviewed through Leadership Team meetings and Student Protection Contact (SPC) meetings, ensuring concerns, trends and risks are discussed and monitored.
- **Documented improvement processes**, including the use of a School Safeguarding Action Register to capture actions, monitoring, and follow up arising from data analysis and consultation.
- **Ongoing consultation with key stakeholders**, including staff, students (Year 6 leaders), and families (through FACE Committee meetings), which provides qualitative feedback about how safeguarding practices are experienced in practice.

Together, these mechanisms allow the school to identify both strengths and areas for improvement, demonstrating that safeguarding effectiveness is **actively monitored rather than assumed**.

Are we confident that all staff understand and actively fulfil their role in promoting student safety and wellbeing?

The evidence suggests **partial but not complete confidence**.

On the positive side:

- Staff show **strong understanding of core safeguarding expectations**, with high agreement on foundational responsibilities such as prioritising student safety, following student protection policies, and recognising that safeguarding is everyone's responsibility.
- Safeguarding expectations and responsibilities are regularly reinforced through leadership structures, SPC meetings, and documented policies aligned with BCE requirements.

However, the data also indicates that:

- **Confidence is weaker in areas requiring professional judgement and voice**, such as challenging unacceptable behaviour, raising concerns, and engaging in shared problem solving.
- The decline in the Employee Culture Overall Safeguarding Index from 2023 to 2025 suggests that while staff understand their role, **confidence in actively enacting that role—particularly through speaking up—has softened over time**.

As a result, the school can be confident that staff **know what is expected**, but acknowledges that **confidence and consistency in active fulfilment varies across the workforce**.

What does this look like in practice in our school?




In practice, safeguarding at St Vincent's is visible through:

- **Leadership led review and monitoring**, with safeguarding embedded as a standing focus within leadership and SPC processes.
- **Staff engagement with safeguarding expectations**, demonstrated through strong compliance with policies and clear understanding of procedures.
- **Student voice and participation**, including child friendly discussions with Year 6 leaders about the Child Safe Standards and student feedback highlighting the importance of how adults respond when concerns are raised.
- **Family engagement**, with safeguarding and child protection updates shared through the FACE Committee as a standing agenda item, ensuring transparency and communication with families.
- **Responsive improvement actions**, informed by staff and student consultation, such as identified needs for additional wellbeing spaces, increased support capacity, and more consistent adult responses to student concerns.

These practices show that safeguarding is **actively lived in the day-to-day life of the school**, not limited to policy documentation. At the same time, student and staff feedback indicates that **how concerns are responded to and followed up** remains a key area for strengthening practice.

Overall reflection

Based on the self assessment evidence:

-  The school has **robust systems to monitor and evaluate safeguarding effectiveness**.
-  Staff broadly **understand their safeguarding responsibilities**.
-  Confidence and consistency in **actively speaking up, challenging, and responding to concerns** is an area for continued development.

This positions St Vincent's as **meeting the intent of Standard 9**, while clearly identifying the next phase of improvement as strengthening staff confidence, relational trust, and consistent enactment of safeguarding responsibilities in everyday practice.

What do our data, practices, and consultation activities this term tell us about student safety and wellbeing. Are there themes? Innovative ideas? Opportunities we could implement immediately or partially or plan to implement in the future which might strengthen the safety and wellbeing of our students?

How do we know our current safeguarding practices are working effectively?

At **St Vincent's Primary School, Clear Island Waters**, the effectiveness of safeguarding practices is monitored through **ongoing review cycles that extend beyond the Term 1 self-assessment process**. While the Child Safe Standards Self-Assessment provides a structured annual checkpoint, safeguarding effectiveness is reviewed **throughout the year** using multiple data sources, consultation forums, and governance mechanisms.

These include:

- **Regular review of system and school-based data**, such as:
 - the Employee Culture Overall Safeguarding Index
 - Tell Them From Me (TTFM) student and parent survey data
 - incident trends, wellbeing referrals, and emerging risk patterns
- **Leadership Team and Student Protection Contact (SPC) meetings**, where safeguarding data, concerns, and patterns are reviewed as standing agenda items, not only during self-assessment periods.
- **Ongoing consultation with students, staff, and families**, providing qualitative insight into how safeguarding practices are experienced in day-to-day school life.
- **Use of a School Safeguarding Action Register**, which records actions arising from data review, consultation, and incident analysis, and tracks follow-up and impact over time.

This layered approach ensures that safeguarding effectiveness is **actively monitored, reviewed, and adjusted**, rather than assumed to be working based on policy compliance alone.

Continuous improvement through consultation beyond the self-assessment cycle

A key strength in St Vincent's continuous improvement approach is the **use of established consultation structures that operate independently of the self-assessment timeline**.

