

23.03.21

**13 Deputy R.J. Ward of the Minister for Children and Education regarding schools inspections (OQ.47/2023)**

Will the Minister outline what reviews, if any, have been carried out regarding the processes undertaken for the school inspections that were supervised by the recently convicted senior member of C.Y.P.E.S. (Children, Young People, Education and Skills), and will the Minister provide details on what that member of staff's role was in the inspections?

**Deputy I. Gardiner (The Minister for Children and Education):**

Thank you for the Deputy's question. A review of the individual's work activity and connections to the offending behaviours was part of the police investigation. There was no evidence of any offending involving children or young people in Jersey.

[12:00]

The individual referred to in the Deputy's question has been dismissed from his role with the Government of Jersey and served only on one school review in November 2019. For the review in question, he was part of a team of reviewers led by an external lead. The lead reviewer, who is the school senior advisor, led the safeguarding component of that review, which is on day one of the process. The dismissed individual was not present for this day. He attended day 2 and 3. The model for this day 2 and 3 is paired work with another reviewer. So at no point was the individual ever alone with the pupils.

**3.13.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:**

May I ask the Minister what other role the individual may have had overall given it was, I believe, a role in overseeing inspections in general, in making judgments and overall judgments of the outcomes of inspections?

**Deputy I. Gardiner:**

The individual worked within the office. He did not have connections with the children in day-to-day work. So if referring to the first questions, his role was overseeing in the policy but involvement with children was not part of it.

**Deputy R.J. Ward:**

The question was regards the inspections and what role?

**Deputy I. Gardiner:**

He was not part of the inspections taking place in the school, he was part only of one inspection on 2 days when he was paired with another member of staff.

**3.13.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:**

We are talking about somebody who has been convicted of a particularly disgusting crime and somebody whose entire trustworthiness has now been thrown aside because of the appalling things that this person has been convicted for. Until recently, they were working in a position where they would have been making decisions, they would have been doing work. This is somebody who was untrustworthy and whose entire work has been undermined by that. What Deputy Ward is trying to get at with his question is what has been done to go through the work that this awful, disgusting person did and what has been done to ensure that the quality of that work is examined and is looked

at again to ensure that whatever arose from that work is appropriate now, given that the person involved in doing it is untrustworthy?

**Deputy I. Gardiner:**

The individual worked within the office. He did not have connections with the children in day-to-day work. So if referring to the first questions, his role was overseeing in the policy but involvement with children was not part of it.

**Deputy R.J. Ward:**

The question was regards the inspections and what role?

**Deputy I. Gardiner:**

He was not part of the inspections taking place in the school, he was part only of one inspection on 2 days when he was paired with another member of staff.

**3.13.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:**

We are talking about somebody who has been convicted of a particularly disgusting crime and somebody whose entire trustworthiness has now been thrown aside because of the appalling things that this person has been convicted for. Until recently, they were working in a position where they would have been making decisions, they would have been doing work. This is somebody who was untrustworthy and whose entire work has been undermined by that. What Deputy Ward is trying to get at with his question is what has been done to go through the work that this awful, disgusting person did and what has been done to ensure that the quality of that work is examined and is looked at again to ensure that whatever arose from that work is appropriate now, given that the person involved in doing it is untrustworthy?

**Deputy I. Gardiner:**

It was a very difficult situation that I found myself in and we have all been shocked by the situation. It is really important to make clear that the person pled guilty in the Magistrates Court on 24th February. He has yet to be convicted and sentencing will be given on 24th March. So the second thing that we are reviewing, our safeguard procedures within the department, we are looking into the enhanced D.B.S. (Disclosure and Barring Service) checks. We are working on a department level. Apart from this, it is 2 different things, the policy that is set, and we are reviewing the policy and see what we can do, and the day-to-day involvement with children that did not take place.

**3.13.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:**

An enhanced D.B.S. check would have done nothing in this instance, but a Google search might have, to have uncovered what this person had been involved with previously, displaying a record of untrustworthiness. Would this Minister endeavour to look at all of the work that this person did on behalf of the public service and assess it and have another person with a much better record of trustworthiness to look at it and ensure that, whatever has happened as a result of that work on behalf of the public service, it can be checked and make sure that whatever resulted from it is appropriate? That is not a question about safeguarding. That is a question about all the work that civil servant will have been involved in.

**Deputy I. Gardiner:**

This is what the department is currently doing and this is the reason, when the news came to our attention, when we became aware of the allegation, we immediately suspended, including all the

resources was taken from the individual. The department and several people within the department; it is really important that it will be a team and not one person reviewing all work. So the team that is looking into the work that the individual has been doing over the years.

**Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:**

My question has probably been answered but I was just asking that all safety and safeguarding is taken into consideration for our children.

**The Bailiff:**

Do you have a question for the Minister?

**Deputy A. Howell:**

No.

**The Bailiff:**

No. Thank you very much.

**3.13.4 Deputy R.J. Ward:**

One of the issues, the person had a senior role in C.Y.P.E.S. and was involved in what would be called value judgments on schools. Value judgments on the performance of staff. Will the Minister undertake to go back over any involvement in both inspections, appointments, et cetera, and look again as to whether those value judgments are now valid and whether they should be looked at again to give confidence to staff who may have been involved with this individual?

**Deputy I. Gardiner:**

Yes, absolutely. Thank you for your suggestion.