

Government Plan 2022 – 25 Review

Children, Education and Home Affairs
Scrutiny Panel

Presented to the States on 8th December
S.R.16/2021



Government Plan
2022-25 Review

***Children, Education
and Home Affairs
Scrutiny Panel***



States of Jersey
States Assembly



États de Jersey
Assemblée des États

1	CHAIR'S FOREWORD	1
2	INTRODUCTION / METHODOLOGY	2
3	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3
	Findings	3
	Recommendations	7
4	DEPARTMENTAL BUDGETS	11
	Departmental Budgets	11
	Departmental Heads of Expenditure	12
5	EFFICIENCIES	16
	Rebalancing and Efficiencies	16
	Minister for Children and Education	17
	Minister for Home Affairs	20
6	SUMMARY TABLES OF SCRUTINY 'RAG' RATINGS	30
	Previously reviewed programmes and capital projects (GP 2020-23 / GP 2021-24)	30
	New programmes requiring additional revenue expenditure (GP 2022-25)	34
	New capital expenditure (GP 2022-25)	35
7	PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED PROGRAMMES AND CAPITAL PROJECTS: UPDATE REPORTS	36
	Programmes	36
	Education Reform Programme	36
	Independent Jersey Care Inquiry P108 – Recommendation Five: Legislation – Legislation – Children's Policy and Legislative Programme	41
	Independent Jersey Care Inquiry P108 – Recommendation Seven – The 'Jersey' Way	43
	Policy/Legislation Service Delivery – Care Leavers Entitlement	45
	Policy/Legislation Service Delivery – Children in Need / Early Help	48
	CAMHS Service Redesign	51
	Improving Educational Outcomes – Early Years	53
	Higher Education	58
	Funding of Senior Posts within Justice and Home Affairs	62
	Policing 2020-23	63
	SARC Dewberry House	65
	Probation Service Additional Funding	66
	Probation – BASS Funding, Regrading and Trainee Post	67

Capital Projects	68
Combined Control IT	68
North of St. Helier Youth Centre	71
8 NEW PROGRAMMES AND CAPITAL PROJECTS IN GP 2022-25: REPORTS	73
Programmes	73
GP22-CSP1-1-09 --- Young People Intensive support	73
GP22-CSP1-2-06 --- Education Demographic Pressures	75
GP22-OI3-28 --- Jersey Police Authority (JPA)	77
GP22-OI3-22 --- Defence Funding	79
Fund as Required --- Brexit Transition - Legal and Policy Support	80
GP22-OI-Non-12 --- Probation Service Inspection	82
Capital projects	84
CSP 1 --- School Estate	84
None --- Ambulance, Fire & Rescue Headquarters	86
CSP 1 --- Army and Sea Cadets Headquarters	88
9 CONCLUSION	90
10 WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE GATHERED	93
APPENDIX 1	94
Terms of Reference	94
Panel membership	95

1 Chair's Foreword



The Panel has undertaken a thorough review of this year's Government Plan at a time when significant reports that will determine the long-term future of Education are to be finalised by Government departments across CYPES and Home Affairs. In addition, influential reviews of sites that will determine schools and/or the Fire and Ambulance station are also due. The Panel has concerns over the absence of these reports and the subsequent effect on adequate information to scrutinise funding initiatives in significant areas. The Panel has made important recommendations around these and other areas of the Government plan specific to the Ministers scrutinised.

Covid-19 continues to provide challenges for face-to-face Scrutiny and required flexibility in our approach to engage as many stakeholders as possible. I would like to pass my personal thanks to all who have contributed evidence. There have been important contributions from participants which helped inform and shape the report. The Panel thanks the Ministers for their time and input. We look forward to positive responses to the challenging, yet positive recommendations made.

I would like to thank the Scrutiny team for the huge amount of work they have undertaken to produce this timely and detailed report. Without their work, the important process of scrutiny would be debilitated, and our democracy diminished.

Deputy Rob Ward
Chair,
Children, Education and Home Scrutiny Panel

2 Introduction / Methodology

The proposed Government Plan 2022 sets out the approach the Government of Jersey has taken in responding to COVID-19 whilst continuing to invest in the Common Strategic Policy priorities:

1. Put children first
2. Improve Islander's wellbeing and mental and physical health
3. Create a sustainable, vibrant economy
4. Reduce income inequality and improve the standard of living
5. Protect and value our environment.

The Plan outlines the investment proposed in each of these five strategic priority areas and also includes a number of proposed efficiencies within the Government.

The Government Plan Financial Annex has also been lodged which contains supporting information for the Government Plan 2022-2025.

The Scrutiny review of the Government Plan has taken a thorough approach, looking at the projects identified for additional revenue expenditure and capital expenditure last year, as well as new projects requiring additional revenue expenditure and capital expenditure in 2022. The Panel has undertaken this review in as much detail as possible with the information provided by Government.

A summary table of all business cases is provided in Chapter 6, along with the Panel's RAG rating.

In line with the methodology used during previous reviews, all Scrutiny Panels have agreed to use a common system to report on the status of each business case, as follows:



The Panel has reviewed the background information and is satisfied with the business case.



The Panel has reviewed the business case and either has concerns or considers that it needs more work, or further detail should be provided. It might also mean that the Panel considers it too early to make an informed decision. This may or may not lead to recommendations and/or amendments.



The Panel has reviewed the business case and is not satisfied or does not agree with the proposal. This may or may not lead to an amendment.

3 Findings and Recommendations

Findings



FINDING 1

The Minister for Children and Education has confirmed that the removal of a social worker role in Children's Services is as a result of a redesign of the service and the early help service providing better support that historically would have been dealt with by Social Workers. It was further stated that the increased caseload and reduction in capacity was a risk relating to the efficiency but was not currently an issue.



FINDING 2

The reduction in non-staff and staff spend within the Integrated Services and Commissioning service of Children, Young People, Education and Skills is defined as a streamlining of the service in order to remove various hurdles for individuals accessing services through the Children and Families Hub. It has been stated that this will not have an impact on service delivery.



FINDING 3

The Minister for Home Affairs has explained that a target of a £406,000 reduction in non-staff expenditure across the Department for Justice and Home Affairs has been set and is intended to identify waste and duplication across the service. This is intended to be confirmed by the middle of 2022.



FINDING 4

The Minister for Home Affairs has confirmed that an estimated £184,000 income in respect of visa, work permit and passport applications has been profiled for 2022 by the Customs and Immigration Department as part of the rebalancing measures. There is, however, no certainty at this stage as to whether this target is achievable, and the Minister will be required to monitor this carefully throughout 2022.



FINDING 5

It is intended for a recurring spend reduction of £315,000 from 1st January 2022 (3% of the services budget) to be made within the States of Jersey Prison Service as part of a new target operating model for the service. However, this new operating model has yet to be finalised and there is a presumption that it will be undertaken with a view to achieving this level of saving.



FINDING 6

It is intended for the States of Jersey Police Force to make savings totalling £459,000 across the non-staff budget of £3.1 million. Taking into the account the transfer of Police IT which occurred earlier in 2022, this would reduce the non-staff budget to £2.9 million in 2022. The Chief of Police has identified several areas where these savings can be found and is confident that they can be achieved.



FINDING 7

It is intended to make an efficiency saving of £377,000 within Civilian Roles in the States of Jersey Police Force in 2022. This does not relate to a removal of posts, but to posts which have been frozen following a staff review into civilian roles within the Police Force. It is noted that the savings are not as a direct result

of the staff review but have been put in place due to the requirement for all Government Departments to make 3% savings across budgets in 2022.



FINDING 8

Throughout its review of the Government Plan, the Panel has not received any information in relation to the new funding formula for schools that is intended to be in place from 1st January 2022, despite repeated requests to have sight of this information. It is the view of the Minister for Children and Education that the work to produce a new funding formula is not connected to the additional funding provided in the Government Plan around the Education Reform Programme. The Panel does not agree with this statement.



FINDING 9

The Panel is unable to state whether the “increased” funding of £11.2 million in 2022 is sufficient to cover the existing deficits, training for teachers and any identified increase in demographics that may arise from the new funding formula.



FINDING 10

There has been an 18-month delay in relation to policy work within the Children’s Legislative Programme due to Policy Officers being seconded to other areas to tackle the COVID-19 pandemic. A number of pieces of legislation are due to be brought forward towards the end of the current Assembly, however, there is no certainty at this stage whether they will be lodged in time for debate prior to the election.



FINDING 11

The Panel is concerned that responsibility for oversight of implementing the Independent Jersey Care Inquiry recommendations now falls to a number of Ministers, whereas in previous discussions around this area responsibility was clearly placed on the Minister for Children and Education (formerly the Minister for Children and Housing) to act as a champion in this area. This does not appear to be the case at present. There needs to be greater clarity over the role of the Minister for Children and Education so that accountability is clear as to where the overall responsibilities lie.



FINDING 12

There has been further take up of the Care Leavers entitlement, with 78 people currently being supported by Children’s Services. Work is ongoing to establish an endowment fund which is expected to be finalised within the coming months following the Government Plan debate.



FINDING 13

The Project Design of the Children in Need/Early Help project has now been completed and the additional the £1.7 million recurring funding in respect of the project relates almost entirely to staffing costs and commissioning of other services in respect of the Children and Families Hub. 11 roles are still to be recruited to at this stage and development of the Key Performance Indicators for the Early Help service is ongoing.



FINDING 14

The initial service design for the Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service has been completed with a number of roles identified to be recruited to during 2022. The overall number of roles within the service is increasing from 28 to 64. There is, however, concern that this significant number of roles will prove difficult to recruit to expediently.

**FINDING 15**

The funding identified for the Improving Educational Outcomes: Early Years Project in 2022 (£1.27 million) does not cover the total estimated funding level of £3.32 million estimated for the Nursery Education Fund (NEF) support for 3-4-year-olds. This is due to a funding reduction of £1.43 million in 2021 for Early Years and the decision taken by the Minister for Children and Education earlier in 2021 to increase the NEF hours from 20 to 30 per child per week and increase the hourly rate to £6.70 per hour.

**FINDING 16**

Due to the increase in the Nursery Education Fund Hours from 20 to 30 hours per week per child, and the increase in the hourly rate to £6.70 per hour agreed by the Minister for Children and Education in 2021, there is no additional funding within the Early Years budgets to implement targeted support for 2-3-year-olds as per the recommendation of the Early Years Policy Development Board.

**FINDING 17**

Funding to assist in the implementation of the recommendations arising from the Early Years Policy Development Board has been identified from the Covid Health and Social Recovery Fund which sits under the Heads of Expenditure for Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance. This funding is to be allocated to the Best Start Partnership to assist with workforce training, a best start co-ordinator role and expansion of the Best Start Nursery Plus Scheme by 20 families. This does not, however, cover funding for degree level courses for practitioners in the private nursery settings as per policy area six of the Early Years Policy Development Board report.

**FINDING 18**

The grant allocated to the Jersey Child Care Trust in 2022 has been reduced by £30,000 due to previous agreement in the Medium-Term Financial Plan 2016-2019 with the planned reduction from 2019 never being brought forward. This reduction will result in the charity not being able to deliver the accredited nanny service in 2022.

**FINDING 19**

The funding levels allocated to Higher Education have exceeded take up since the scheme was introduced in 2018. Changes to the manner in which parental income is assessed in 2021 by Order have raised concern that some students may be affected in terms of the amount of grant available to them from the start of the 2021/22 academic year.

**FINDING 20**

It is still intended for the States of Jersey Police Force to recruit with the intention of meeting the target of 215 Police Officers and proposed efficiency savings do not impact the funding for this target. There is, however, concern that the impact on police officers will still be felt as a result of civilian roles not being recruited to which will need to be monitored closely by the Minister for Home Affairs.

**FINDING 21**

A new people model for the Combined Control Room is due to be consulted on during November 2021 with a view to identifying the model to be implemented. It is intended for the new Computer-Aided Dispatch System to be purchased and implemented in 2022 with funding allocated to the capital project. It is expected that both of these changes will realise efficiency savings.

**FINDING 22**

There is currently not clarity over the siting of a new North of St. Helier Youth Centre. Whilst funds are attributed to this project in 2022, the Panel is concerned that the project has not been suitably prioritised in the capital programme to date.

**FINDING 23**

The additional funding for the Young People Intensive Support Programme is being brought forward to provide targeted support for a small cohort of young people with the greatest needs. This will help to support a multi-agency team to with training, additional staff and increase the support available in the school setting.

**FINDING 24**

The funding allocated to the Education Demographics Pressures project is required to fund increased numbers of students moving through the school system via the Average Weighted Pupil Unit. The funding also provides a catch up on funding for students at Mont à l'Abbé where an increase has not happened for a number of years. There is £2 million allocated to demographic SEN within Government Reserves in the event need exceeds demand. The Panel is concerned, however, that without details of the new funding formula being developed, the level of funding within the Government Plan cannot be identified as sufficient or not.

**FINDING 25**

The new revenue funding allocated to the Jersey Police Authority (JPA) within the Government Plan 2022 – 25 is in order to increase the resources available to it in order to ensure the States of Jersey Police Force is operating as efficiently and effectively as possible. It is also noted that the funding provided in the Government Plan is one third of what was requested by the JPA. This will require monitoring by the Minister for Home Affairs to ensure the funding is adequate for the role of the JPA.

**FINDING 26**

The additional funding for the Jersey Field Squadron has been identified in order to cover an historic issue whereby funding of £1 million was provided on an annual basis that did not take into account RPI, salary increases and inflation. The additional funding is intended to bring the overall budget up to date.

**FINDING 27**

The fund as required project 'Brexit Transition – Policy and Legal Support' seeks to provide funding for reactive work in relation to implications arising from Brexit. An estimate of £172,000 has been set aside for 2022, however, there is no certainty over this level of funding.

**FINDING 28**

The Jersey Probation and After-Care Service (JPACS) has submitted a funding request for an external inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) to take place in 2023 due to workload of the inspectorate. Whilst the service has undergone a number of inspections in recent years, JPACS has not been inspected by HMIP since 2005.

**FINDING 29**

There are a number of capital projects within the Education portfolio that are being progressed in 2022, however, there is still uncertainty in relation to the outcome of the School Sites Review which has yet to be presented. Until such time as the outcome of this review is known, there is uncertainty over the level of funding allocated to the Schools Estates programme for 2022.

**FINDING 30**

The allocated funding for the Fire and Ambulance Headquarters in 2022 is based on the Rouge Bouillon site being allocated for the project. At present, the school site review is ongoing and there is no certainty as to which project the site will be allocated to as it is dependent on the outcome of this review. In the event the site is not allocated to the Fire and Ambulance Headquarters project, further work and funding will be required to identify and carry out pre-feasibility work on a new site.

**FINDING 31**

A new site for the Army and Sea Cadets Headquarters is due to be selected so that pre-feasibility work can be undertaken in 2022. The current details of the site are commercially confidential, so the Panel cannot state at this time whether the funding identified will meet the requirements for the project in 2022 at this time.

Recommendations

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

The Panel is concerned about the rationale for the removal of a social worker post which is planned as a £50,000 recurring spend reduction. The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that the impact of the cost reduction is assessed through the quarterly performance report for the department for Children, Young People, Education and Skills and an update provided to the Panel in advance of the Government Plan 2023-2026.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that the proposed efficiency savings are not impacting service delivery within the Integrated Services and Commissioning service. An assessment of this reduction should be undertaken on a bi-annual basis against the new people strategy and any negative impact on services or wellbeing of staff rectified.

**RECOMMENDATION 3**

The Minister for Home Affairs should ensure that no front-line service is directly affected as a result of efficiency savings made in respect of non-staff spend and that any structural budget concerns arising from this saving are addressed as a matter of priority.

**RECOMMENDATION 4**

The Minister for Home Affairs should monitor on a monthly basis the number of applications for visas, work permits and passports and associated income against the rebalancing target of £184,000. Should this figure not be achievable,

then the Minister must take action to identify additional income from across other areas of the department.

**RECOMMENDATION 5**

The Minister for Home Affairs should provide a briefing to the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel as soon as the new Target Operating Model for the Prison Service is completed, outlining the structure of the service and the total level of funding required in order to implement it by end of January 2022.

**RECOMMENDATION 6**

The Minister for Home Affairs should, in collaboration with the Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police, Jersey Police Authority and States of Jersey Police Force Association monitor the impact of the non-staff budget spend reduction within the Government Plan on a monthly basis to ensure it is not directly impacting front line services within the police.

**RECOMMENDATION 7**

In the event that the Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police identifies a significant impact on the operation of the police force as a result of the £377,000 rebalancing measure in civilian roles, the Minister for Home Affairs should immediately seek to release funding in order for the frozen posts to be recruited to as a matter of priority.

**RECOMMENDATION 8**

The Minister should also report to the Panel, on a quarterly basis, an assessment of how the cuts are affecting Police Officers. Consultation with the Jersey Police Authority States of Jersey Police Force Association should be undertaken on a regular basis to inform this assessment.

**RECOMMENDATION 9**

The Minister for Children and Education should publish the new funding formula for schools to the States Assembly as a matter of priority prior to the Government Plan debate taking place.

**RECOMMENDATION 10**

The Minister for Children and Education should publish an action plan alongside the Inclusion Review report as a matter of priority with clear financial and human resources implications identified in respect of each action. This should be completed by the end of January 2022.

**RECOMMENDATION 11**

The Minister for Children and Education should report, by the end of January 2022 and thereafter on a quarterly basis, the status of the outcomes from the Independent School Funding Review. This should include updates on the policy initiatives being brought forward as a result.

**RECOMMENDATION 12**

The Chief Minister should formally delegate responsibility for actions in relation to the response to the Independent Jersey Care Inquiry to the Minister for Children and Education as per previous arrangements made with the Minister for Children and Housing. This should be undertaken and confirmed to the Panel as a matter of priority before the end of 2021.

**RECOMMENDATION 13**

The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that there is a clear plan for the recruitment of the additional roles within the Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service. This should be provided to the Panel by the end of 2021 alongside quarterly updates on the uptake of the roles. This update should also include details of the impact of the new roles and how they have reduced waiting times within the service.

**RECOMMENDATION 14**

The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that the full grant amount given to the Jersey Child Care Trust is maintained over the next four-year period of the Government Plan and that funding is identified from 2023 onwards for this.

**RECOMMENDATION 15**

The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that budget allocations for Early Years are revisited in the Government Plan 2023-2026 to ensure that all funding identified to support the recommendations of the Early Years Policy Development Board is placed within the Departmental Base budget in future years.

**RECOMMENDATION 16**

Following the publication of the Early Years Policy Development Board report, the Minister for Children and Education should publish an action plan for how the recommendations will be implemented by the end of January 2022. This should outline the financial and human resources implications of each recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION 17**

The Minister for Children and Education should continue to monitor the take-up for higher education funding as a result of the changes made in the Education (Discretionary Grants - General) (Jersey) Order 2021 to ensure that no students are adversely affected by the change in assessment of parental income.