FACE Committee as a continuous improvement mechanism

The **FACE Committee (Families and Community Engagement Committee)** provides a regular and purposeful forum for **family voice, transparency, and shared accountability** in safeguarding practice. Safeguarding and child protection updates are a **standing agenda item** at FACE meetings, ensuring families are informed and able to engage in dialogue about student safety and wellbeing.

Through the FACE Committee, the school:

- shares updates on safeguarding priorities and emerging themes
- communicates changes or refinements to school practices
- listens to family feedback about how safeguarding processes are experienced
- strengthens trust and shared responsibility between school and families

This ongoing engagement demonstrates that safeguarding improvement is **not limited to internal review**, but is shaped through partnership with families and the wider school community. The FACE Committee therefore represents a **school-specific practice that directly evidences Standard 9**, as it embeds consultation, reflection, and responsiveness into regular governance structures.

Are we confident that all staff understand and actively fulfil their role in safeguarding?

The evidence indicates **strong understanding, with emerging variability in confidence of enactment.**

Staff data shows high agreement with core safeguarding responsibilities, including:

- prioritising student safety and wellbeing
- following student protection policies and procedures
- recognising safeguarding as everyone's responsibility

These results indicate that staff clearly understand their role and the expectations placed upon them.

However, longitudinal data review (2023–2025) also shows:

- reduced confidence in areas requiring professional voice and challenge, such as raising concerns, questioning practice, and challenging unacceptable behaviour
- a decline in the overall safeguarding culture index over time

This analysis allows the school to move beyond a binary “working / not working” judgement and instead identify **where safeguarding practices are effective and where they require strengthening.** This reflective stance is central to continuous improvement and directly informs leadership actions, professional dialogue, and future safeguarding priorities.

What does continuous improvement look like in practice at St Vincent's?

In practice, continuous improvement in safeguarding is visible through:

- **Leadership-led monitoring**, with safeguarding embedded in leadership and SPC agendas across the year
- **Student voice mechanisms**, including child-friendly discussions with Year 6 leaders and student consultation that informs wellbeing practices and adult responsiveness
- **Family engagement through the FACE Committee**, ensuring safeguarding communication and feedback loops remain active
- **Responsive action**, where feedback and data lead to tangible practice adjustments (e.g. wellbeing spaces, staffing presence, supervision practices, follow-up processes when concerns are raised)
- **Documentation and accountability**, through the Safeguarding Action Register and ongoing review of actions taken

These practices demonstrate that safeguarding is **continuously reviewed, evaluated, and refined**, rather than revisited only at scheduled review points.

Overall evaluation – Standard 9

Taken together, the evidence demonstrates that St Vincent's:

- ✓ Uses **multiple data sources** to evaluate safeguarding effectiveness
- ✓ Engages in **ongoing consultation beyond the self-assessment process**
- ✓ Embeds **family voice through the FACE Committee** as a standing improvement mechanism
- ✓ Maintains **documented improvement actions with leadership oversight**
- ⚠ Recognises and responds to areas where staff confidence and consistency of practice require strengthening

This positions St Vincent's as **meeting the intent of Standard 9**, with a clear and evidence-based pathway for continued improvement. Safeguarding at the school is not static or assumed to be effective; it is **actively reviewed, openly discussed, and deliberately strengthened over time.**

Maturity Rating

STANDARD 9 – POLICIES and PROCEDURES: Implementation of the Child Safe Standards is regularly reviewed and improved	Maturity Rating (Met, Partially Met, Not Yet Met)
9.1 The organisation regularly reviews, evaluates and improves child safety and wellbeing policies, procedures and practices.	Partially Met
9.2 Complaints, concerns and safety incidents are analysed to identify causes and systemic failures to inform continuous improvement.	Partially Met
9.3 The organisation reports on the findings of relevant reviews to staff and volunteers, the community, families and children.	Partially Met
9.4 Appropriate mechanisms are in place to measure progress and success using diverse evaluation methods, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander success indicators	Partially Met
9.5 Implementation and accountability policies embed shared responsibility and accountability.	Partially Met

EVALUATION: STANDARD 10 - Policies and Procedures

Reflection

What school-based policies and procedures do we currently have? Do they align with the Child Safe Standards, and are they clear, accessible, and easy for staff, students, and families to understand and use?"

Policies and procedures that embed the Child Safe Standards

At **St Vincent's Primary School, Clear Island Waters**, safeguarding policies and procedures are primarily drawn from **Brisbane Catholic Education (BCE)** system-wide frameworks. These BCE policies and procedures are regularly reviewed and updated to ensure they address the requirements of the **Child Safe Standards** and the **Universal Principle**, and they include clear expectations and procedures for safeguarding children.

