

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIRMAN OF EDUCATION AND HOME AFFAIRS SCRUTINY
PANEL BY DEPUTY I.J. GORST OF ST. CLEMENT**

ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 21st OCTOBER 2008

Question

R.89/2008 regarding the implementation of Dr. K. Bull's Report into Children with Social Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) states, with regard to recommendation 17.1.8, that 'a recommendation for an External Independent Review Group was effectively superseded by the introduction (under Ministerial Government) of the Social Affairs Scrutiny Panel' (Scrutiny panel now split into two).

Can the Chairman outline whether his panel have implemented the 'Bull' recommendations 17.1.8 and 17.2.1 (relating to the management of the revamped facility) and, if so, can he explain why they have not produced any report to show that this work has been undertaken?

Answer

The Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel has not implemented the two recommendations to which the De refers and, as a result, has not produced any report on the matter. However, there are two issues which need to be considered in relation to this matter:

1. When was the Panel told about its responsibilities in this matter?
2. Does the work of an "External Independent Review Group", as described in these two recommendations within the remit of Scrutiny?

Until Children's Executive: Progress Report (R.89/2008) was presented to the States on 20th August 2008 Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel had been unaware that responsibility for these two recommendations had been assigned to Scrutiny. The Panel has researched this point thoroughly, including contacting the former Chair of the Social Affairs Scrutiny Panel; it has found no record that any formal communication was ever received by the Panel. This is regrettable and the Panel therefore thanks Deputy Gorst for highlighting this issue.

As it is, the Panel has no doubt that the work described in recommendations 17.1.8 and 17.2.1 does not fall within the remit of Scrutiny. Therefore, had the Panel been told of its apparent responsibilities, it could have advised the Executive of this fact. The Panel believes that an error has therefore been made by the Corporate Parent (that is to say the Ministers for Health and Social Services; Education, Sport and Culture; and Home Affairs) in merely assuming that responsibility for recommendation 17.1.8 had passed to the former Social Affairs Scrutiny Panel.

It would appear that these two recommendations have therefore not been implemented. Indeed, the Panel has noted that the 'Williamson Report' included recommendations to a similar effect. The Panel would therefore recommend that the Corporate Parent re-examines these recommendations to ensure their implementation.

The Panel has maintained a good working relationship with the Ministers in its remit. However, this incident highlights the need for effective two-way communication to occur between the Executive and Scrutiny.

For ease of reference, recommendations 17.1.8 and 17.2.1 from Dr. K. Bull's report are enclosed below.

Recommendations 17.1.8 and 17.2.1 of Review of the Principles, Practices and Provision for Children and Young People with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties and Disorders in the Island of Jersey:

17.1.8 An External Independent Review Group be established to ensure accountability of each Committee (Mini

in realising the targets set against the Partnership and Strategic Planning development and delivery. The group should include representatives who are specifically appointed to guarantee efficiency of procedures, protocols and practice in establishing a Children's Executive, and, delivering a cohesive, cost effective and efficient overall service for children and young people with EBD.

17.2.1 Within a period of one year, or at the very latest by April of 2004, the existing remand provision be closed and a new facility, which meets the requirements laid out in the Strategic Plan and the subsequent Behaviour Management Programme, to be established to cater for the very specific needs of young people at risk to themselves and others. The use of such a facility – to be described in greater detail as part of a multi-purpose campus – be dictated and governed by the outcomes of detailed cross-agency assessment of both the offending behaviours and the social context in which the offender exists as well as the level of offence as categorised by a Tariff of Offending Behaviour (17.2.2). The welfare of those remanded or sentenced to the new facility should be paramount and, therefore, should form the basis of the treatment, care and educational services to be provided on site. The oversight of the new facility should fall to the Children's Executive. The management of the new facility should fall to a Director of Services. The post-holder should be able to develop a unified and coalesced cross-agency service/facility and demonstrate high level knowledge and skill in relation to health care (psychiatric provision); educational developments; and social structures. The Director should be accountable to the Children's Executive and his/her performance monitored against very specific targets set by them and reviewed on an annual basis, by the External Independent Review Group.