**RECOMMENDATION 18**

The Minister for Home Affairs should, in partnership with the Jersey Police Authority, Jersey Police Force Association and Chief of Police, monitor the impact of the proposed efficiency savings in respect of civilian roles on a monthly basis and report to the Panel on a quarterly basis the outcomes of these discussions and any actions taken as a result.

**RECOMMENDATION 19**

The Minister for Home Affairs should provide details of the final people model in respect of the Combined Control Room to the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel as soon as the consultation process is completed.

**RECOMMENDATION 20**

Should any efficiency savings in respect of the Combined Control room be identified as a result of the new 'people model' then the Minister for Home Affairs should ensure that these are included within the next iteration of the Government Plan 2023-2026.

**RECOMMENDATION 21**

The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that work is progressed in 2022 as a matter of priority to build the new North of St. Helier Youth Centre.

**RECOMMENDATION 22**

The Minister for Children and Education should establish a baseline measurement from which to assess the Intensive Support programme in order to demonstrate its effectiveness and the tangible outcomes for children and young people. The progress of this project should be reported back to the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel on a quarterly basis.

**RECOMMENDATION 23**

The Jersey Police Authority should, within its annual report, make a statement as to whether the funds provided to it are sufficient for it to meet its duty in regard to the States of Jersey Police Force Law 2012.

**RECOMMENDATION 24**

The Minister for Children and Education should, by the end of January 2022 provide the outcome of the school sites review to the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel and provide a private briefing to the Panel on its outcome.

4 Departmental Budgets

Departmental Budgets

The Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Panel scrutinises the work of two Ministers: the Minister for the Children and Education and the Minister for Home Affairs. Therefore, the project policy work contained in the programmes and capital projects assigned to the Panel predominantly sit under:



Minister for Children and Education, Deputy Scott Wickenden



Minister for Home Affairs, Deputy Gregory Guida
It should be noted that the States of Jersey Police fall under the Minister for Home Affairs, however, their budget is extracted for the purposes of the Government Plan.

Departmental Heads of Expenditure

In the Government Plan 2022 - 2025, the States Assembly has been asked to approve the proposed amount to be appropriated from the Consolidated Fund for 2022, for each head of expenditure. The tables below provide a summary of the proposed “Heads of Expenditure” allocated to the Departments for 2022 and estimates produced for 2023 - 2025:

Table 13 Heads of Expenditure 2022-25¹				
	2022 Allocation (£000)	2023 Estimate (£000)	2024 Estimate (£000)	2025 Estimate (£000)
Children, Young People, Education and Skills	167,037	167,199	168,253	168,973
Justice and Home Affairs	30,746	30,835	30,895	30,999
States of Jersey Police	25,205	25,346	25,468	25,468

Summary Table 5(i) 2022 Revenue Heads of Expenditure²			
	Income (£000)	Expenditure Allocation (£000)	Head of Expenditure (£000)
Children, Young People, Education and Skills	20,536	187,573	167,037
Justice and Home Affairs	3,187	33,933	30,746
States of Jersey Police	234	25,439	25,205

A further breakdown of these figures was provided on pages 24, 32 and 35 of the Annex to the Government Plan 2022-24.³

Children, Young People, Education and Skills 2022						
Service Area	Income (£000)	DEL (£000)	Net Revenue Expend iture (£000)	Non Cash Net Revenue Expend iture (£000)	Total Net Revenue Expenditur e (£000)	FTE

¹ [Government Plan 2022 – 2025 Table 13 p.126](#)

² [P.90/2021 Summary Table 5\(i\) p.19](#)

³ [Annex to the Government Plan 2022-25 – p.20, 32 and 35](#)

Children's Safeguarding and Care	6	22,785	22,779	2	22,781	261.5
Integrated Services and Commissioning	121	12,699	12,578	54	12,632	49.8
Education	15,422	113,105	97,683	131	97,814	1,349.5
Young People, Further Education and Skills	4,987	38,411	33,454	17	33,471	288.6
Directorate	0	543	543	0	543	7.0
Net Revenue Expenditure	20,536	187,573	167,037	204	167,241	1,956.3

Justice and Home Affairs 2022						
Service Area	Income (£000)	DEL (£000)	Net Revenue Expenditure (£000)	Non Cash Net Revenue Expenditure (£000)	Total Net Revenue Expenditure (£000)	FTE
States of Jersey Prison Service	622	10,847	10,225	269	10,494	152.0
Jersey Customs and Immigration	1,911	7,220	5,309	313	5,622	79.0
States of Jersey Ambulance Service	16	5,816	5,800	73	5,873	82.0
States of Jersey Fire and Rescue Service	312	5,762	5,450	141	5,592	71.0
Health and Safety Inspectorate	0	557	557	0	557	7.0
Jersey Field Squadron	0	1,478	1,478	0	1,478	5.0
Justice and Home Affairs Directorate	326	2,253	1,927	738	2,665	18.0
Net Revenue Expenditure	3,187	33,933	30,746	1,534	32,280	414.0

States of Jersey Police 2022						
Service Area	Income (£000)	DEL (£000)	Net Revenue Expenditure (£000)	Non Cash Net Revenue Expenditure (£000)	Total Net Revenue Expenditure (£000)	FTE
States of Jersey Police	234	25,439	25,205	650	25,855	340.0
Net Revenue Expenditure	234	25,439	25,205	650	25,855	340.0

The 2022 resources allocated to the Ministers which fall under the Panel's remit are as follows:

Resources mapped to Ministerial portfolios ⁴	
Minister	2022 Allocation (£000)
Minister for Children and Education	171,159
Minister for Home Affairs	56,030

Changes to the Departmental Budget ⁵ Children, Young People, Education and Skills	
	(£000)
2021 allocation	160,286
Inflation and legislative decisions	0
Revised Investments	6,931
New Investments	1,078
Pay Awards	1,453
Service Transfer Budgets	(2,215)
Rebalancing	(496)
Other Variations	0
2022 Estimate	167,037
Net Difference 2021-2022	6,751

⁴ Government Plan 2022 – 2025 Table 14 p.127

⁵ Government Plan 2022 – 2025 Annex Table 8 p.14

Changes to the Departmental Budget⁶ Justice and Home Affairs	
	(£000)
2021 allocation	29,613
Inflation and legislative decisions	0
Revised Investments	(1)
New Investments	1,222
Pay Awards	452
Service Transfer Budgets	(85)
Rebalancing	(455)
Other Variations	0
2022 Estimate	30,746
Net Difference 2021-2022	1,133

Changes to the Departmental Budget⁷ States of Jersey Police	
	(£000)
2021 allocation	26,804
Inflation and legislative decisions	0
Revised Investments	193
New Investments	0
Pay Awards	317
Service Transfer Budgets	(1,273)
Rebalancing	(905)
Other Variations	0
2022 Estimate	25,205
Net Difference 2021-2022	(1,599)

⁶ Government Plan 2022 – 2025 Annex Table 8 p.14

⁷ Government Plan 2022 – 2025 Annex Table 8 p.14

5 Efficiencies

The Government Plan 2020-2023 set out the ambition to achieve £100 million of efficiencies, with the first £40 million to be achieved in 2020. The plan for £40 million in 2020 was published in October 2019 and a performance update was included in the Government 6-month report, published in August 2020. The Government Plan 2021 – 2024 set out the 2021 plan to deliver £20 million of efficiencies and other rebalancing measures.

Rebalancing and Efficiencies

The Government Plan proposes £21 million of rebalancing measures in 2022, with the intent that a further £40 million of savings will be delivered across 2023 and 2024. The table below shows the efficiencies and rebalancing totals for each Minister under the Panel's remit:

	2022 (£000)
Council of Ministers	5,418,000
Minister for Children and Education	496
Minister for Home Affairs	1,471

The summary description of proposals reviewed by the Panel for each Minister are set out in the table below:

Minister	Department	Summary description	Recurring or One-Off	Budget Impact	2021 Value (£000)
Minister for Children and Education	CYPES	Children's Safeguarding and Care: Remove one social worker role. This will slightly increase caseload and reduce capacity across the team	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Staff	50
Minister for Children and Education	CYPES	Skills: Target savings from functional review	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Staff	166
Minister for Children and Education	CYPES	Integrated Services & Commissioning: Re-base budgets to best manage priorities within reduced resources. Will further reduce GP20 growth and limit the planned improvements in Early	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Non-Staff	56

⁸ Government Plan 2022 – 2025 Table 1 p.84

⁹ P.90/2021 Summary Table 6 - Efficiencies and Rebalancing Measures 2022 - Summary Proposals p.21

		Intervention and Therapeutic provision to looked after children			
Minister for Children and Education	CYPES	Integrated Services & Commissioning: Re-base budgets to best manage priorities within reduced resources. Will further reduce GP20 growth and limit the planned improvements in Early Intervention and Therapeutic provision to looked after children	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Staff	224
Minister for Home Affairs	JHA	Continue the best practice of reviewing and securing recurring reductions in non-staff budget	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Non-Staff	406
Minister for Home Affairs	JHA	Increase in income following review of the forecast number of applicants e.g. visas, work permits and passports in Customs and Immigration	Recurring	Income	184
Minister for Home Affairs	JHA	Review of the States of Jersey Prison Service Target Operating Model	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Staff	315
Minister for Home Affairs	JHA: SoJP	Police: Improvement in supplier contract maintenance and identification of reduction in non-staff contract spend	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Non-Staff	247
Minister for Home Affairs	JHA: SoJP	Reduction in learning and development course costs and associated travel	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Non-Staff	212
Minister for Home Affairs	JHA: SoJP	Removal of a number of civilian posts following a staff review and rationalisation process. Responsibilities will be enhanced in other posts to maintain the high levels of service delivery	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Staff	377
Total for 2021	-	-	-	-	2,237

Panel analysis

Minister for Children and Education

Minister for Children and Education	CYPES	Children's Safeguarding and Care: Remove one social worker role. This will slightly increase caseload and reduce capacity across the team	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Staff	50
-------------------------------------	-------	---	-----------	------------------------	----

The Panel's main concern in relation to the efficiencies within CYPES centred around the removal of a social worker role, making a recurring saving of £50,000 per year. The Panel questioned this during a public hearing with the Minister for Children and Education and suggested that, given the need for social workers and previous issues identified in relation to the recruitment and retention of them, this may be a counterintuitive decision. It was provided with the following rationale by the Director for Safeguarding and Care:

Director, Safeguarding and Care:

You might say it is counterintuitive, but we are talking about kind of developing services. In the past in social care one of the answers was to throw more social workers at it. What we have done as part of our service redesign is we have taken around 10 social workers out of our head count and we have increased the number of family support workers. They stay on the Island longer. The family support staff often are local and they are able to provide more continuity of care and direct work to support families to help with many of the practical tasks. So while we are able to take out social workers from social care, we are seeing less children in social care because they are now in Early Help. One of the key indicators in terms of Early Help is we have less pressure on our service because of Susan's Early Help service.¹⁰

The Panel noted the following concerns raised by JCSA Prospect in their submission to the Panel:

The proposed loss of a social work position within children's safeguarding and care, is of significant concern, not only could this impact on the care and wellbeing of children, but additional workload placed on remaining staff could also impact both on their wellbeing and the quality of service they can provide. Additionally this could have a knock on effect on recruitment and retention of social workers, an area the GoJ has been struggling with for a number of years.¹¹

The Panel noted that the description of the efficiency within the Government Plan suggested a reduced capacity across the social work team and an increase in caseload for social workers as a result. It was explained that the nature of the service redesign mean that this was more of a risk than it was a fact, and it was not, in fact causing an issue in the service.¹² The Panel is concerned that, whilst the impact may not be currently felt, there is significant potential for this to cause capacity and caseload issues across an important service. The Panel notes that this impact should be kept under review and therefore recommends that this is closely monitored to ensure that any impacts are mitigated accordingly.

**FINDING 1**

The Minister for Children and Education has confirmed that the removal of a social worker role in Children's Services is as a result of a redesign of the service and the early help service providing better support that historically would have been dealt with by Social Workers. It was further stated that the increased caseload and reduction in capacity was a risk relating to the efficiency but was not currently an issue.

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

The Panel is concerned about the rationale for the removal of a social worker post which is planned as a £50,000 recurring spend reduction. The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that the impact of the cost reduction is assessed through the quarterly performance report for the department for Children, Young People, Education and Skills and an update provided to the Panel in advance of the Government Plan 2023-2026.

¹⁰ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – p.38

¹¹ Submission – JCSA Prospect

¹² Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – p.38

Minister for Children and Education	CYPES	Integrated Services & Commissioning: Re-base budgets to best manage priorities within reduced resources. Will further reduce GP20 growth and limit the planned improvements in Early Intervention and Therapeutic provision to looked after children	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Non-Staff	56
Minister for Children and Education	CYPES	Integrated Services & Commissioning: Re-base budgets to best manage priorities within reduced resources. Will further reduce GP20 growth and limit the planned improvements in Early Intervention and Therapeutic provision to looked after children	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Staff	224

The Panel also examined the changes proposed within the Integrated Services and Commissioning service of CYPES. It is noted that the savings within this area cut across both staff and non-staff spend. The Panel questioned the rationale for the saving, specifically how many roles would be affected by the £224,000 saving on staff spend:

Group Director, Integrated Services and Commissioning:

What I also did was because we have got the C.A.M.H.S. (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service) coming in, where there is early intervention elements around that I have looked to make sure that we have absolutely squeezed the money as best as possible. If I can give you an example of that, we have early intervention money for C.A.M.H.S. and early intervention money for more generic children in need. What we have then done is streamlined some of our referral processes, so people who now refer to C.A.M.H.S. from January via the Children and Families Hub, we will have a C.A.M.H.S. practitioner in there, so we will reduce the kind of hurdles that people go through. We have tried to make efficiencies in that regard and it has no impact on services¹³.

Furthermore, the Minister for Children and Education confirmed that the rationale behind the saving was to limit the ‘number of hoops’ that would be required to jump through as a result of the setting up and operation of the Children and Families Hub. Therefore, the efficiency saving is mainly targeted around streamlining services to reduce expenditure, rather than reducing service offering. It was confirmed that the saving would have no impact on service delivery. Again, the Panel would caution that any spend reductions could have an impact on service delivery if not monitored effectively.

Concern was raised by JCSA Prospect in relation to the savings having an impact on staffing as follows:

The proposed savings within Early Intervention and Therapeutic provision, the cost reductions of £280K are clearly going to have a significant impact on the service. A reduced level of service in this area will negatively impact on children and could create longer term issues. I am concerned on the effect on staff if these staff savings are being made by redundancies, and also the effect on remaining members of staff I don't understand how this is putting children first?

¹³ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – p.29+30

The Panel would highlight this concern to the Minister and recommend that impact on staffing within the service is monitored closely as well.



FINDING 2

The reduction in non-staff and staff spend within the Integrated Services and Commissioning service of Children, Young People, Education and Skills is defined as a streamlining of the service in order to remove various hurdles for individuals accessing services through the Children and Families Hub. It has been stated that this will not have an impact on service delivery.



RECOMMENDATION 2

The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that the proposed efficiency savings are not impacting service delivery within the Integrated Services and Commissioning service. An Assessment of this reduction should be undertaken on a bi-annual basis against the new people strategy and any negative impact on services or wellbeing of staff rectified.

Minister for Home Affairs

Minister for Home Affairs	JHA	Continue the best practice of reviewing and securing recurring reductions in non-staff budget	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Non-Staff	406
---------------------------	-----	---	-----------	----------------------------	-----

The first efficiency outlined in respect of the Department for Justice and Home Affairs is stated as ‘continue the best practice of reviewing and securing recurring reductions in the non-staff budget’. This is noted as relating only to non-staff expenditure within the department and has been estimated at a total cost of £406,000 recurring. The Panel questioned what is meant by the term ‘best practice or reviewing and securing recurring reductions in the non-staff budget’ and was provided with the following information by the Minister during a public hearing:

The Minister for Home Affairs:

Hunting waste I think is something we should all be doing and any organisation should have that in the back of their mind. So there are different ways of doing things. We cannot skimp on training so all of the services need to be trained. They need to be trained in the right way but there are different ways of doing it. One of the things, it is just an example because it has been unfortunately one of the most expensive ones, but firearms training cost us about £150,000 a year just to send people to the U.K. (United Kingdom) regularly, and it is something that will almost completely disappear once we have a proper range in the Island. So we are making a large investment into the range but then those recurring expenses will not happen. There might be other ways to save in training just by doing it a little bit better.¹⁴

The Panel notes that this relates to the department overall, however, it questioned whether this reduction would come into effect from 1st January 2022. It was confirmed by the Minister that this would take place from the middle of 2022, subject to all things going to plan.¹⁵ The Panel notes the issue in relation to the funding for the Jersey Field Squadron (discussed later on in the report), whereby funding had been allocated of £1 million each year without taking

¹⁴ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

¹⁵ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

into account RPI and salary increases over previous years. The Government Plan seeks to address this, however, it questioned how the risks were managed within each of the services. The Minister provided the following response:

The Minister for Home Affairs:

It is a very fair question and we do have an example. When the ambulance service was transferred to Home Affairs the Health Department had promised £150,000 of savings and they came to us with that cut already effected in the budget. They said: “Okay, here is a transfer for your budget.” There is £150,000 savings. The ambulance service had never done anything to save that money. So it became a structural issue that we have to integrate in their budget. They have a little bit of over spend this year so we need to find out which part is due to exceptional circumstances because operating the ambulance has been much more difficult during COVID than many other services. So we have to find what part of this is exceptional and what part of it might be structural, and then maybe we integrate this in the budget so that they have the budget that they need. Yes, we were quite aware of that. We have done it for one service and I hope that we can do it for the other services.¹⁶

The Panel notes that there is no certainty at present as to where these spend reductions are likely to come from within the department. As such, it cannot state whether the efficiencies are achievable within 2022 in this particular area. There will be a high probability that a reduction in non-staff budgets will result in reduced service due to cost of living and potential for higher inflation during 2022.



FINDING 3

The Minister for Home Affairs has explained that a target of a £406,000 reduction in non-staff expenditure across the Department for Justice and Home Affairs has been set and is intended to identify waste and duplication across the service. This is intended to be confirmed by the middle of 2022.



RECOMMENDATION 3

The Minister for Home Affairs should ensure that no front-line service is directly affected as a result of efficiency savings made in respect of non-staff spend and that any structural budget concerns arising from this saving are addressed as a matter of priority.