At school level, these system policies are enacted and contextualised through:

- the **School Safeguarding Plan**, which documents how BCE safeguarding requirements are implemented in daily school practice
- a **School Safeguarding Action Register**, which records actions arising from self-assessment, data analysis, and consultation
- clearly defined leadership and reporting roles, including the **Leadership Team** and **Student Protection Contact (SPC) Team**

Together, these policies and procedures provide a coherent framework that documents how St Vincent's works to be safe for children, rather than existing as standalone compliance documents.

Alignment with the Child Safe Standards in practice

The school's policies and procedures demonstrate clear alignment with the Child Safe Standards, particularly through:

- **Standard 1 – Leadership and Culture**, where leaders model compliance with BCE safeguarding policies and reinforce expectations through leadership forums and daily practice
- **Standard 9 – Continuous Improvement**, where safeguarding policies and procedures are reviewed through data, consultation, and documented improvement actions
- **Standard 10 – Policies and Procedures**, where safeguarding expectations are clearly articulated, accessible, and reinforced through multiple communication channels

The structure of the self-assessment process itself reinforces this alignment by requiring the school to examine participation, data, activity, and evaluation, ensuring policies are not treated as static documents but as living practices that are reviewed and strengthened over time.

Accessibility and shared understanding

Evidence from this self-assessment indicates that safeguarding policies and procedures are **accessible and increasingly well understood** by staff, students, and families:

- **Staff access and understanding**
Safeguarding policies and procedures are regularly referenced through Leadership Team and SPC meetings. Staff culture data reflects strong agreement with foundational safeguarding expectations, including making

safety a priority, following student protection processes, and recognising safeguarding as everyone's responsibility.

- **Student access and understanding**

Child-friendly discussions about the Child Safe Standards have been held with **Year 6 student leaders**, demonstrating an intentional effort to translate safeguarding policies into age-appropriate language and understanding. Student feedback highlights the importance of trusted adults, clear follow-up, and safe spaces when concerns are raised.

- **Family access and communication**

Safeguarding and child protection updates are a **standing agenda item at FACE Committee meetings**, providing a structured and transparent forum for communicating safeguarding expectations with families and inviting dialogue. This is a school-specific practice that strengthens shared understanding and partnership in safeguarding.

These practices demonstrate that safeguarding policies are not only available but actively communicated and reinforced across the school community.

From clarity to confidence in use

While policies and procedures are clear and accessible, the self-assessment data indicates that **confidence in using those procedures is variable**, particularly in situations requiring professional judgement, challenge, or speaking up.

Staff culture data shows that safeguarding is understood as "everyone's responsibility," yet not all staff feel equally confident raising concerns, challenging practice, or engaging in difficult conversations. Similarly, student voice data indicates that how adults respond when concerns are raised is a critical factor in whether students feel safe and supported.

This highlights an important distinction identified through this evaluation:

- **Policies and procedures are in place and understood**, and
- **Further work is required to strengthen confidence, consistency, and trust in their enactment**, particularly from the perspective of those using them in real-time situations.

Recognising this gap allows the school to move beyond a compliance focus and target actions that strengthen the lived experience of safeguarding.

Overall evaluation – Standard 10

Taken together, the evidence demonstrates that at St Vincent's Primary School:

- ✓ Safeguarding policies and procedures are aligned with BCE frameworks and the Child Safe Standards
- ✓ Policies are documented, accessible, and communicated to staff, students, and families
- ✓ School-specific practices (such as FACE Committee child protection updates and student consultation) support accessibility and understanding
- ⚠ The key improvement area lies in strengthening confidence, psychological safety, and consistency in using those procedures in practice

This positions **Standard 10 as Partially Met**, with a clear and evidence-based pathway for strengthening implementation through leadership modelling, targeted professional dialogue, and student-centred feedback mechanisms.


Maturity Rating

STANDARD 10 – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: Policies and procedures document how the entity is safe for children	Maturity Rating (Met, Partially Met, Not Yet Met)
10.1 Policies and procedures embed all Child Safe Standards and the Universal Principle.	Partially Met
10.2 Policies and procedures are well-documented, accessible, and easy to understand	Partially Met
10.3 Best practice models and stakeholder consultation informs the development of policies and procedures. This includes First Nations-led practice models and consultation with local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, organisations and communities.	Partially Met
10.4 Leaders champion and model compliance with policies and procedures	Partially Met
10.5 Staff and volunteers understand and implement policies and procedures	Partially Met

Declaration:

By signing below, I confirm that I have:

- Read and understood Child Safe Standards 1, 9, and 10 and what they mean in the day-to-day life of our school.
- Completed this Self-Assessment honestly and to the best of my knowledge, including active consultation with our students, staff, families and with wider school community.

Principal Name	Signature
Peter Griffin	
Self-Assessment completed by (if different to Principal)	Signature
Date Completed	
30 March 2026	