Minister for Home Affairs	JHA	Increase in income following review of the forecast number of applicants e.g. visas, work permits and passports in Customs and Immigration	Recurring	Income	184
---------------------------	-----	--	-----------	--------	-----

The Panel notes that the £184,000 income identified through this programme relates to an increase in the forecast for numbers of applicants for visas, work permits and passports within Customs and Immigration. The Panel questioned how this figure was arrived at and what review was undertaken in order to identify it. It was provided with the following information from the Acting Director General for Justice and Home Affairs at a public hearing:

¹⁶ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

Acting Director General, Justice and Home Affairs:

This year's increase has been a combination of increased visa applications and quite significantly increased passport applications. Some of that is a bounce back from COVID where people just were not applying for passports. Some of it also at that point had been some people realising that they needed a passport to register for Yoti, to do their online tax application. We think it was not just passports for travel, it was passports for I.D. (identification), and the £184,000 is the customs and immigration teams profiled assumption of what the increased income will be next year and that therefore we can use that as part of our efficiency commitment, that we will make more money.¹⁷

Furthermore, the Panel questioned what contingencies would be in place should it look like the estimate of £184,000 was unlikely to be met during the year:

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Given it is a forecast are their contingencies in place if that money does not materialise? Because it is part of your efficiency with income, if that income does not happen are you going to make more cuts elsewhere to make up for that? Balancing seems to come to mind all the time.

Acting Director General, Justice and Home Affairs:

We would have to balance it, as you suggest, so the initial position would be that if the department does not make the £184,000 income then we would have to perhaps increase the contribution on one of the other efficiency lines or find it somewhere else. If we really cannot do that then it would be a similar process to what we have outlined. These things are obviously monitored very closely monthly and income forecasts are monitored extremely closely month on month. So, we would have a good feel for how that is going throughout the year.¹⁸

It is noted that the Government has introduced a framework for charges and fees more broadly and, as such, it is important to note whether this would have an impact on this proposed efficiency. It was confirmed by the Acting Director General that this particular efficiency does not relate to an increase in fees, more so the expectation of fees being paid as they currently stand. It was further explained that, whilst passport fees had been increased last year in line with UK fees, the main focus of this income was in relation to the expected volume of applications submitted.¹⁹

The Panel notes that this is based on an estimate and, therefore, it is not possible at this stage to clarify how many applications will be made in 2022. There is also concern that due to the changes arising from Brexit, the Immigration Rules and the impact of Covid that the number of visas required will be less than estimated. As such, the Minister will need to monitor this closely and, should the estimated income level appear to not be on track, take action in regard to finding alternative income.

**FINDING 4**

The Minister for Home Affairs has confirmed that an estimated £184,000 income in respect of visa, work permit and passport applications has been profiled for 2022 by the Customs and Immigration Department as part of the rebalancing measures. There is, however, no certainty at this stage as to whether this target

¹⁷ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

¹⁸ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

¹⁹ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

is achievable, and the Minister will be required to monitor this carefully throughout 2022.



RECOMMENDATION 4

The Minister for Home Affairs should monitor on a monthly basis the number of applications for visas, work permits and passports and associated income against the rebalancing target of £184,000. Should this figure not be achievable, then the Minister must take action to identify additional income from across other areas of the department.

Minister for Home Affairs	JHA	Review of the States of Jersey Prison Service Target Operating Model	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Staff	315
---------------------------	-----	--	-----------	------------------------	-----

The Panel notes that this rebalancing measure relates to a review of the States of Jersey Prison Service (SJPS) Target Operating Model (TOM). The Panel understands that this was previously undertaken within the overall TOM for Justice and Home Affairs under the previous Prison Governor, however, since the appointment of the new Prison Governor, she has been reviewing the current structure to take a further look at how to make the service more efficient. It was noted by the Department for Justice and Home Affairs that only minimal changes had been made to the structure of the prison service as a result of the first TOM. Noting that a figure of £315,000 has already been identified for this rebalancing measure, the Panel questioned how this figure had been identified in the absence of the second review of the TOM taking place:

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Can I just get a context for the timeline of the reductions? So the £315,000 spending reduction has been identified before this target operating model has been processed, the second version of it?

Acting Director General, Justice and Home Affairs:

Yes, so that is a high-level assumption of a reasonable reduction that will be able to be made in the prison budget from the beginning of 2022 because of the implementation of the target operating model. We have to take that high level view in order to account for it as an efficiency and then deliver against it. It will clearly be refined as we implement the target operating model. But that will be the aim.²⁰

The Panel further questioned whether the outcome of the TOM had been defined already as a result of the identified rebalancing measure:

Deputy R.J. Ward:

To some extent, has the outcome of that not already been determined before the process starts, i.e. at the end of this target operating model you will be spending £315,000 less on staffing? The target operating model process now is find those staffing savings.

Acting Director General, Justice and Home Affairs:

To an extent, yes. That is what we found ourselves ... all departments have found themselves in a similar situation, I think, through target operating model processes. They are finding themselves and setting themselves an efficiency target and then using other very good reasons to get the right structure for the prison as a way to deliver

²⁰ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

*those savings. As I say, it will be refined. In reality it may not be £315,000, as we work through it. It may be more, it may be less.*²¹

It is noted that the £315,000 figure has been identified from the new Prison Governor's initial work in this regard. It was also confirmed, in response to questions about a wing of the prison being shut down (as reported in the media) that there were a number of vacancies with the Prison Officer roles at present which were being recruited to. The Panel raised this concern in light of the proposals to further reduce the staffing costs as per the indicative figure in the rebalancing programme:

Deputy R.J. Ward:

But you can see how, if you are in the prison service, you might think: "Oh, we have just been through one (a TOM) and we came to a conclusion now all of a sudden we are going to have another with the presumption of an efficiency saving of £315,000" would be a very worrying time for them.

Acting Director General, Justice and Home Affairs:

*Yes, and Susie has been in dialogue with all the staff about that and, as I say, the associations ... we have had good, initial conversations and she is working very closely with the management team and the associations on the development of the model.*²²

Furthermore, the Panel notes that, whilst there is no site of the proposals at present, the face value of the rebalancing measure does suggest that it will lead to less staff roles within the prison service. The Minister for Home Affairs gave the following explanation of the process and plans that would be brought forward:

The Minister for Home Affairs:

Yes, the new governor has come in with some very ambitious plans to change the way that you process prisoners. The ultimate aim is of course to reduce reoffending but the principle is to design a very different process of how people go through prison, especially a softer release system. So it is something that we are backing up with legislation ... One very important aspect of it. Another aspect of it is the way that probation now integrates with the prison so that probation continues following somebody as they go through prison, and it is a much more managed process towards the time where they leave instead of open the gate, get them out and close the gate. They will be followed as they leave. They will be helped as they leave. In any case, it is quite exciting. It is quite an exciting project because it really changes the way that we consider prisoners in Jersey. It is her project. She really wants to see that done. What we are doing here is saying we did not change the structure of the prison radically in the first one so you still have this opportunity of changing it and making it what you want it to be. However, we do not want a more expensive service. We want an efficient service. So you are starting with this notion that when you redesign it you make it efficient. That is the 3 per cent, that is the £300,000 that she has to find. The officers' posts will be filled. Those are necessary. They are missing. She is quite desperate to get them. So those will be filled as soon as possible.

The Panel notes the Ministers point that the restructuring of the service in general will be based on a new pathway for Prisoners moving through the system, however, this is intended to be based on a presumption of the service not costing more as a result. It is reassuring to note that the Prison Officer posts which are currently vacant will be recruited to and it is vital that these posts are maintained within any new structure. Given that the outcome of the

²¹ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

²² Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

operating model is yet to be finalised, the Panel cannot state at this stage whether the £315,000 rebalancing measure is achievable, however, it would express concern that the presumption of building in an overall 3% saving prior to this process being completed does highlight potential risks associated with the effective operation of the prison which must be dealt with accordingly to ensure front line services are not affected as a result.



FINDING 5

It is intended for a recurring spend reduction of £315,000 from 1st January 2022 (3% of the services budget) to be made within the States of Jersey Prison Service as part of a new target operating model for the service. However, this new operating model has yet to be finalised and there is a presumption that it will be undertaken with a view to achieving this level of saving.



RECOMMENDATION 5

The Minister for Home Affairs should provide a briefing to the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel as soon as the new Target Operating Model for the Prison Service is completed, outlining the structure of the service and the total level of funding required in order to implement it by end of January 2022.

Minister for Home Affairs	JHA: SoJP	Police: Improvement in supplier contract maintenance and identification of reduction in non-staff contract spend	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Non-Staff	247
Minister for Home Affairs	JHA: SoJP	Reduction in learning and development course costs and associated travel	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Non-Staff	212

The Panel notes that a total of £459,000 has been identified by the States of Jersey Police Force (SoJP) in relation to spend reduction in the non-staff budget. The Panel questioned the Chief Officer of the SoJP on what areas were anticipated to be included in relation to the improvement in supplier contract maintenance and reduction in non-staff contract spend. It was provided with the following example within a public hearing:

Making up that £247,000, it says contractual. Some of it is contractual I guess, but it is how we can properly look at those areas where we think we can make savings. For example - and I have a list of things to help the panel - meals and entertainment. When I say "meals and entertainment" it is meals as a result of staying on duty for extended periods of time, that sort of additional cost, stationery and postage, training, including conferences. Now, that figure contributes to the £247,000.²³

Furthermore, the following examples were given in relation to the reduction in learning and development course costs and associated travel (noting that this was an area for concern for the Panel given the requirement for training for Police Officers in certain areas):

How we were able to make some of those training savings; there was an example only a couple of weeks ago. I mention these just to add context to the savings. We trained around 20 prospective detectives, but we trained them in the Island, so we brought the trainers to us. That was 2 trainers for 2 weeks, providing training to approximately 20 staff. Approximate figures are that that would cost around £80,000 to send those officers out of Island to other places in the U.K. (United Kingdom). The actual cost was

²³ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 25 October 2021

£20,000. In recognition of the important letter that you received from the Association around training and the costs of those sorts of things, what COVID has done is allowed us to look at how we can better deliver, in other words, bringing training to us. We cannot currently do that for firearms officers for reasons that we understand, and you will understand that we are hopeful of getting a new range. I use that example just to provide a degree of context.²⁴

It was acknowledged by the Chief of Police that there were some disbenefits to the proposed idea of bringing training on-island, including limiting networking opportunities for Police Officers.²⁵ Another example of how contractual and non-staff spend could be reduced was provided as follows:

Moving on, things like, for example, technical support, which is a rather sort of wide title, but that is how we get technical support, particularly for our digital forensics' teams ... this is an expensive part of the business, but we believe we can make savings in our technical support areas. Also police doctors is another area where there is a contractual arrangement. We think we can make around about £15,000 savings.²⁶

The Panel notes that the overall savings identified for the Police total £836,000 in 2022, of which this particular area is related to non-staff expenditure. The Chief of Police explained that £3.1 million out of circa £26 million funding for the police related to non-staff expenditure. When factoring in the £459,000 being made in relation to non-staff expenditure, the Panel notes this would bring the non-staff budget down to a total of £2.6 million. During factual accuracy checking, it was confirmed by the Chief of Police that as the Police IT was transferred to Modernisation & Digital earlier in the year and with the £459k rebalancing target factored in, the SoJP non-pay budget for 2022 is just under £3m. Whilst the Panel is grateful for the examples provided by the Chief of Police as to where these savings will be found, it would caution that this is a significant amount being reduced from the non-staff budget. As such, the Panel recommends that the Minister for Home Affairs monitors this closely with the Chief of Police, Jersey Police Authority and States of Jersey Police Force Association and addresses any shortfalls in the non-staff spend budget should they occur.



FINDING 6

It is intended for the States of Jersey Police Force to make savings totalling £459,000 across the non-staff budget of £3.1 million. Taking into the account the transfer of Police IT which occurred earlier in 2022, this would reduce the non-staff budget to £2.9 million in 2022. The Chief of Police has identified several areas where these savings can be found and is confident that they can be achieved.



RECOMMENDATION 6

The Minister for Home Affairs should, in collaboration with the Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police, Jersey Police Authority and States of Jersey Police Force Association monitor the impact of the non-staff budget spend reduction within the Government Plan on a monthly basis to ensure it is not directly impacting front line services within the police.

²⁴ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 25 October 2021

²⁵ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 25 October 2021

²⁶ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 25 October 2021

Minister for Home Affairs	JHA: SoJP	Removal of a number of civilian posts following a staff review and rationalisation process. Responsibilities will be enhanced in other posts to maintain the high levels of service delivery	Recurring	Spend Reduction: Staff	377
---------------------------	-----------	--	-----------	------------------------	-----

This particular rebalancing measure, upon first glance, raised significant concerns with the Panel. Whilst it is noted that the information in the Government Plan highlights that this is in relation to civilian posts, concerns were also raised by the Jersey Police Force Association and JCSA Prospect as to the impact of these proposed savings:

JCSA Prospect

The Police civilian staff underwent a TOM this year, however it is unclear whether these savings are as a result of this TOM or whether further cuts are planned. The Police civilian staff TOM has left staff morale at an all-time low already, there are a number of staff signed off with stress, and recruitment and retention is likely to become problematic. A number of roles have been downgraded, so are unlikely to attract applicants with police backgrounds, as was previously the case. One therefore has to question whether this will impact on crime investigation.²⁷

Jersey Police Force Association:

£800,000 if divided by a £51,000 salary (approximate wage of an officer having passed their probationary period) would equate to 15.6 police officers for one year. This level of resilience would provide more police presence on the streets of St Helier and within the parish communities, reducing crime whilst increasing faith and reassurance for the public.²⁸

The Panel questioned the Minister for Home Affairs on the overall savings in relation to the SoJP and also questioned the Chief of Police further during public hearings. The point that was raised by the States of Jersey Police Force Association in relation to overall impact of the savings on the ability of the police to keep Islanders safe was pressed with the Minister, to which he gave the following response:

The Minister for Home Affairs:

Certainly. As I said, it is a concern. On one hand almost any organisation can shave 3 per cent off their work if they are careful, if they do not waste. On the other hand, for front line services it is dangerous if you go too far. It is something that I will obviously personally, for all the services, very carefully for the last remaining months of my time. I think they can do it. They have accepted to do it. But we have to be very careful that we do not cut too close.²⁹

Furthermore, the Panel questioned the Minister on whether the proposed cuts would put officers' well being at risk and the public at risk:

The Minister for Home Affairs:

The heads of departments have accepted them so they say they can deliver them. It is just at the edge where it becomes a political matter. The heads consider they can run their organisations properly that way. Now it is a political issue to say do we want to go that far or do we actually want to maybe pad it a little bit and be safer and have

²⁷ Submission – JCSA Prospect

²⁸ Submission – Jersey Police Force Association

²⁹ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

*the services that we need? Again, we will let them try but we will have a very close look at how it is done.*³⁰

The Panel looked in further detail at the impact on staffing within the police as a result of these savings with the Chief Officer of the SoJP. It was confirmed that the roles affected by the £377,000 savings were not frontline Police Officers and that number of officers would remain on target to be 215 posts as set out in previous iterations of the Government Plan.³¹ It was confirmed by the Chief of Police that a staff review specific to civilian roles had been undertaken, although this was not undertaken in the context of making 3% savings as set out by Government for 2022.³² The following information was provided to the Panel in respect of the staff review by the Chief of Police during a public hearing:

Chief Officer, States of Jersey Police Force

*However, the timing was a challenge, and in that we agreed on what the staff review was going to look like. Just as we were about to start to recruit to new posts, because the lion's share of the £836,000 saving is police staff posts, not to be confused with police officer posts, which I think the panel is clear on. We were looking to recruit more at that stage, but then we were advised of the request from Government to find 3 per cent, which was alluded ... well, in fact, not alluded it, it was the comment made in the letter from the Jersey Police Association to the panel, where it talked about the £800,000 saving. It is £836,000, as the panel will know, and the majority of that is through police staff. We were looking to recruit more at that stage, but then in many ways the timing was very bad and in many ways the timing was very good. The timing was bad because we had just gone through quite a difficult process, which impacted on all our staff, our police staff in particular, about to recruit some more posts and as we were about to, we then realised that we had to make a contribution to the 3 per cent. So we did not recruit as many as we wanted to and we put some of those posts ... we froze some of those posts.*³³

The Panel notes that the staff review and the 3% savings are not linked, however, this can be seen as an interaction of reviews and efficiencies coming together. It also notes that this rebalancing measure does not involve removing staff roles, but not recruiting to them. It was confirmed by the Acting Director General for Justice and Home Affairs that the total number of posts affected totalled 9.³⁴

Whilst the Panel notes that this reduction in staff spend does not relate to Police Officer roles, it raised the question on whether removal of civilian posts will have a knock-on effect on frontline officers. The Chief of Police gave the following response and reassurance about concerns in this area:

Chief Officer, States of Jersey Police Force

There will be a knock-on effect and I think my team, who may be listening to this, and indeed other members sat around the room, there has to be an impact. Do I think that that impact will be felt by front line officers? Yes, I do think there will be a degree of impact, but I will monitor it closely. I do not believe that impact will be significant, and particularly around training; all the accredited training will still be delivered because I have to do it. For example, firearms officers must be maintained, and to use a phrase we use in policing, they must be "in ticket". In other words, they must have a valid training card, which would be scrutinised very carefully should there be a police

³⁰ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15 October 2021

³¹ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 25 October 2021

³² Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 25 October 2021

³³ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 25 October 2021

³⁴ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15 October 2021

*shooting or an incident. So all the training that I have to give will be provided, but there will be an impact, and it is my job to monitor that over 2022.*³⁵

The Panel questioned whether there would be a certain point where that impact would come as such, for example, in terms of the public making complaints, and whether there would be a certain trigger point at which time the impact would need to be addressed:

Chief of Police:

*I think there will be. I am not sure what that trigger point might be, but I think all of those, for want of a better phrase, proxy measures that you have described are those that I will be alive to in 2022. Police officers cannot deliver a service to Islanders without police support, without the background stuff being done. All that stuff that often gets lost and forgotten, they cannot operate, so suffice to say I will monitor that closely. Of course, the Jersey Police Association, it does not represent police staff. You may be aware of that, it represents exclusively police officers, but it works hand in glove, because we are all one team, so this letter, quite rightly, is alerting you to that fact. But the final point is I will look at that carefully over the next year.*³⁶

The Panel understands that the impact of this civilian role spend reduction will be monitored closely by the Chief of Police over the coming year. It would, however, express concern over the, as of yet unknown, impact that could occur for front-line police officers without the support of the frozen civilian roles. As such the Panel has recommended that the Minister for Home Affairs maintains a regular dialogue with the Chief of Police in relation to the impact of these savings and, should the impact start to be felt negatively, immediately addresses these concerns by releasing funding in order for the frozen roles to be recruited to.

FINDING 7



It is intended to make an efficiency saving of £377,000 within Civilian Roles in the States of Jersey Police Force in 2022. This does not relate to a removal of posts, but to posts which have been frozen following a staff review into civilian roles within the Police Force. It is noted that the savings are not as a direct result of the staff review but have been put in place due to the requirement for all Government Departments to make 3% savings across budgets in 2022.



RECOMMENDATION 7

In the event that the Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police identifies a significant impact on the operation of the police force as a result of the £377,000 rebalancing measure in civilian roles, the Minister for Home Affairs should immediately seek to release funding in order for the frozen posts to be recruited to as a matter of priority.



RECOMMENDATION 8

The Minister should also report to the Panel, on a quarterly basis, an assessment of how the cuts are affecting Police Officers. Consultation with the Jersey Police Authority States of Jersey Police Force Association should be undertaken on a regular basis to inform this assessment.

³⁵ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 25 October 2021

³⁶ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 25 October 2021

6 Summary tables of Scrutiny ‘RAG’ ratings





The Panel has undertaken review of the various programmes and capital projects that were assigned to it by the Government Plan Review Panel, and passed comments were necessary. Following its review’s Terms of Reference, the Panel carried out scrutiny of projects based upon the following guideline criteria:







- Where funding over £500,000 has been allocated
- Where funding has been withdrawn or decreased significantly from the previous year
- Where funding has been increased significantly from the previous year
- Projects which the Panel consider are of most concern (as a result of, for instance, delays, deferrals, overspends or because they are not in keeping with Common Strategic Priorities)
- Projects which have been identified as of concern by stakeholders
- Projects which are contentious and/or in the public eye.
- Projects where insufficient information has been provided and more information is sought
- Concern is held on the project’s alignment with Common Strategic Priorities, social impact and impact upon children.

This section provides a summarised overview of the Panel’s RAG ratings assigned to both previously reviewed programmes (GP 2020-23 / GP 2021-24) and new ones which have been identified in the Government Plan 2022-25.


Previously reviewed programmes and capital projects (GP 2020-23 / GP 2021-24)

The tables immediately below identify the programmes included in previous iterations of the Government Plan, which will continue to be invested in in 2022, and indicates whether the projects are ‘Complete’, ‘On Track’, ‘Reduced’, ‘Delayed’, ‘Deferred’ or subject to ‘Partial Deferral’.

Programmes (Continuing from previous Government Plans)						
Programme	CSP reference	Page number	Scrutiny RAG Status	Mid-year review Status	2022 Allocation (£000) (previous)	2022 Allocation (£000) (revised)
Children’s Change Programme	CSP 1-1-01	-		On Track	1,395	1,522
Independent Jersey Care Inquiry P.108	CSP 1-1-02	41		Delayed	1,614	1,487
Policy/Legislation Service Delivery	CSP 1-1-03	45		On Track	3,282	3,282
P82 Children’s Services Early Intervention	CSP 1-1-04	-		On Track	6,155	4,005













CAMHS Service Redesign	CSP1-1-06	51		On Track	1,750	1,750
Youth Service Move-on Café	CSP1-1-07	-		On Track	53	53
SARC Dewberry House	CSP1-1-08	65		On Track	150	150
Higher Education	CSP 1-2-01	58		On Track	6,395	6,395
Improving Educational Outcomes	CSP 1-2-02	53		Delayed	3,709	3,768
Education Reform Programme	CSP1-1-08	36		On Track	11,200	11,200
Involving and Engaging Children	CSP1-2-05	-		On Track	1,030	1,030
Public Services Ombudsman	CSP 1-3-02	-		Delayed	-	200
Youth Service English as an additional language	CSP1-3-03	-		On Track	150	150
Financial Crimes Unit	CSP 3-2-07	-		On Track	991	991
Digital Jersey Academy	CSP 3-2-04	-		On Track	219	219
Skills Jersey	CSP 3-4-01	-		Complete	695	695
Jèrriais	CSP 3-5-03	-		On Track	398	398
Policing 2020-23	013-11	63		No Update	1,784	1,784
Re-organisation Justice and Home Affairs	O13 16	62		No Update	314	314
Legal Aid	01-Non-06	-		No Update	400	400
Probation Service Additional Funding	01-Non-07	66		On Track	35	35
Probation – BASS funding, regrading and trainee post	OI-Non 07	67		On Track	185	185

Capital Projects (Continuing from previous Government Plans)						
Programme	CSP reference	Page number	Scrutiny RAG Status	Mid-year review Status	2022 Allocation (£000) (previous)	2022 Allocation (£000) (revised)
VCP Replacement School	None	136		On Track	-	-
Mont a l'abbe secondary school	None	136		On Track	-	-
Replacement Assets and Minor Capital (CYPES)	CSP 1	136		On Track	200	200
Minor Capital Police	JHA-Police	136		No Update	200	250
Minor Capital JHA	JHA	136		Partial Deferral	166	150
Replacement of Aerial Ladder Platform	None	136		Delayed	-	671
Schools (Discrimination Law)	CSP 1	136		No Update	500	500
Children's Residential Homes (Discrimination Law)	CSP 1	136		No Update	100	100
Community Site Improvements	IHE 2	136		On Track	2,000	1,000
Le Rocquier and School/Community Sports Facilities	CSP 1	136		Delayed	2,400	3,150
School 3G Pitch Replacements	CSP 1	136		On Track	750	-
St. John and Grainville Fields	CSP 1	136		Delayed	400	400
Les Landes Nursery	CSP 1	136		On Track	500	1,050
Mont a L'abbe Extension	CSP 1	136		On Track	650	1,600
Extend La Moye School Hall and 2 additional classrooms	CSP 1	136		On Track	1,000	1,950
JCG and JCP additional music facilities	CSP 1	136		On Track	1,000	500

JCG and JCP new playing fields	CSP 1	136		No Update	-	-
Jersey Instrumental Music Service Premises	CSP 1	136		On Track	-	2,000
Reorganisation of Secondary Schools	CSP 1	136		No Update	-	-
FE Campus	CSP 1	136		Delayed	-	-
North of St. Helier School	CSP 1	136		No Update	-	-
South of St. Helier School	CSP 1	136		No Update	-	-
La Sente	CSP 1	136		No Update	-	-
Victoria College New Classroom Block	CSP 1	136		No Update	-	-
Victoria College Student Support Centre	CSP 1	136		No Update	-	-
Next Passport Project	JHA OI3	136		Partial Deferral	998	355
Combined Control IT	JHA OI3	136		Delayed	-	400
Electronic Patient Records	JHA OI3	136		On Track	-	130
Le Squez Youth Centre/Community Hub	CSP 1	137		On Track	-	-
North of St. Helier Youth Centre	CSP 1	137		On Track	-	2,000
States of Jersey Police Firearms Range	JHA 2	137		On Track	-	264




New programmes requiring additional revenue expenditure (GP 2022-25)

The table below identifies the programmes that will receive first-time investment in 2022 and were therefore not included in previous iterations of the Government Plan.

New Additional Revenue Expenditure Programmes: Government Plan 2022 - 2025				
Programme	CSP reference	Page number	Scrutiny RAG Status	2022 Allocation (£000)
Young People Intensive Support	CSP1-1-09	38		400
Education Demographic Pressures	CSP1-2-06	39		678
Defence Funding	OI3-22	79		454
Jersey Police Authority	OI3-23	79		101
TETRA Service User Agreement	OI3-24	79		45
Family Court Premises Expenses	OI-Non-11	97		47
Probation Service Inspection	OI-Non-12	99		-
ECCU part funding of additional resource	OI-Non-13	98		149
Liberation 77-80	OI-Non-14	95		100
Her Majesty's Platinum Jubilee 2022	OI-Non-15	94		100
Magistrates Court Restructuring	OI-Non-18	97		25
Brexit Transition – Legal and Policy Support	n/a	79		Fund as Required

New capital expenditure (GP 2022-25)



The table below identifies new capital projects that will receive first-time investment in 2022 and were therefore not included in previous iterations of the Government Plan.

New Capital Expenditure: Government Plan 2022 – 2025				
Capital Project	CSP reference	Page number	Scrutiny RAG Status	2022 Allocation (£000)
Ambulance, Fire and Rescue Headquarters	None	136		500
Schools Estates	CSP 1	136		1,250
Army and Sea Cadet Headquarters	CSP 1	137		494

7 Previously reviewed programmes and capital projects: update reports

This section provides an update on the Programmes and Capital Projects that were previously reviewed by the Panel that it has carried out further scrutiny of in concordance with this review's Terms of Reference.

Programmes

Education Reform Programme			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Putting Children First		Minister for Children and Education	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
On track			n/a

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
7,946	11,200	11,200	11,583

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
11,200	11,200	11,583	11,583

Mid-Year Report Update

The Education Reform Programme was established at the end of 2020 following the approval of funding in the Government Plan 2021 – 24. The objective of this three-year programme is to reform the education system and improve outcomes for children. Early focus has been on investing additional funds in schools to reduce structural deficits initiating a review of inclusion and setting out the overarching education strategy for the island within which policy can be developed. Work to improve the quality of teaching through increased investment in professional development has also made good progress.

Panel analysis

The Panel received representations from the Board of Governors at Haute Vallee School raising concern over what was being done to address (in their words) the 'funding crisis' within schools in Jersey. The Panel met with the Chair and former Chair of the Board of Governors who explained that there was a £23 million shortfall in funding across education.³⁷ This figure

³⁷ Public Hearing – Chair and Former Chair of the Board of Governors, Haute Vallee – 25th October 2021

was challenged by the Minister for Children and Education who explained the following during a public hearing:

Deputy Rob Ward:

The school funding formula has been undertaken as a consultation with head teachers and representatives from schools who believe they have an agreement on the way it will look. That school funding formula uncovered a deficit of around £23 million for base funding of schools. Is that something that is familiar to you from what you have seen from the school funding review?

The Minister for Children and Education:

I have not heard that £23 million funding deficit number raised to me at all until I heard it in your scrutiny hearing on Monday with the board of governors.³⁸

However, further into the hearing, the Minister explained that the figure came from consultation with Head Teachers with the aim of identifying a suitable level of funding across schools.

The Minister did, however, confirm that this process and outcome was not to be taken as read, and further ‘quality assurance’ of the consultation process and funding formula was required.³⁹ It was confirmed to the Panel that this process would be undertaken by CYPES directorate, Treasury and the PSC (formerly 2020 Delivery, the company that had undertaken the Independent School Funding Review. The Project Director confirmed the following points in relation to the project team:

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Okay. That project team that you talk about, are they people who are on the front line of education? Are they facing those funding pressures every day? Who are that project team?

Project Director:

Yes, absolutely. So the scope of this first part of the funding formula review was for primaries and secondaries so excluded Highlands and excluded some of the special schools. That decision on scoping was so that we could deal with the bulk of the schools in the system first of all. It includes head teachers from both the primary and the secondary phases, among others, to make sure that we have some, as you say, front line input into some of the pressures that are being felt. That consultation, that engagement, was felt to be critical while we are developing this funding formula.⁴⁰

The Panel notes that head teachers are involved in the quality assurance process alongside other senior roles, however, it has not had any indication that teachers on the front line have been involved in this process. There is a concern that this process is ‘top down’ rather than bottom-up and that the staff on the frontline of education may not have as much input into the funding formula. This is a concern for the Panel.

When questioning the progress of the funding formula, the Panel was informed that the new formula would be shared with the Panel and schools before the end of December 2021.⁴¹ It was also explained that the additional money in 2022 for schools would be directed to schools through the new formula.⁴² The Panel questioned whether this was the full £11.2 million

³⁸ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021 – p.6

³⁹ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021 – p.6

⁴⁰ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021 – p.8

⁴¹ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021 – p.8

⁴² Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021 – p.8

identified for 2022 within the Education Reform Programme, and the Project Director confirmed that not all of that funding was directly related to schools as some related to Highlands College and some related to Teacher Continuous Professional Development. It was also confirmed that the funding formula project did not carry any incremental funding with it in isolation:

Project Director:

So the independent schools funding review set out a series of incremental funding as agreed in the Government Plan that will be implemented and put into schools in line with the Government Plan over the next 4 years. Where that funding is directly into schools as opposed to Highlands or into teacher C.P.D., that will be undertaken through the funding formula. The funding formula project itself, if I refer you back to the recommendations in the Government Plan, does not carry any incremental funding with it in isolation. It is around distributing the existing funding. As the Minister pointed out, if the funding formula work, however, determines that there is a further shortfall in school funding, then he will consider how that should be positioned through the Government Plan in future cycles of extra funding.⁴³

The Panel, therefore, notes that the new funding formula itself has no additional funding identified to it in this iteration of the Government Plan for 2022.

The Panel questioned the difference between the number identified for 2021 (£7.9 million) and 2022 (£11.2 million). The Project Director gave the following response to this during the public hearing with the Minister for Children and Education:

Project Director:

Of course, and you are quite right to call out those differences. What I have done is I have just subtracted from the numbers that you quoted funding that is not going directly into schools. So I will give you an example. In each of those numbers that you have quoted, there are some one-off funds that go into the project implementation costs, so I have excluded those. I have also excluded some of the money that will be invested centrally, for example, in bolstering the educational psychology team or in bolstering some of the S.E.N. services. I have also excluded some of the money that is going into Highlands as opposed to the primary and secondary schools, and some of the money that is going into teacher C.P.D. where that is being run centrally as opposed to being given directly to schools. So I can provide that reconciliation to you if that is a help, but the reason there is a difference in what you are describing, Senator, and what I have quoted is I have looked to quote just the money that will be allocated to schools on to their budgets.⁴⁴

The Panel notes that additional money for schools will be in place for 1st January 2022 and this was confirmed as £7.8 million in 2022. This will be allocated through the funding formula. This raised concern, noting that the funding formula was yet to be completed, however, was expected to be in place so that money could be distributed from 1st January 2022. The Panel also requested an update on the amount of funding that was required within the £7.8m to cover existing deficits within the Education budget. This was outlined as follows:

Business Finance Partner:

At the moment, schools added up ... secondary schools are forecasting £1.2 million overspent, primaries £1.1 million, so that is £3.3 million, roughly £3.3 million, and the special schools about £900,000.⁴⁵

⁴³ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November – p.13

⁴⁴ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November – p.15

⁴⁵ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November – p.15

The Panel was informed that, in total, due to offsetting of underspends in other areas, the total deficit within the education directorate (including some additional COVID pressures) sat at £2.9 million for the end of 2021.⁴⁶ The Panel was provided with the overall additional funding going directly to schools in 2022 above that provided in 2021 as follows:

Project Director:

Can I just be clear about the numbers? I want to quote the subset of the numbers that are going directly into schools, which is my answer to the Senator earlier. We will be putting £6.2 million into schools this year and that number increases to £7.8 million next year. So, Chair, when you were talking about the forecast deficit for schools this year, that includes the money that has already been added. So, I think the important figure that you are trying to get to in terms of extra money in schools' budgets in 2022 from the education reform programme, the answer is an extra £1.6 million. That is the difference between the £6.2m added to the Government Plan this year and the figure of £7.8m, which is the equivalent for 2022, the difference being £1.6m extra money into schools in 2022 over 2021 from the reform programme.⁴⁷

The Panel notes that an additional £1.6 million of extra money is going directly into schools above that which was in place in 2021. This is on top of the funding which has been identified within the Education Reform Programme to manage the deficit in schools. The Panel also notes that, without the revised funding formula to identify any further additional funding, there is no certainty that the additional amounts provided for 2022 will be sufficient to meet the aims of the programme.

At the time of writing this report, the Panel had requested the funding formula and Inclusion Review in order to assist it in its deliberations on the additional funding. However, it was not provided with this information.

Whilst the Minister has explained that the Inclusion Review and School Funding Formula do not directly relate to funding in the Proposed Government Plan 2022-2025 (this was received as a result of an urgent question in the States Assembly on 26th November), the Panel would argue that this is not an accurate statement. The Inclusion Review, as the Panel understands, has reviewed the current structure for inclusion in the Islands Schools (including Special Educational Needs (SEN) provision), and as such will provide information as to the potential gaps in the services and recommendations to improve upon them. The Panel has been informed that this report does not in itself provide recommendations or estimates for funding requirements and it has also been told that work will need to be undertaken in order to ascertain whether additional funding is required or not. Furthermore, the school funding formula (which is intended to be in place on 1st January 2022) is replacing a model that is nearly thirty years old and may well identify that the allocated funding within the Government Plan is not sufficient to meet its needs. The Panel would conclude (without the full details being provided) that it is highly likely that additional funding will be required in order for any gaps or issues to be resolved. Therefore, to state that the funding for education in 2022 is not related to these projects is not, in the Panel's view, an accurate statement. The Panel has therefore lodged an amendment to the Government Plan in order to provide an additional £10 million in 2022 to CYPES in order to implement the recommendations arising from the Inclusion Review and any shortfall in funding identified by the new funding formula.

From the evidence received by the Panel in this review of the project, it holds concerns that the Education Reform Programme appears, at this stage, to be a structural reform of the

⁴⁶ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November – p.16

⁴⁷ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November – p.18

current education system rather than a reform of the pedagogical approach that then informs the structure of education. The additional funding, whilst welcomed, is apportioned to projects which mainly focus on project implementation, continuous professional development and training for teachers, reducing the structural deficit within education and bolstering SEN services. In terms of additional funding going directly into schools to support teachers and students, beyond the additional £1.6 million 2021 identified in the hearing, the Panel is not able to provide any certainty as to whether the amount allocated in the Government Plan will meet the outcome of the new funding formula. Furthermore, without the outcome of the Inclusion Review, the Panel cannot state at this stage whether the additional funding provided in the £11.2 million for SEN provision is adequate. It has therefore rated the project as red at this stage and has brought forward an amendment as a result.

The Panel notes the requirements under the public finances law in relation to sustainable wellbeing and the legal duties of the Minister in relation to SEN provision.



FINDING 8

Throughout its review of the Government Plan, the Panel has not received any information in relation to the new funding formula for schools that is intended to be in place from 1st January 2022, despite repeated requests to have sight of this information. It is the view of the Minister for Children and Education that the work to produce a new funding formula is not connected to the additional funding provided in the Government Plan around the Education Reform Programme. The Panel does not agree with this statement.



FINDING 9

The Panel is unable to state whether the “increased” funding of £11.2 million in 2022 is sufficient to cover the existing deficits, training for teachers and any identified increase in demographics that may arise from the new funding formula.



RECOMMENDATION 9

The Minister for Children and Education should publish the new funding formula for schools to the States Assembly as a matter of priority prior to the Government Plan debate taking place.






RECOMMENDATION 10

The Minister for Children and Education should publish an action plan alongside the Inclusion Review report as a matter of priority with clear financial and human resources implications identified in respect of each action. This should be completed by the end of January 2022.



RECOMMENDATION 11

The Minister for Children and Education should report, by the end of January 2022 and thereafter on a quarterly basis, the status of the outcomes from the Independent School Funding Review. This should include updates on the policy initiatives being brought forward as a result.

Independent Jersey Care Inquiry P108 – Recommendation Five: Legislation – Legislation – Children’s Policy and Legislative Programme			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Putting Children First		Minister for Children and Education	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
Delayed			

Funding allocations approved in Government Plan 2020-2023 (£000):

2020	2021	2022	2023
404	417	429	442

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
400	400	400	400

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
400	400	400	400

Panel analysis

The Panel questioned the Minister on the impact of Covid on the Children’s Legislative Programme and was informed of the following:

Senator T.A. Vallois:

In terms of the actual legislation though, I am trying to understand the rationale for the £400,000 that is being proposed for this particular area, which is on page 188, which is under recommendation 5. It is the case that the legislation will be finalised. What is that £400,000 going towards in 2022?

Senior Policy Officer, S.P.P.P. (2):

The experience of responding to the pandemic meant that policy officers within our department were deployed to do COVID policy work for varying lengths of time. That has produced a knock-on both in policy officers returning to their substantive posts in the areas of children’s legislative development. I think there has also been a knock-on in the demands within the law drafting area because they have had an enormous amount of legislation to proceed with. We have approximately an 18-month delay that had been experienced in some of these key pieces that have been described; the children and young people’s legislation and the children convention of rights legislation that will be coming forward shortly.

Furthermore, the Panel was updated that over 5,000 individuals working with children and young people had now been trained in the Jersey Children First Practice model which formed part of this funding.⁴⁸

The Panel also requested an update on the progress of the youth justice work, noting that this sat not only within CYPES but across Justice and Home Affairs and the Chief Ministers remit. It was informed that policy support had been seconded in from probation to consult in this area.⁴⁹

The legislative programme leading up to the election in 2022 has been shared with the Panel and it notes that it is intended for a number of pieces of legislation falling out of this area to be lodged in time for debate prior to the election. The Panel is in the process of arranging briefings on these areas with a view to conducting further reviews as required. It should be noted that the funding provided within this area has not changed as a result of the delays from COVID, and the Minister for Children and Education has maintained the view that funding will not be removed in this area. Given the mitigating factors around COVID and policy officer resources, the Panel still cannot give a definitive view on whether the funding is adequate to bring forward all of the necessary legislation. Furthermore, the election will understandably place some delays on legislation that is not lodged in time to be debated in March 2022.






FINDING 10

There has been an 18-month delay in relation to policy work within the Children's Legislative Programme due to Policy Officers being seconded to other areas to tackle the COVID-19 pandemic. A number of pieces of legislation are due to be brought forward towards the end of the current Assembly, however, there is no certainty at this stage whether they will be lodged in time for debate prior to the election.

⁴⁸ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.9

⁴⁹ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.9

Independent Jersey Care Inquiry P108 – Recommendation Seven – The ‘Jersey’ Way			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Putting Children First		Minister for Children and Education	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
Delayed			

Funding allocations approved in Government Plan 2020-2023 (£000):

2020	2021	2022	2023
208	214	220	227

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
200	200	200	200

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
200	200	200	200

Panel analysis

The Panel notes that this particular policy area crosses over a number of Ministerial areas. Previously the Panel was informed that the Minister for Children and Education (formerly the Minister for Children and Housing) held responsibility for enacting the work in respect of the response to the Independent Jersey Care Inquiry. During the hearing with the Minister for Children and Education on 22nd October, the Panel questioned whether the Minister still retained responsibility in this area. It was confirmed that the Minister held responsibility in relation to the work of the Citizen’s Panel, however, the Director for Safeguarding and Care explained the following:

Director, Safeguarding and Care:

It sits within the Chief Minister’s overall remit because there are a number of elements of government that need to be involved. For example, the survivors are adults, adult services are delivered by Health and Community Services, and the £1 million in terms of the trauma network, trauma sits with the Health and Community Services. There are, of course, elements for learning in respect of what we do and that is why I meet with the Citizens’ Panel in the way in which we think about Children’s Day. It is really important that the Government of Jersey see this as a government responsibility, and it does not sit with any one Minister outside of the Chief Minister’s office.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October 2021 – p.21

The Panel notes that this reports back to the concept of Corporate Parenting and identifying a clear structure for responsibility is key to ensuring this. Furthermore, there is concern from the Panel that not having a clear role with responsibility in this area could lead to a watered-down approach.

The Panel noted from the Mid-Year review that this particular programme has been delayed. It questioned the Minister on the rationale behind this delay:

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Okay. The mid-year review notes the programme was delayed. What was the rationale for the delay in some of the programmes around that work in recommendation 7, or would that be ...

The Minister for Children and Education:

I would say that would be one for the Chief Minister as an overall oversight. Some of the areas that we have been responsible for the delays have been because ... so the work, there were 2 different groups that needed to get together and start coming up with a joint plan, which they did amazingly with their recommendations. Children's Day has been going on. There was no delay apart from we would have loved to have done more if it was not for COVID.

The Panel is concerned that in previous discussions around the Government Plan and the projects relating to the IJCI, that a clear responsibility was placed on the former Ministers for Children and Education (and Children and Housing) to act as a champion in this area. From the evidence received during this review, the Panel is concerned that this does not appear to still be the case and responsibility appears to be shared out amongst a number of Ministers instead.

Given this finding, the Panel has recommended that this responsibility is delegated directly to the Minister for Children and Education as per previous arrangements by the end of 2021. As such the Panel has rated this project as amber at this stage.



FINDING 11

The Panel is concerned that responsibility for oversight of implementing the Independent Jersey Care Inquiry recommendations now falls to a number of Ministers, whereas in previous discussions around this area responsibility was clearly placed on the Minister for Children and Education (formerly the Minister for Children and Housing) to act as a champion in this area. This does not appear to be the case at present. There needs to be greater clarity over the role of the Minister for Children and Education so that accountability is clear as to where the overall responsibilities lie.



RECOMMENDATION 12

The Chief Minister should formally delegate responsibility for actions in relation to the response to the Independent Jersey Care Inquiry to the Minister for Children and Education as per previous arrangements made with the Minister for Children and Housing. This should be undertaken and confirmed to the Panel as a matter of priority before the end of 2021.

Policy/Legislation Service Delivery – Care Leavers Entitlement			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Putting Children First		Minister for Children and Education	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
Delayed			

Funding allocations approved in Government Plan 2020-2023 (£000):

2020	2021	2022	2023
206	206	206	206

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
165	175	185	185

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
175	175	175	175

Panel analysis

The Panel notes that within the mid-year review, this project had been delayed. This was questioned during a public hearing with the Minister for Children and Education and the following response was provided by the Director for Safeguarding and Care:

Director, Safeguarding and Care:

Certainly in terms of the way in which we are leading on this work, there have not been any delays. We are now currently supporting 78 care leavers. The care leaver offer was launched at the beginning of last year as an entry level offer. We recognised it was only the start of this journey for the Government. Since the start of this year we have seen an increase of 27 per cent in the care leavers we are supporting and from March last year to the end of last year, we saw over 100 per cent increase in the number of care leavers that we were supporting.⁵¹

Furthermore, it was explained that the total 78 care leavers compared to 76 children in care at the moment, which was explained to be a significant number. A further breakdown was provided in relation to the Care Leavers being supported as follows:

- 42 per cent of those are in employment and education,
- 85 per cent are in stable accommodation,
- 42 per cent are accessing income support and:
- 29.5 per cent are actively accessing Back to Work services.⁵²

⁵¹ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.22

⁵² Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.23

In partnership with Customer and Local Services it was confirmed that Children's Services had just undertaken a collective self-assessment using a self-assessment tool that is used by 152 local authorities in England to look at the care leaving services with the intention of that report being published. It was confirmed that this would be shared with the Panel.⁵³

The Panel recalled that, in the previous Government Plan, it had made an amendment to the plan to not reduce the funding available for the Care Leavers offer as part of the efficiencies and rebalancing programme. This was accepted by the States Assembly. However, in the mid-year review update on efficiencies, the Panel notes that the full amount of £330,000 identified (of which only £100,000 related to the Care Leavers Entitlement) had been met during 2021. The Panel questioned how this had happened given the decision of the States Assembly:

Head of Finance and Business Partnering:

I think that is just because that was the title originally on that saving. The result of the amendment to the Government Plan, P.130, was that the £100,000 was put in reserves for us to access if we needed it and the £330,000 as a whole came out of the services, but in fact we did not take anything from care leavers. We took the other 2 items from where they were meant to come from, which was £180,000 that we had for the antenatal services in P.82 and was not needed because we had a separate allocation that covers it. A little bit of intensive fostering because we did not have the numbers and that £100,000 remains in central reserves untouched but we just realigned all our budgets to cover it at this point. It remains in reserve for us to call down if we need it.⁵⁴

The Panel is pleased to note that this budget was not in fact reduced and that the amount relating to that efficiency (£100,000) remains in central reserves to be drawn down if required. A further question was raised in regards to the work that was being done to promote the Care Leavers entitlement and the following response was provided:

Senator T.A. Vallois:

I know historically, particularly with income support, the promotion of what the entitlement is and people knowing where to go and what they are entitled to. Are we actively promoting that?

Director, Safeguarding and Care:

The fact that we have had such a significant increase ... so March last year we were only supporting 35 care leavers, we are now supporting 78. In terms of those that have come forward and we have documentary evidence that we have approached every single care leaver that we have been able to ascertain both from our computer records and from our paper files, which we have had for decades and approach them directly to let them know about the offer and some of those will come forward if they need it in due course. But to be really clear in terms of how ambitious we are being, we have someone who is on the other side of the world, who is slightly older than 25, who is a care leaver of Jersey who is wanting to access university provision in their home country. We are actively working with them to enable them to do that. We are going far and beyond just considering those that are turning up to La Motte Street.⁵⁵

The Panel notes that the Care Leavers entitlement is approaching the 2-year mark since implementation. As such it was felt important to understand whether any trends had developed

⁵³ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.23

⁵⁴ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.23

⁵⁵ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.23

whereby care leavers were requiring support for specific things or at specific times of the year. It was explained that, whilst there had been an increase in capacity and capability around informatics, as this funding was only 18-months old, it was difficult to discuss particular trends at this time. The Director for Safeguarding and Care did explain that, whilst set criteria was applied to the funding, there was some agility within the exceptions panel that dealt with applications. Concern was, however, raised that there were some issues in relation to systems and legislation that responded to care leavers needs (an example was given of providing on and off island accommodation for care leavers attending university). In response to this, the Director for Safeguarding and Care explained the following:

Director, Safeguarding and Care:

So we are, at the moment, using sensible and appropriate workarounds, which is at the discretion of the accounting officer. Mark Rogers is the director general of the department. We always approach it with a “can do” attitude. So we have a care leaver, for example, who needs accommodation in both home town, university town, and here. We are working hard to enable that to happen.⁵⁶

Finally, the Panel noted within the mid-year review that work to establish an endowment fund in respect of care leavers in the legal definition (up to the age of 25) and older care leavers (who have experience of care in Jersey), was due to be completed in the second half of 2021. It was questioned what progress had been made in that regard now that it is well into the second half of the year. The Panel was provided with the following information:

Senior Policy Officer, S.P.P.P. (2):

We took a paper very recently to C.O.M. and so we have agreement that we will progress towards an appropriate procurement process being undertaken with regard to setting up a fund. The fund will be benefiting both care leavers in the legal definition, up to the age of 25, and older care leavers who have had experience of care in Jersey. As others have described, they may not be living in the Island any more but we are still their corporate parent. This is a fund that has been released through the soon sale of the Aviemore site, next to the former Haut Le Garenne Children’s Home. So it is seen as a Care Inquiry legacy project and we will have a reasonably substantial envelope of money that is going to be purposed exactly to target some of the needs and wants experienced by our care leavers to assist them and to improve their outcomes. We are in the middle of the policy work at the moment to scope exactly how that will be targeted and exactly what the operating model will be, and there should be some news in the next couple of months.⁵⁷

The Panel is pleased to see that work is continuing in this area and it shall be monitoring developments in relation to the endowment fund further as they progress. It is also important to note that the take up of the entitlement has increased and contingency funding as per the Panel’s previous amendment to the Government Plan is in place should it be required.






FINDING 12

There has been further take up of the Care Leavers entitlement, with 78 people currently being supported by Children’s Services. Work is ongoing to establish an endowment fund which is expected to be finalised within the coming months following the Government Plan debate.

⁵⁶ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.25

⁵⁷ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.25

Policy/Legislation Service Delivery – Children in Need / Early Help			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Putting Children First		Minister for Children and Education	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
Complete			

Funding allocations approved in Government Plan 2020-2023 (£000):

2020	2021	2022	2023
1,560	1,760	1,760	1,760

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760

Panel analysis

It was identified in the mid-year review, that this particular project had been identified as 'complete'. The following update was provided in the review:

This project was established to address the need to strengthen Early Help in Jersey. The service specification and structure for the new Family and Community Support Service was implemented following formal consultation in February 2021 and recruitment is underway to build the new service to deliver early help to children young people and families. Data from the Children and Families Hub demonstrates that it is effectively addressing the Jersey Care Commission's 2019 recommendations for the development of early help services. This ensures that the Multi-Agency Support Hub (MASH) responds appropriately to referrals in respect of safeguarding concerns only and that all requests for early help and intervention are processed effectively and separately from the MASH.

Having noted that the project was listed as complete, the Panel wanted further clarity over the costs associated with the project and what had been achieved to date so that it could be considered 'complete'. The Minister for Children and Education gave the following update during a public hearing:

The Minister for Children and Education:

So the project that we say was complete was the design and the strategy for the early help. Now we are going into implementation of getting that moving forward. We have had an initial recruitment drive; we have had 13 new appointments that have been

*made to build the family and community support services. We have a further 11 posts that need to be filled and we are doing a second recruitment drive, which has commenced already. That is where we are.*⁵⁸

The Panel further questioned whether the programmes aim had been met by the funding allocated to date (£1.7 million recurring since 2020) and was informed that the early help project was still in its infancy, but the project work to design the service was now complete. The Group Director for Integrated Services and Commissioning further explained that this was done on a multi-agency basis. Furthermore, the rationale behind the work was outlined as follows by the Group Director:

*Some of our big target outcomes were around getting children and families who started to struggle some help very early on. We developed the practice framework that supports that work, a team around the child approach, lead worker, making sure there was consistency, a quick response, clarity about where to get services, so hence the Children and Families Hub.*⁵⁹

Noting that the project was marked as 'complete' but that this related solely to the groundwork for the service, the Panel questioned what the £1.7 million recurring allocated was related to. It was confirmed that the majority of this funding was in relation to staffing the service, alongside other commissioned partners:

Deputy R.J. Ward,

Can I just ask, there is £1.76 million over the next 4 years, and I know that is an estimate when it comes to the Government Plan and the next 4 years. Is that virtually always all staffing?

Group Director, Integrated Services and Commissioning:

Pretty much. For instance, we are commissioning a training course for our family partnership workers. They used to be called family support workers. We wanted to call them family partnership workers because it was about doing what it says on the tin, so we have commissioned training for 60 staff, so we are spending some money on that. We are also commissioning, as I said, from the third sector, like Family Nursing & Homecare, Brighter Futures, substance misuse and H.C.S. (Health and Community Services), so it is a combination, but a big chunk of the £1.7 million is staff.

The Panel also questioned whether any metrics or Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) were in place to measure the success of the programme. The following information was provided to the Panel at this stage:

Group Director, Integrated Services and Commissioning:

Yes, so the performance framework that we are getting to is a work in progress and we have been able to link in to use Mosaic. That is being used by Children's Social Care, so there is an early help module comes with that, which will allow us to measure performance to get much better information and data. On an individual basis, we are using consistent tools about outcomes for children, so we are doing that on an individual basis and then wanting to try to, I suppose, scale that up so that at some point we are able to say 90 per cent of children were safer than they were before, they are healthier than they were before and doing better at school. We have recently employed an analyst who can help us with that, but we have been working on that

⁵⁸ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.27

⁵⁹ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.27

*across the partnership. So this has been a really good example of the third sector and the Government working together, but it is work in progress, Senator.*⁶⁰



The Panel does note that the design phase of this project is now complete, and the funding allocated from 2022 onwards applies mainly to staffing costs. It is noted, however, that there are 11 roles still to be recruited to within the Children and Families Hub which will be vital to ensuring the service is able to deliver its aims and meet the KPI's associated with it. Without these roles in place it is not possible to state whether the funding allocated will meet the requirements of the service. Therefore, the Panel has rated the project as amber at this stage.



FINDING 13

The Project Design of the Children in Need/Early Help project has now been completed and the additional the £1.7 million recurring funding in respect of the project relates almost entirely to staffing costs and commissioning of other services in respect of the Children and Families Hub. 11 roles are still to be recruited to at this stage and development of the Key Performance Indicators for the Early Help service is ongoing.

⁶⁰ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.28

CAMHS Service Redesign			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Putting Children First		Minister for Children and Education	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
On track			n/a

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
0	1,750	2,000	2,250

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
1,750	2,000	2,250	2,250

Panel analysis

The Panel noted the following update from the mid-year review in relation to the progress of the CAMHS Service redesign:

A new Head of Health and Wellbeing has been recruited and is in post and new roles have been identified which are currently being evaluated. A proposal for health and wellbeing service has been drafted and development of a dynamic framework for creative therapies is underway.⁶¹

The Panel questioned the Minister for Children and Education on the progress that had been made in relation to evaluating and identifying new roles within the service and was provided with the following information:

Deputy R.J. Ward:

C.A.M.H.S. service redesign. Minister, can you update the panel on the progress of identifying and evaluating the new roles within the service? Head of Health and Well-being is one of the posts, for example.

The Minister for Children and Education:

The C.A.M.H.S. detailed redesign model was signed off - I think it was the draft Children and Young People Mental Health Strategy, if I am correct - in October 2021, so the beginning of this month, 9th October 2021. The proposal is to significantly increase the C.A.M.H.S. F.T. (full-time) from 28 to 64, but we are looking for the recruitment now.⁶²

It was also confirmed that it was intended for recruitment to the roles to commence so that many of the new roles would be in place in the new year. Of the £1.75 million allocated to the

⁶¹ Mid-year review – R.138/2021

⁶² Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.32

redesign project for 2022, it was also confirmed that the majority of this funding would be in respect of staffing costs. The staffing roles were broken down as follows:

The Minister mentioned that we are increasing to just shy of 64 posts. We are under 30 just now, so there is an extra 35 posts. We will have 11 duty and assessment teams, so they will be doing short-term work, initial triage, and then where people need a longer-term therapy or treatment, they will move into specialist C.A.M.H.S. We are increasing that to 30 posts, so they will do things around, for example, eating disorders, which is a big issue, family therapy and the like. They will also offer a service to looked-after children.⁶³

The Panel subsequently raised concern over the number of posts that are required to staff the service, not from a financial perspective, but from a recruitment perspective. Noting the current pressures on recruitment in mental health services generally, the Panel would stress the success of the service will depend entirely on the strength of its recruitment and retention.

Furthermore, the Panel questioned how the reshaping of the service would affect waiting times for accessing services. The Minister explained that there had already been some improvement from the initial stages of the restructure, however, explained more was still to be done:

The Minister for Children and Education:

But we are already seeing with the duty and assessment team a reduction in the length of time to access therapies. The neurodevelopmental waiting list remains quite long and people have banded that about in terms of the length of months, whether that has been 18 months, then down to 12. We are now sitting at 4 months with that. That is not good enough, but we have bought services to try and get into that, so it is coming down. It needs to be better⁶⁴.

The Panel notes that the service is undergoing significant changes as a result of this restructure and it is pleased to see that a number of additional roles are being recruited to. It would, however, caution that recruitment challenges within this area exist at present and this must be considered and factored in as the service develops over the coming year. The Panel has therefore rated the project as amber.



FINDING 14

The initial service design for the Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service has been completed with a number of roles identified to be recruited to during 2022. The overall number of roles within the service is increasing from 28 to 64. There is, however, concern that this significant number of roles will prove difficult to recruit to expediently.






RECOMMENDATION 13

The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that there is a clear plan for the recruitment of the additional roles within the Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service. This should be provided to the Panel by the end of 2021 alongside quarterly updates on the uptake of the roles. This update should also include details of the impact of the new roles and how they have reduced waiting times within the service.

⁶³ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.35

⁶⁴ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October – p.36

Improving Educational Outcomes – Early Years			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Putting Children First		Minister for Children and Education	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
No update			

Funding allocations approved in Government Plan 2020-2023 (£000):

2020	2021	2022	2023
0	1,103	2,700	2,700

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
889	1,277	1,765	1,765

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
1,277	1,765	1,765	1,765

Panel analysis

The Panel notes that, within the mid-year review, there is no update provided in relation to the funding for early years. The report of the Early Years Policy Development Board (EYPDB) was presented on 28th September 2021 and set out six key policy recommendations for the future of early years in the Island. Whilst this has been accepted by the Chief Minister, there is still no action plan or timescale for the implementation of the recommendations. At the end of 2020, the former Minister for Education announced that the number of hours available through the Nursery Education Fund (NEF) would be raised from 20 to 30 hours.

The Panel notes that within the Government Plan 2022-25, only £1.27 million is allocated in relation to the Early Years setting. Upon further discussion during a public hearing, it was confirmed that this funding is solely in relation to the NEF funding for 2022 within private nursery settings.⁶⁵ This was also confirmed by the Minister as being at a higher rate and to account for the increase in hours from 20 to 30.⁶⁶ It should be noted that the allocation of £1.27 million is less than the original estimate for 2022 of £2.7 million outlined in the 2020-23 Government Plan.

Noting that the funding did not have any relation to implementing the work of the EYPDB, the Panel requested an update on what was happening in relation to bringing this work forward:

⁶⁵ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021

⁶⁶ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021

Thank you. Under a guidance and a request from the Minister, we have pulled together all of the recommendations from the Early Years Policy Development Board and also a host of other recommendations in the early years centre, which drive different sources. For example, there are a number of COVID bits which provide some single or multi-year funding. There are also some existing action plans from the Best Start Partnership and also, of course, the business-as-usual change. A long story short, there is an awful lot of intended activity, some of which is funded on a recurring basis, some of which is funded on a one-off basis, some of which is unfunded. In order to try and crash through this into something which makes it nice and clear and simple, we have engaged a programme manager to lead a piece of work to pull together a long list of all of those activities to determine what is funded and what is not, through an engagement process of a wide number of stakeholders come up with a specific action plan which looks at what we will be delivering. I think at the moment we are going to keep it quite simple, so look on a half-year basis, starting first half of 2022 and then being re-planned on a 6-monthly basis. We are engaging the Best Start Partnership as our lead consultation group because that is a well-formed group, it has good representation. It also has some independence in there through the independent chair. That is our consultation group and we intend, by the end of this month, possibly the first week or 2 in December, to conclude on what our half-2022 action plan will be in the context of the early years group and we will be looking to present that to the Minister for his support.⁶⁷

The Panel understands that work is ongoing to identify a clear action plan in relation to the findings of the EYPDB, however, given that no funding has been attributed to it for 2022 within this project, it holds concerns about the feasibility of implementing any of the recommendations within the report. The Panel requested further information from the Minister and was informed that a best start co-ordinator role is due to be recruited to in order to drive, co-ordinate and implement the programme of Covid recovery activity for children and families in the early years.⁶⁸ The Panel notes that this role will be funded through the Covid Health and Social Recovery Fund until 2024, when funding will cease. At this stage, the Minister has stated an application will need to be made to the Government Plan in order to maintain that role.⁶⁹ Upon further questioning, the Panel was informed that a total of £330,000 has been allocated from the Covid Health and Social Recovery Fund to support the work of the Best Start Partnership. This includes the following funding to support the implementation of the EYPDB recommendations:

- *Best Start Co-ordinator role and administrative support for the programme amount required this would be circa £80,000 per year*
- *Professional development courses amount required this would be £85,490 for professional courses delivered in partnership with Highlands College; approx. £20,000 per year to fund CPD courses across the children’s workforce and approx. £8,750 to support a programme of coaching and mentoring.*
- *Best Start Nursery Plus scheme amount required this would be £82,097 to expand the programme each year for 20 more families⁷⁰*

The Panel notes that the Covid Health and Social Recovery Fund sits under the Heads of Expenditure for the Covid-19 Response with oversight from Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance (SPPP) and is allocated by a Political Oversight Group chaired by the Chief Minister.⁷¹ Given the overall budget for Early Years sits within CYPES, the Panel believes that

⁶⁷ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021 – p.30

⁶⁸ Written questions – Minister for Children and Education

⁶⁹ Written questions – Minister for Children and Education

⁷⁰ Written questions – Minister for Children and Education

⁷¹ Written questions – Minister for Children and Education

this funding should sit within the Heads of Expenditure for CYPES rather than the Covid-19 Response. Noting from a response from the Minister for Children and Education that the Accountable Officer for CYPES (the Director General) holds ultimate accountability for this funding through the Children's Strategic Partnership Board, the Panel has therefore agreed to bring an amendment which would place the funding within the Heads of Expenditure for CYPES in order to clarify where ultimate accountability rests.

Furthermore, in a response from the Minister, it was noted that the increased hourly rate for the NEF (£6.70 per hour) and additional hours from 20 to 30, has meant that the budget for Early Years is exclusively for supporting children in the 3-4 year age group, however, the total estimated amount for the NEF for 3-4-year olds in 2022 has been stated as £3.32 million in a subsequent response from the Minister. This comes in at £2.05 million less than the allocated funding in the Government Plan for 2022.⁷² Given this significant shortfall in funding for the estimated maximum requirement, the Panel has agreed to bring an amendment which would increase the allocation for Early Years (NEF 3-4-year olds) to £3.32 million overall (an increase of £2.05 million).

It was also noted in the response from the Minister that, had the reduction in funding and increase in the hourly rate and hours not occurred, there would have been an additional £1.84 million to provide funding for targeted support from the NEF for 2–3-year-olds with specific needs (the Best Start Offer Plus).⁷³ This figure was further estimated to be £2.25 million for 2022 to purchase all necessary hours in the private sector⁷⁴. Given there is no funding available to implement this recommendation from the EYPDB, the Panel has agreed to bring an amendment that would allocate £750,000 for 2022 (a third of the estimated £2.25 million) to implement this recommendation. Noting that work is still required in order to develop the action plan around this area, the Panel has agreed to provide a third of the total funding so that any offer can be implemented from September 2022, leaving the first two thirds of the year to finalise and develop the scheme.

The Panel understands that policy six of the EYPDB relates to the introduction of a transformation fund to recognise and enable a graduate workforce in private nursery settings providing pedagogical leadership within each setting.⁷⁵ Noting that no additional funding within the Government Plan has been allocated to allow for degree courses (it should be noted the funding previously discussed for training through the Best Start Partnership relates only to Level 3, 4 and 5 courses), and in the absence of a full action plan for it, the Panel has agreed that additional funding should be provided in the Government Plan in order to advance this policy aim. It has, therefore, agreed an amendment which would provide for one practitioner from each private nursery (28 private registered nurseries currently operate in Jersey), to undertake a degree course. The Panel notes that the one-year full time degree course in Childhood Studies at Highlands College costs £8,295 per year. Taken as a benchmark, the Panel notes that this figure multiplied by the 28 private nurseries would require funding of £232,260 in 2022. It has, therefore, brought an amendment to allow for this to take place during 2022.

One final area of concern for the Panel was received in a submission from the Jersey Child Care Trust in relation to a proposed cut of £30,000 to the grant they receive from the Government.⁷⁶ It is noted that this will result in the accredited nanny scheme not being viable for the charity in 2022. The removal of this funding identified a number of issues for the JCCT including a serious impact on, amongst other issues, safeguarding as well as financial

⁷² Written questions – Minister for Children and Education

⁷³ Written questions – Minister for Children and Education

⁷⁴ Written questions – Minister for Children and Education

⁷⁵ EYPDB report – Policy Six

⁷⁶ Written Submission – JCCT

implications for families. Noting the importance of the charity sector in relation to early years services, the Panel is especially concerned that this grant reduction is being made in relation to the services offered by the JCCT in the current COVID climate. The Panel questioned the rationale for the reduction of funding with the Minister for Children and Education and was provided with the following information:

The rationale for the 2022 grant reduction comes from the States adoption of P68.2016 MTFP addition for 2017 - 2019. The reduction was to total £90k, with a £45k reduction in 2018, followed by a further £45k in 2019. The 2018 reduction of £45k was carried out but the 2019 reduction was not. This £30k reduction is therefore part of the previous commitment to reduce the grant by £45k in 2019. Please note the JCCT will benefit from additional funds in the region of £39K for 2022 and 2023 from the successful COVID Health and Social Recovery bid for Early Years and Best Start programmes.⁷⁷

Whilst the Panel is thankful for the Ministers response in this regard, it is still concerned about the grant reduction in the current climate, especially the impact of COVID on young children's development. It has therefore agreed to bring an amendment that would re-instate the full amount of grant funding in 2022. This will need to be maintained over the rest of the Government Plan period and the Panel has recommended that the Minister brings forward plans to fully fund this grant from 2023 onwards.

The Panel has, therefore, brought forward amendments to the Government Plan which seek to allocate funding to meet the overall estimated costs of the NEF for 3-4 year-olds in 2022, provide further funding for the targeted support for 2–3-year-olds from the NEF, reinstate the full grant amount for the JCCT, move the Best Start Partnership Funding from the Covid-19 Heads of Expenditure to CYPES and provide additional funding for degree level training courses in the private nursey settings. As such, the Panel has rated this project as red given the concerns raised.

FINDING 15



The funding identified for the Improving Educational Outcomes: Early Years Project in 2022 (£1.27 million) does not cover the total estimated funding level of £3.32 million estimated for the Nursery Education Fund (NEF) support for 3-4-year-olds. This is due to a funding reduction of £1.43 million in 2021 for Early Years and the decision taken by the Minister for Children and Education earlier in 2021 to increase the NEF hours from 20 to 30 per child per week and increase the hourly rate to £6.70 per hour.

FINDING 16



Due to the increase in the Nursery Education Fund Hours from 20 to 30 hours per week per child, and the increase in the hourly rate to £6.70 per hour agreed by the Minister for Children and Education in 2021, there is no additional funding within the Early Years budgets to implement targeted support for 2-3-year-olds as per the recommendation of the Early Years Policy Development Board.

FINDING 17



Funding to assist in the implementation of the recommendations arising from the Early Years Policy Development Board has been identified from the Covid Health and Social Recovery Fund which sits under the Heads of Expenditure for Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance. This funding is to be allocated to the Best Start Partnership to assist with workforce training, a best start co-

⁷⁷ Written questions – Minister for Children and Education

ordinator role and expansion of the Best Start Nursery Plus Scheme by 20 families. This does not, however, cover funding for degree level courses for practitioners in the private nursery settings as per policy area six of the Early Years Policy Development Board report.

FINDING 18



The grant allocated to the Jersey Child Care Trust in 2022 has been reduced by £30,000 due to previous agreement in the Medium-Term Financial Plan 2016-2019 with the planned reduction from 2019 never being brought forward. This reduction will result in the charity not being able to deliver the accredited nanny service in 2022.

RECOMMENDATION 14



The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that the full grant amount given to the Jersey Child Care Trust is maintained over the next four-year period of the Government Plan and that funding is identified from 2023 onwards for this.

RECOMMENDATION 15






The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that budget allocations for Early Years are revisited in the Government Plan 2023-2026 to ensure that all funding identified to support the recommendations of the Early Years Policy Development Board is placed within the Departmental Base budget in future years.

RECOMMENDATION 16



Following the publication of the Early Years Policy Development Board report, the Minister for Children and Education should publish an action plan for how the recommendations will be implemented by the end of January 2022. This should outline the financial and human resources implications of each recommendation.

Higher Education			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Putting Children First		Minister for Children and Education	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
On Track			

Funding allocations approved in Government Plan 2020-2023 (£000):

2020	2021	2022	2023
6,000	6,199	6,395	6,598

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
6,199	6,395	4,803	4,803

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
6,395	4,803	4,803	4,803

Panel analysis

The Panel notes the following update in relation to this programme within the mid-year review update:

The guiding principles for a new scheme have been agreed with the Minister. Officers have been developing options and will present these to the Minister in early Q3.⁷⁸

The Panel received a number of comments from the Jersey Student Loans Support Group (JSLSG) in relation to the current situation relating to Higher Education. The following comment was

We note that the plan was to review before the end of 2021, any proposal needing to be debated by the assembly in order it would be in place for the academic year 2023/24, giving sufficient time for parents and students to plan ahead. We had confirmed this with the minister recently. The minister told us that officers were due to present the options, and he was taking that to the CoM for a decision. It wasn't until your meeting with the minister 1st November, that he mentioned it is to be an RPI adjustment which came as a surprise. There is no detail of what the RPI adjustment will be.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ Mid-Year Review – R.138/2021

⁷⁹ Submission - JSLSG

A further concern was raised in relation to the current scheme and the support that is offered to students through the maintenance grant aspect of the higher education funding:

That the maintenance grant that is currently given was largely the same under the old scheme, and has been for the life of the current scheme which is now two years over its intended review date as agreed by the assembly. We would expect the RPI to be calculated based on the start of the current scheme figure at the minimum, and ought to be reviewed each year. The cost of student accommodation in the U.K. has outstripped the U.K. RPI. consistently for years. Evidenced from the NUS Unipol surveys.⁸⁰

The Panel was provided with the following update from the Minister for Children and Education in relation to the changes that would be made to the scheme as a result of the work that had been done to review it.

The Minister for Children and Education:

It has been a massive piece of work being done to understand the higher education and how much money in what sectors and the likes because we have struggled with record-keeping and which we have now caught up to date with. At the moment we are looking at the higher education funding and what we can see within the good news stories is what we can see is year on year and more and more children have been funded to go to university, which I think is a great success story for us. The funding model itself as it looks hits proportionately higher to the lower-end incomes for students going to university. On that view with the changes that are going on, I am looking at possible increases in the funding on a R.P.I. (Retail Price Index) level at the moment but I am not going to be proposing any substantive changes to it because the evidence that is showing in front of me is that the right demographics are getting this caught at the highest level and it is pretty consistent.⁸¹

The Panel notes that the only likely changes to the scheme will be R.P.I increases and that the current Minister is of the view that the scheme itself is targeted correctly. Whilst this is understood, the Panel notes that the funding from 2023 onwards sees a drop of £1.5 million. It therefore questioned whether this reduction would include efficiencies:

Senator T.A. Vallois:

What is projected is under that current model or with the drop in 2023 allocation from that £2.6 million down to £2 million, is that expected to make efficiencies in the plans for the new higher education model?

Business Finance Partner:

In 2023 that is the assumption built into that model.⁸²

It was further confirmed by the Minister for Children and Education that the funding levels applied to Higher Education since the new schemes introduction in 2018 had exceeded the demand for the scheme:

The Minister for Children and Education:

The estimates that we have given to the higher education funding year on year has been more than what the actual pressure has been, right, so there is not people that are putting in for higher education funding that were turning down for any reason. We

⁸⁰ Submission - JSLSG

⁸¹ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021

⁸² Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021

have been estimating far higher levels of funding for higher education than what has been the uptake. If the fees go down it will not change the fact that we have money left over year on year and nobody is being prevented from going to university because of allocation of funds.⁸³

The final area of questioning undertaken by the Panel was in regards to the impact of COVID-19 on the number of students accessing higher education and whether this had a knock-on effect on the funding being utilised:

Senator T.A. Vallois:

I think the only other thing to understand is, what impact COVID has had on the higher education budget and if that has had any impact at all and what that might look like going forward because it might be one of those change models?

The Minister for Children and Education:

We have seen, again, an increase in children going to university year on year, so even through the COVID period over the last, let us say, 2 years there still has been a year-on-year increase on funding for higher education through our scheme, which is great.⁸⁴

One area of change within the Higher Education funding is the manner in which parental income is assessed. The Minister for Children and Education recently made the Education (Discretionary Grants - General) (Jersey) Order 2021 which changes the way in which parental income is assessed under the scheme. Previously a single parent household would be assessed on one income within that household, however, it was confirmed by the Law Officers that this was not the way in which the overriding Education (Grants and Allowances) (Jersey) Order 2018 was worded and that the income of both parents (in the event of divorce or separation) was required when considering higher education grants. The Panel was briefed on this matter on 17th November 2021 and notes that the Minister has placed a 'grand fathering' scheme on the proposed changes meaning that any student currently undertaking a course will not be reassessed under the changes during the duration of their course. Any new student applications for September 2021 will be assessed under the new scheme. One area of concern highlighted by JSLSG on this matter was whether the funding in the Government Plan was based on the Order as written or on the basis of the how the department had been applying it previously.⁸⁵

The Panel notes the changes as a result of the order and recommend that the impact on applications is monitored closely to ensure that no students are being financially affected by the changes within the order. The Minister for Children and Education should also continue to review the scheme in order to ensure no-one is denied access to higher education due to lack of income (the very issue that the current scheme was designed to address). For that reason, the Panel has rated the project as amber at this stage.



FINDING 19

The funding levels allocated to Higher Education have exceeded take up since the scheme was introduced in 2018. Changes to the manner in which parental income is assessed in 2021 by Order have raised concern that some students may be affected in terms of the amount of grant available to them from the start of the 2021/22 academic year.



⁸³ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021

⁸⁴ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021

⁸⁵ Written Submission – JSLSG

**RECOMMENDATION 17**

The Minister for Children and Education should continue to monitor the take-up for higher education funding as a result of the changes made in the Education (Discretionary Grants - General) (Jersey) Order 2021 to ensure that no students are adversely affected by the change in assessment of parental income.

Funding of Senior Posts within Justice and Home Affairs			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Modernising Government		Minister for Home Affairs	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
No update			n/a

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
314	314	314	314

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
314	314	314	314

Panel analysis

The Panel notes that this funding was brought forward in 2021 due to the target operating model for Justice and Home Affairs. The Minister confirmed that the reason for the additional funding was due to a structural deficit in funding roles. Previously these roles had been funded from underspends. It was confirmed to the Panel in its previous review of the Government Plan that the roles affected were the Director General and Group Director for Public Protection and Law Enforcement.

It is noted now that the additional £314,000 is now part of the budget for Justice and Home Affairs, however, it was brought forward as additional funding in 2021 to counteract the deficit created by the Target Operating Model. This is now resolved, and the Panel has no further comments to make in this regard. It has therefore assigned the funding a green rating.

Policing 2020-23			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Modernising Government		Minister for Home Affairs	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
No update			

Funding allocations approved in Government Plan 2020-2023 (£000):

2020	2021	2022	2023
821	1,919	2,073	2,196

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
1,630	1,784	1,907	2,046

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
1,784	1,907	2,046	2,046

Panel analysis

The Panel noted that no update was provided for this project within the mid-year report. The most recent update had explained that the project had been partially deferred in 2021. The Panel requested an update on this during the public hearing with the Minister for Home Affairs on 15th October:

Deputy R.J. Ward:

In terms of policing the 2020 and 2023 project on policing, this project was partially deferred in a previous Government Plan and the funding reduced to £1.63 million for 2021 from £1.919 million previously estimated. Has the reduction in funding for 2021 impacted the delivery of the project's aims and, if so, how? That is about policing in general, I believe.

The Minister for Home Affairs:

No, I do not think so. In fact, the fact that we increased the number of officers allowed them to do many things that they were not able to do. The fact that they reinstated the drug squad, for example, or that they have community officers now assigned to the Parishes is a great item of growth. Yes, they had cuts but on the other hand they got 25 more officers.⁸⁶

One of the key areas raised to the Panel in relation to the Police numbers came from the Jersey Police Force Association noting the efficiency savings previously discussed in this report. The point was made that the Association strongly believes that the States of Jersey

⁸⁶ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15 October 2021

Police cannot afford to make any further cuts without putting the safety and well-being of officers at risk, and therefore as a consequence the public.⁸⁷ The Jersey Police Authority outlined that after discussions and assurances from the Chief Officer of the Police that they cautiously supported the proposed budgetary reductions.⁸⁸ However, this was tempered by the fact that they would monitor monthly for the coming year any adverse impacts the reductions may cause and petition the Minister should further funding be required.⁸⁹

The Panel is already cautious that by not recruiting to civilian roles, this will in turn have an impact on the capacity of Police Officers which will also require monitoring. The Panel is pleased to see that it is not intended to reduce Police Officer numbers as a result of the efficiency savings, and assurances over the planned number of Police Officers (215) were given by the Chief of Police during a public hearing:

Chief of Police:

The second thing, and I think this is probably the more crucial point, is of course the £836,000 savings has no impact whatsoever on the agreed establishment for police officers of 215. We will continue to maintain the 215 number. It is the establishment. There is no cut in any budget. Indeed, during COVID, at the height of COVID of last year, I sent 10 staff to the U.K., even with the restrictions. I sent another 10 police a week last Sunday to Norfolk, where they receive their initial training. Looking at my latest figures, with the 10 in November, we should be upwards of around 214 police officers. That number - and I know the association are aware of this - the 215 is set by the Minister and is monitored regularly and indeed will be monitored tomorrow by the Jersey Police Authority, so this has no impact on the number of police officers that we will recruit.⁹⁰

The Panel, as with the views raised by the Police Authority and Police Force Association, is cautious in relation to the true impact the efficiency savings will have on Police Officers. Whilst it is positive to see that the number of actual Officers will increase, the Minister must ensure that the impact on Officers of the removal of civilian roles is monitored closely and issues addressed as soon as they arise. It has therefore rated the project as amber.



FINDING 20

It is still intended for the States of Jersey Police Force to recruit with the intention of meeting the target of 215 Police Officers and proposed efficiency savings do not impact the funding for this target. There is, however, concern that the impact on police officers will still be felt as a result of civilian roles not being recruited to which will need to be monitored closely by the Minister for Home Affairs.



RECOMMENDATION 18



The Minister for Home Affairs should, in partnership with the Jersey Police Authority, Jersey Police Force Association and Chief of Police, monitor the impact of the proposed efficiency savings in respect of civilian roles on a monthly basis and report to the Panel on a quarterly basis the outcomes of these discussions and any actions taken as a result.

⁸⁷ Submission – Jersey Police Force Association

⁸⁸ Submission – Jersey Police Authority

⁸⁹ Submission – Jersey Police Authority

⁹⁰ Quarterly Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 25th October 2021 – p.5/6

SARC Dewberry House			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Putting Children First		Minister for Home Affairs	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
On Track			n/a

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
150	150	150	150

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
150	150	150	150

Panel analysis

The Panel notes that in the Government Plan there is funding allocated to the development of the Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC) both in terms of revenue funding and capital funding. This particular project relates to the revenue funding, the purpose of which was explained during a public hearing with the Minister for Home Affairs:

Senator T.A. Vallois:




Just to confirm, the revenue that was allocated for the pre-feasibility study, is that the case that you are going to make to carry that over, or you have already made the case for the capital, so that should be in the Government Plan? I am trying to make it clear between revenue and capital.

Acting Director General, Justice and Home Affairs:

Yes, so I was referring to the capital. There is a separate line in the Government Plan for £150,000 of revenue for the S.A.R.C., which is completely separate to the capital project. That is about funding members of staff and it is a correction to existing running costs having been captured at £150,000 lower than they should have been in the original Government Plan of 2020. That will show as an ongoing correction for the rest of the life of the plan, but it is to pay for specified numbers of staff that are needed as part of the current operation.⁹¹

The Panel is satisfied with the requirement for the funding, noting the important work of the SARC and therefore has no further comments in respect of it.

⁹¹ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

Probation Service Additional Funding			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Modernising Government		Non-Ministerial	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
On Track			

Funding allocations approved in Government Plan 2020-2023 (£000):

2020	2021	2022	2023
35	35	35	35

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
35	35	35	35

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
35	35	35	35




Panel analysis

The Panel wrote to the Chief Probation Officer for further details on the use of the recurring £35,000 each year. It was provided with the following overview by the Chief Probation Officer:

This funding bid (GP20-161) was submitted for the Government Plan 2020-2023 and met some of the inflation shortfall in the salaries of staff who had previously been paid by the Justice and Home Affairs department under the auspices of the Building a Safer Society Strategy (BASS). The four post holders were the Restorative Justice Officer, Portuguese Offender Officer, Substance Misuse Officer and the Co-ordinator of the ADAPT domestic abuse programme. The first three posts still exist and are explained in more detail below. Following the retirement of the ADAPT Co-ordinator the funds were reinvested in a trainee Probation Officer which has provided an opportunity to provide services in a wider range of areas. The domestic abuse work has been overseen by a Probation manager and other staff using a new programme in conjunction with HMP La Moye.⁹²

The Panel notes this is continued funding for posts identified in 2021 and therefore is pleased to see the development of the work that has been undertaken so far. It therefore rates the project as green.

⁹² Submission – Chief Probation Officer

Probation – BASS Funding, Regrading and Trainee Post			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Modernising Government		Non-Ministerial	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
On Track			

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
161	185	201	212

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
185	201	212	212

Panel analysis

The Panel wrote to the Chief Probation Officer for further details on the use of the recurring £201,000 each year. It was provided with the following overview by the Chief Probation Officer:

It is important to clarify that this extra money has not been a result of a “growth” plan by the Service. Instead, the BASS funding (previously paid by Justice and Home Affairs) was repurposed by that department leaving a deficit of £146,000 in the Probation Service budget. It is important to note that due to the posts not receiving funding for increments over several years, there was an additional shortfall of £54,000 a year. This difference was funded by the Department by way of underspends in other areas- most recently through the postponing of appointing to two vacancies. It has now been agreed that these two posts will be permanently removed from the budget in recognition of the need for the Department to play its part in the rebalancing of the island’s finances. The budget attached to those posts was £98,000 a year.⁹³

The Chief Probation Officer further explained that the regrading of posts as part of the States Employment Board project to encourage fairness between departments resulted in the department requiring a budget correction of approximately £55,000.⁹⁴ It was also explained that this followed a restructure of the department which increased operational resilience and recognised the additional complexity introduced in respect of responsibilities to conform with evolving multi agency practice, legislation and policy.⁹⁵




The Panel was also informed that two local candidates have been appointed to trainee Probation Officer roles. The Panel is supportive of this additional funding and has therefore allocated the project a green rating in this iteration of the Government Plan.

⁹³ Submission – Chief Probation Officer

⁹⁴ Submission – Chief Probation Officer

⁹⁵ Submission – Chief Probation Officer

Capital Projects

Combined Control IT			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Information Technology (Capital)		Minister for Home Affairs	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
Delayed			

Funding allocations approved in Government Plan 2020-2023 (£000):

2020	2021	2022	2023
2,290	0	0	0

Funding allocation approved in Government Plan 2021-2024 (£000):

2021	2022	2023	2024
2,000	0	0	0

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
400	0	0	0

Panel analysis

The Panel notes from the mid-year review that the project has been delayed to date. The following update was provided within the mid-year review:

*This project seeks to create a combined control room for all three emergency services to be able to better report monitor and respond to all emergencies in Jersey. This will create a more unified service able to respond to all emergencies and encourage closer working between agencies. This will promote a more comprehensive and efficient response to emergencies occurring in the Island. The several elements of this project were delayed due to COVID-19 and related budget constraints, but progress has been made this year. One of the major elements (selecting a new Computer Aided Dispatch) has made considerable progress and it is expected that a supplier will be selected this year. Some spending on this workstream will be deferred into 2022. Progress is being made with the new telephony and the new team structure on track to deliver in 2021. The investigation of options for the future of the Emergency Call Handling Service (currently provided by JT) has been deferred for the time being. *The 2021 allocation does not take into account the 'Our Hospital' reprofiling exercise earlier this year which included a partial deferral of funds into 2022.⁹⁶*

⁹⁶ Mid-Year Review – R.138/2021

The Panel followed up on this update during the public hearing with the Minister for Home Affairs and requested an overview of the expenditure to date

Acting Director General, Justice and Home Affairs:

Yes, so the expenditure this year so far has been about the project costs and the telephony improvement that we are making. There is a new Mitel phone system in the room - we have paid Mitel and J.T. (Jersey Telecom) for that - and also a new system called the Integrated Communications Control System, which is effectively the users having proper headsets that mean they can deal with the phone and the radio at the same time. We have paid for that. This year's expenditure is around that technical improvement and the project management costs and then I would expect the substantive capital expenditure to now fall next year once we have been out to tender and appointed a supplier.⁹⁷

The Panel notes that a number of changes have been delivered this year in relation to the phone system with further expenditure expected in 2022 in relation to the substantive capital aspects of the project which is the actual computer aided dispatch system (CADS) itself. The Minister confirmed that this was still to go out for tender.⁹⁸ Following on from this information, the Panel questioned whether there would be impact from the further expenditure on efficiency savings within the department:

Senator T.A. Vallois:

In terms of some of the improvements that have been able to be made with the money that has been spent so far, and recognising the more substantial side of the capital project for next year to be carried forward, does that have any effect whatsoever on your ability to make some of the efficiency savings? I am trying to see whether there is an invest to save incentive.

The Minister for Home Affairs:

Yes, there is, but it is the people's model, so right now it has 3 services running emergency calls from the same room; well it changed during COVID but that is the idea. What we want is one service taking care of all the emergency calls, so when that happens and you need the computer-aided dispatch system to do that, anybody will be able to take any call and work on it. That allows for efficiencies and they can be on both sides. One of them is that you can reorganise shifts so that you need less people to do the same work, but also the work can be better. That is the next step, but the big hurdle to get to that is to find that computer-aided dispatch system and apply it here.⁹⁹

The Panel notes that there may well be some movement of roles in this area given the expected changes, however, this was not deemed significant by the Minister. The Panel was also informed by the Acting Director General that consultation was due to begin in November on the 'people' model for the combined service and was offered a briefing before it went live. The Panel has yet to take up this offer, however, it will form part of its overall work programme. Given the requirement for the capital expenditure to allow the CADS to be in place and noting the requirement around the people model for the service, the Panel cannot give an overall view on the proposed funding level within 2022. This will require monitoring by the Minister, as will the outcome of the people model. As such, the Panel has rated the project amber at this stage.

⁹⁷ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

⁹⁸ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

⁹⁹ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

**FINDING 21**




A new people model for the Combined Control Room is due to be consulted on during November 2021 with a view to identifying the model to be implemented. It is intended for the new Computer-Aided Dispatch System to be purchased and implemented in 2022 with funding allocated to the capital project. It is expected that both of these changes will realise efficiency savings.

**RECOMMENDATION 19**

The Minister for Home Affairs should provide details of the final people model in respect of the Combined Control Room to the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel as soon as the consultation process is completed.

**RECOMMENDATION 20**

Should any efficiency savings in respect of the Combined Control room be identified as a result of the new 'people model' then the Minister for Home Affairs should ensure that these are included within the next iteration of the Government Plan 2023-2026.

North of St. Helier Youth Centre			
CSP		Minister(s)	
Putting Children First		Minister for Children and Education	
2021 Mid-year review status	2022 Scrutiny RAG status	2021 Scrutiny RAG status	2020 Scrutiny RAG status
Delayed			

It should be noted that the CEHA Panel has not previously reviewed this programme, however, this project has been allocated to it by the Government Plan Review Panel in this round of the Government Plan Review. As such all ratings are based on those given to it by the Environment, Infrastructure and Housing Panel that has previously reviewed it.

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
-	-	2,000	2,300

Panel analysis

The Panel questioned the Minister for Children and Education and the progress made in identifying a site for the proposed Youth Centre and was provided with the following update:

The Minister for Children and Education:

There are so many pressures for sites that everyone wants either for social housing, for housing, for schools and the like that I have come across my ... we need to find the site for the school, we need to get through the bridging Island Plan. I know it should be in there. I am as frustrated as you are, Chairman, but I cannot tell you right now where it is.¹⁰⁰

The Panel notes that there is considerable pressure across the Government at present to identify sites for various capital projects. Whilst £2 million is allocated to this particular project in 2022, the Panel is concerned that this project was agreed in the initial debate on the Common Strategic priorities in 2018 and there does not appear to have been any movement on this since that debate took place. It is noted that an amendment has been brought to the Island Plan to dedicate a site to this project, however, this will not take place until March 2022, although the Panel understands the proposed site has been accepted in the inquiry for the Bridging Island Plan. Until such time as there is further clarity on the site of the project the Panel cannot state whether the funding allocated from 2024 onwards is satisfactory. Therefore, the Panel has rated the project as amber at this stage.



FINDING 22

There is currently not clarity over the siting of a new North of St. Helier Youth Centre. Whilst funds are attributed to this project in 2022, the Panel is concerned that the project has not been suitably prioritised in the capital programme to date.

¹⁰⁰ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 22nd October 2021 – p.45



RECOMMENDATION 21


The Minister for Children and Education should ensure that work is progressed in 2022 as a matter of priority to build the new North of St. Helier Youth Centre.

8 New programmes and capital projects in GP 2022-25: reports

See chapter 6 for summary table of ‘RAG’ ratings assigned by the Panel.

Programmes

The following section provides the Panel’s analysis of each new additional revenue expenditure programme:

GP22-CSP1-1-09 --- Young People Intensive support		
CSP	Minister(s)	Scrutiny RAG Status
Put Children First	Minister for Children and Education	

Business Case: Overview

The Government Plan 2022-25 states: ‘We will provide additional support services that are targeted at children who are most at risk, vulnerable and who may pose a risk to others. The funding will:

- Support positive change in young people’s behaviour and create conditions to improve positive outcomes for children
- Ensure that approaches are in place that provide alternatives to involvement in the criminal justice system or specialist placements off-Island
- Involve wrap-around support encompassing education, youth workers, social workers, psychological and therapeutic support. The team involves a total of 18-20 FTE: 12 FTE will be reprioritised within the department, so this funding supports c.6-8 FTE

Panel analysis

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
400	400	400	400

The Panel notes that £400,000 is allocated to this project in 2022. During a public hearing with the Minister for Children and Education, the Panel questioned the rationale behind the additional funding above that which was provided in the Government Plan report itself. The following information was provided by the Director General for CYPES:

Director General, Children, Young People, Education and Skills:

Essentially, build a new team, so this year we have re-purposed some money within the commissioning and integrated services budget to start to create a group of people who are focused on the small but quite needy dozen or so adolescents who I guess people have heard about, one way or another. We have started the work already from existing resources and that team consists of all those things that you have just read out, family support workers, counsel workers, et cetera. Around just south of £1 million

worth of money is presently going into that, about £900,000 I think is where we are this year. The £400,000 is to complete the build of that team next year, so that we have got sufficient resource for the numbers of youngsters we are expecting.¹⁰¹

The Panel notes that the service to be provided is focussed on a specific group of young people who are exhibiting the greatest level of needs. It is a welcome development that support is being put in place for these young people, however, the Panel would suggest that the need for this highlights the historic issues in relation to an effective early help service. The Panel further questioned what tangible benefits would be in place as a result of this new team and the additional funding:

Director General, Children, Young People, Education and Skills:

Let me just give you 2 concrete examples of what the money will get spent on then. For example, the Head of Inclusion, is now on the point of being able to recruit for the first time, I think, here ever, workers, average workers who from her service, so beyond the psychology, beyond S.E.N.C.O., who can go and work in schools and support both students and staff to develop strategies that will help those youngsters stay in education. That is one example. I think some of the excellence funding that we are going to be using across the piece will also be augmented through the service to help more trauma-informed practice develop. We have more staff who understand more about why it is that these youngsters have the needs that they have and what can be done to support them. That is the kind of practical investment that that money will go into, better training, additional staff, so schools will see the benefit of workers coming in on a level that they do not at the moment.¹⁰²

The funding allocated to this programme will require ongoing evaluation to ensure that it is being targeted effectively and meeting the needs of the children and young people it is centred around. As such, whilst the Panel welcomes the support for the children and young people affected, it cannot at this stage identify the full tangible benefits of the support and state whether the allocated funding is sufficient. To that end, the Panel has recommended that the Minister keep the programme under constant evaluation and report back to the Panel on a quarterly basis the tangible outcomes of the programme. It has therefore rated the project as amber at this time.

FINDING 23



The additional funding for the Young People Intensive Support Programme is being brought forward to provide targeted support for a small cohort of young people with the greatest needs. This will help to support a multi-agency team to with training, additional staff and increase the support available in the school setting.


RECOMMENDATION 22



The Minister for Children and Education should establish a baseline measurement from which to assess the Intensive Support programme in order to demonstrate its effectiveness and the tangible outcomes for children and young people. The progress of this project should be reported back to the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel on a quarterly basis.

¹⁰¹ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021

¹⁰² Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021

GP22-CSP1-2-06 --- Education Demographic Pressures		
CSP	Minister(s)	Scrutiny RAG Status
Put Children First	Minister for Children and Education	

Business Case: Overview

The Government Plan 2022-25 states: 'We will provide additional resource to mitigate increasing demographic pressures within the education system'. This includes:

- The high number of pupils in primary school moving through the system into secondary education
- Addressing the increased costs in Jersey's special schools due to higher numbers entering these provisions
- Supporting higher numbers of children with complex special educational needs
- Further demographic investment in early years is required to make sure the new provision of 30 hours at the updated Nursery Education Rate of £6.70 can be met in 2022
- Additional funding has also been requested through the Education Reform Programme, which seeks to transform the delivery of education in Jersey

Panel analysis

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
678	789	1,412	2,132

The Panel notes that this additional funding relates to fluctuations in birth rates which in turn change the requirement for Average Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) funding for children moving through the education system. It is noted that this increases with the child as they move from Primary through the Secondary school. The Panel questioned what this funding would cover during the public hearing with the Minister for Children and Education:

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Is that purely the number of students increasing because of the fluctuations in birth rates which run through into school after 5, 10, 15 years? I am assuming that is the case. Would I be right in saying if you got more students you would need more money to pay to fund the extra in accordance with the pupil funding system?

Business Finance Partner:

It is partly that and there is some catch-up from Mont à l'Abbé because we had not done a numbers catch-up from Mont à l'Abbé for some years.


The Panel also notes that the funding in this project is in order to fund increased numbers of students at Mont à l'Abbé. It is noted that the students attending Mont à l'Abbé are not assessed in the AWPU and this funding is required in order to catch up the current numbers with the relevant funding. The Panel also notes that a figure of £2 million is available in reserves in relation to additional funding for SEN demographics.

The Panel notes the rationale for the demographics funding and understands the requirement to fund students appropriately as they move through the system. It would, however, raise concern in relation to the current AWPU which is nearly 30 years old, and this in turn links to the work being done to bring forward a new funding formula. As such, the new funding formula may highlight increased costs in relation to demographics compared to the current formula. Without the details of the new funding formula, the Panel cannot state at this stage whether the funding provided for in the Government Plan is sufficient to manage the demographic increases that are occurring in schools. Given previous concerns raised around the Education Reform Programme and new funding formula, the Panel has therefore rated this project as red at this stage.



FINDING 24

The funding allocated to the Education Demographics Pressures project is required to fund increased numbers of students moving through the school system via the Average Weighted Pupil Unit. The funding also provides a catch up on funding for students at Mont à l'Abbé where an increase has not happened for a number of years. There is £2 million allocated to demographic SEN within Government Reserves in the event need exceeds demand. The Panel is concerned, however, that without details of the new funding formula being developed, the level of funding within the Government Plan cannot be identified as sufficient or not.

GP22-OI3-28 --- Jersey Police Authority (JPA)		
CSP	Minister(s)	Scrutiny RAG Status
Modernising Government	Minister for Home Affairs	

Business Case: Overview

The Government Plan 2022-25 states: 'We will support JPA's request for additional funding to increase resources to fulfil their legislative functions efficiently and effectively over the life of the Government Plan 2022-25'.

Panel analysis

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
101	186	86	86

The Panel notes that the funding allocated to the JPA has been brought forward further to the States of Jersey Police (Amendment No.3) Law 2021 (P.10/2021) which made changes to the operation of the JPA. The Panel supported this amendment earlier in the year and is pleased to note the additional funding being brought forward to assist the legislative changes.

The Panel requested further details of what the additional funding would be used for within the JPA and was provided with the following information by the Minister for Home Affairs:

The Minister for Home Affairs:

Interestingly, one of the reasons they asked for a larger budget was to be able to look at the budgeting of the police and they saw that they were not able to do it with the staff that they had now. They want more people so that they can be much more involved in that. I accept it totally. So we have given them the resources to do that. If they come back to us and say: "I am sorry, this is not enough" again I am sure I will find the courage to fight it with Government.¹⁰³

The Minister also confirmed the role of the JPA and highlighted the importance of the role that they undertook:

The Minister for Home Affairs:

They supervise the police. The police must be separated from the Ministry. We have an influence on the budget, an influence on the very high level of general direction, but we do not run the police and we cannot interfere with the running. The J.P.A. (Jersey Police Authority) can supervise and tell them what to do, but to do that you need to be well-informed and you need to have the resources. We are talking about more than 300 people whose agency you need to supervise, so it does take resources. I think the budget that we gave them is about one-third of what they asked for, so they were quite a bit more ambitious when they came to us.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

¹⁰⁴ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

The Panel notes from the Minister's response that the additional funding allocated to the JPA is less than what was requested by them. The Panel maintains regular discussion with the JPA and will continue to ascertain whether the funding allocated is allowing them to undertake their role as effectively as possible. It is difficult at this stage to state whether the funding will in fact meet the expectations for the JPA to fulfil its role, so the Minister must continue to monitor this and discuss further with the JPA as 2022 progresses. In its previous review of the States of Jersey Police Force (Amendment No.3) Law 2021, the Panel noted the following matter in this regard:

Regarding the aspect of resourcing for the JPA, it is the Panel's understanding that the JPA will continue its ongoing dialogue with the Minister for Home Affairs in respect of the resources required to conduct its functions. Moreover, it is the Panel's understanding that the Annual Policing Plan would act as a statutory requirement that the Minister receives advice from the JPA as to the resources required by the SoJP to meet its functions.¹⁰⁵

Given the uncertainty over the funding level at this stage, the Panel has rated this as amber and will continue to review this throughout 2022.



FINDING 25

The new revenue funding allocated to the Jersey Police Authority (JPA) within the Government Plan 2022 – 25 is in order to increase the resources available to it in order to ensure the States of Jersey Police Force is operating as efficiently and effectively as possible. It is also noted that the funding provided in the Government Plan is one third of what was requested by the JPA. This will require monitoring by the Minister for Home Affairs to ensure the funding is adequate for the role of the JPA.



RECOMMENDATION 23

The Jersey Police Authority should, within its annual report, make a statement as to whether the funds provided to it are sufficient for it to meet its duty in regards to the States of Jersey Police Force Law 2012.

¹⁰⁵ Comments – P.10/2021

GP22-OI3-22 --- Defence Funding		
CSP	Minister(s)	Scrutiny RAG Status
Modernising Government	Minister for Home Affairs	

Business Case: Overview

The Government Plan 2022-25 states: ‘We will ensure the Jersey Field Squadron is financially sustainable over the life of the Government Plan 2022-25 and allow for the continued stewardship of Jersey Field Squadron’s historically significant built heritage assets. This will enable the Jersey Field Squadron to maintain a core complement of a minimum of 68 people and capacity to train 12 recruits annually in line with the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) that was established in 1981 between the then States of Jersey and the UK Home Office, over the life of the plan’.

Panel analysis

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
454	481	509	537

The Panel notes that the rationale for this funding stems from an historic budgeting issue in relation to the Jersey Field Squadron (JFS). The Panel was informed that, historically, the JFS had received block funding of £1 million per year which had not been increased in order to meet RPI increases in salaries or taken into account inflation. This was questioned during the public hearing with the Minister for Home Affairs:

Senator T.A. Vallois:

So at least if it is recognised as a number in here then it is paying for what it costs?

The Minister for Home Affairs:

Absolutely, it is a recognition of the cost, and it is an accident. I think they just did not take into account salaries’ inflation, so they thought if they give £1 million every year for ever it will be fine. It is people, and salaries go up every year, so there should be an inflation and they just had not done that 10 or 15 years ago.¹⁰⁶

Noting the requirement for the increase in funding is to match RPI and salary increases, the Panel is satisfied for the rational for the funding it has therefore rated the project as green. It would, however, recommend that the Minister for Home Affairs continues to monitor the funding allocation to the JFS to ensure a similar issue does not occur in the future.



FINDING 26

The additional funding for the Jersey Field Squadron has been identified in order to cover an historic issue whereby funding of £1 million was provided on an annual basis that did not take into account RPI, salary increases and inflation. The additional funding is intended to bring the overall budget up to date.

¹⁰⁶ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

Fund as Required --- Brexit Transition - Legal and Policy Support		
CSP	Minister(s)	Scrutiny RAG Status
Modernising Government	Minister for Home Affairs	

Business Case: Overview

The Government Plan 2022-25 states: ‘We will fund as required a two-year Grade 11 Customs and Immigration Legal and Policy Principal within JCIS with primary responsibility for Immigration matters, and a 2-year fixed term contract position for an Immigration Legal Adviser, within Law Officers’ Department (LOD). At the end of 2023, it is anticipated that the necessary legal and policy work to implement the revised framework will have been delivered’.

Panel analysis

Fund as Required – Estimated amounts held in the General Reserve 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
172	172	-	-

The Panel notes that this programme is designated as ‘fund as required’, which is a term that has not been used in the previous iterations of the Government Plan. The Panel therefore questioned what this term meant and, in this instance for Brexit Policy and Legal Support, what would be undertaken with the funding:

Deputy R.J. Ward:

It is about Brexit transition, but it basically says “fund as required” and I just wanted to ask you as to what “fund as required” means because we have spent a long time talking about figures, but “fund as required”, that term comes up a number of times in the Government Plan in other areas, so I will not vex you with those, but what does that mean and where does that come from?

The Minister for Home Affairs:

There is still, I suppose unfortunately so long after it has happened, quite a bit of uncertainty about where Brexit is going to go. Of course, customs and immigration are directly in charge of the way it is managed. We are completely on top of things right now but if they change there might be some very big expenses occurring. Right now, we are in a system that does not have tariffs but depending on what happens in Northern Ireland next year we might be in a system that does have tariffs. We might be in a system that completely eschews the Trade Co-operation Agreement, so unfortunately there is no figure we can put on it because we have no idea of how bad or good it could be¹⁰⁷.

The Panel notes that the funding is in place in order to deal with unforeseen circumstances relating to the ongoing Brexit implications. Within the Government Plan itself, there is no indication as to the amount that has been set aside within the general reserve to be drawn down for this project. The Panel notes that an estimated cost for this particular project was identified in a response to a letter from the Corporate Services Panel as follows:

¹⁰⁷ Public hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

g) Are there any estimates of the potential cost of each project?

Estimates of the potential cost of the initiatives are included in the supporting business cases, but remain uncertain. The amounts included in the General reserve are shown below:


	Type	2022 (£000)	2023 (£000)	2024 (£000)	2025 (£000)
AME Contingency	AME	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Demographics SEN	AME	2,000	2,238	2,476	2,730
PECRS pre-87 debt	DEL	966	1,445	1,950	2,480
DEL Contingency	DEL	5,026	5,043	5,384	5,367
Disposal of Recycling Materials 2023-2025	DEL	0	200	200	200
Hazardous Waste Disposal 2023-2025	DEL	0	1,250	1,250	1,250
Glass Contract 2023-2025	DEL	0	468	260	260
Future Fisheries & Marine Resources Management	BREXIT (DEL)	263	253	238	238
UK/EU TCA Biosecurity Border Controls	BREXIT (DEL)	1,539	1,532	1,378	1,394
Brexit Transition - JCIS Legal & Policy Principal Post	BREXIT (DEL)	172	172	0	0
General Reserve Contingency		11,966	14,601	15,136	15,919

The Panel notes that £172,000 is estimated in the general reserve for allocation to the Brexit transition project. The concept of fund a required is a new feature of the Government Plan and whilst it is understood that the implications of Brexit cannot be fully planned for given uncertainty over a number of aspects, the Panel would caution that this must be monitored closely.

FINDING 27



The fund as required project 'Brexit Transition – Policy and Legal Support' seeks to provide funding for reactive work in relation to implications arising from Brexit. An estimate of £172,000 has been set aside for 2022, however, there is no certainty over this level of funding.

GP22-OI-Non-12 --- Probation Service Inspection		
CSP	Minister(s)	Scrutiny RAG Status
Non Ministerial	n/a	

Business Case: Overview

The Government Plan 2022-25 states: ‘The Probation Service is a department of the Royal Court that provides assessments for the courts and supervision services for offenders within the community and custody. Its work also extends to working with children in the court system and those who have been sanctioned via the Parish Hall Enquiry system. Probation Service is requesting funding to be inspected by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP). As a key agency in the island’s criminal justice system, it is important that the work of the Service is inspected to receive assurances it is effective, efficient and provides value for money’.

Panel analysis

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
-	47	-	-

The Panel was provided with the following overview of the need for this funding by the Chief Probation Officer as follows:

Probation Service Inspection

This would allow Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) to inspect the work of the Jersey Probation Service and was recommended in an independent review of the Probation and Prison Services in 2019. The review noted that, although the Jersey Probation Service had undergone a number of inspections in recent years, it had not been inspected by HMIP since 2005. HMIP will not be able to undertake the inspection until the first quarter of 2023 due to a backlog in its work created by the pandemic. The Probation Service supports the importance of external scrutiny as this will provide assurance that it is effective, efficient and provides value for money. It is anticipated that the HMIP inspection will focus on strategic leadership, quality of information and case management, safeguarding, and public protection. It will involve an examination of the Service’s work with adults and children both within the community and in custody. It has been difficult to accurately gauge the cost of an external inspection at this point in time as negotiations commenced pre COVID. The process would entail several inspectors travelling to the island for approximately a week and the Service providing files of evidence prior to the inspection work being undertaken. It is anticipated that local stakeholders would also be interviewed. I am confident that the £47,000 requested would be sufficient for the task. I have been in dialogue with the newly appointed Chief Probation Officer of Guernsey. The concept of a Channel Islands inspection regime has been mooted and can be explored. This would not, initially at least, have the tradition or gravitas of a HMIP inspection but would be considerably cheaper. It is an issue that I will discuss with the Probation Board.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ Submission – Chief Probation Officer


The Panel notes that the inspection itself will not take place until 2023 due to a backlog in work for the HMIP. Therefore, the required funding of £47,000 is not required in 2022. The Panel understands the rationale for the inspection and is supportive of the need to continue external inspection of services. It has therefore rated the project as green, subject to further details being requested in respect of the inspection process in 2022 above those provided in the submission from the Chief Probation Officer.

**FINDING 28**

The Jersey Probation and After-Care Service (JPACS) has submitted a funding request for an external inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) to take place in 2023 due to workload of the inspectorate. Whilst the service has undergone a number of inspections in recent years, JPACS has not been inspected by HMIP since 2005.

Capital projects

The following section provides the Panel’s analysis of each new capital project:

CSP 1 --- School Estate	
Minister(s)	Scrutiny RAG Status
Minister for Children and Education	

Business Case: Overview

The Government Plan 2022-25 states: ‘In the last ten years, several projects for educational premises have received funding, enhancing their safety or delivering on brand new buildings. Along with the Schools Estate Major Projects, a broad spectrum of School & Educational Developments are either underway or due to begin during the next four years. The Le Rocquier School and Community Sports facilities project intends to deliver on the early expansion of school and sports facilities to the East of the island. The project will provide for a new school hall, along with assessing the future requirements for a sports centre. Several projects listed in future years for School & Educational Developments have money allocated as part of the Government Plan process. Funding is available within the Central Planning Reserve to enable assessments to be carried out and complete suitable business cases, along with developing funding strategies to deliver projects in future years beyond this current Government Plan.

Panel analysis

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
1,250	4,850	14,250	5,000

The Panel notes that this project relates to a number of individual capital projects which are being undertaken across the education portfolio. It also relates to the school site review which is, at present, not complete. The Panel questioned the Minister for Children and Education on his key capital priorities in relation to education and was provided with the following information:

The Minister for Children and Education:

Les Landes Nursery is clear and Mont à l’Abbé, the monies are there. Where I look at where the monies are for 2022 that is clearly where our priorities are because they are what start within the next year. We have the Jersey Instrumental Music Service premises, the music facilities for J.C.G. and J.C.P., the extension to La Moye Hall and additional classrooms at La Moye.¹⁰⁹

The Panel also inquired as to whether the town primary schools, especially the Rouge Bouillon site (which the Panel notes is ear marked for other capital projects but a decision has yet to be made due to the school site review). It was confirmed that the projects were included in the school site review, however, had not been identified to start in 2022. It was noted, however, that funding was available in 2022 to undertake pre-feasibility work. Without the full outcome of the school sites review, it is incredibly difficult for any certainty to be placed on the Rouge

¹⁰⁹ Public Hearing – Minister for Children and Education – 1st November 2021

Bouillon site and whether this will be used to accommodate a larger St. Helier school, or whether it will be used for other capital projects.

The Panel notes that only £1.2 million of funding is allocated to this project for 2022 and understands the majority of that will be spent on feasibility work, rather than actual physical building work. This increases from 2023, to a total of £14.2 million in 2024. Further review of the figures associated with later years will be required in the next iteration of the Government Plan 2023-26. As such, the Panel has rated this project as red at this stage.




FINDING 29

There are a number of capital projects within the Education portfolio that are being progressed in 2022, however, there is still uncertainty in relation to the outcome of the School Sites Review which has yet to be presented. Until such time as the outcome of this review is known, there is uncertainty over the level of funding allocated to the Schools Estates programme for 2022.



RECOMMENDATION 24

The Minister for Children and Education should, by the end of January 2022 provide the outcome of the school sites review to the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel and provide a private briefing to the Panel on its outcome.

None --- Ambulance, Fire & Rescue Headquarters	
Minister(s)	Scrutiny RAG Status
Minister for Home Affairs	

Business Case: Overview

The Government Plan 2022-25 states: ‘The Ambulance, Fire & Rescue Headquarters has set out a credible Business Case for the development of the current Fire and former Police Headquarters site. A States Debate held in July 2021 determined the need for a review of school sites to determine a suitable site for the location of a North of St. Helier school. The outcome of that review will inform which of these two bids will make use of the site and which will need to look for an alternative’.

Panel analysis

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
500	2,435	1,743	3,423

The Panel notes that £500,000 is allocated to this project in 2022. As such the Panel questioned the Minister on what the allocated funding would be spent on within 2022:

The Minister for Home Affairs:

Pre-feasibility. First, this will work only if we have the Rouge Bouillon site, because that is the site that we have designed for and that we are ready to start. If it comes anywhere else then the budget will have to change, because we will have to start from scratch and try to find a different way of doing this. If we do have the Rouge Bouillon site then that is just pre-feasibility.¹¹⁰

The Panel understands that the funding allocation in 2022 is based on the pre-feasibility work being undertaken specifically in relation to the Rouge Bouillon site. Should this site not be agreed for the fire and ambulance headquarters, then it is expected that the work to identify a site will need to be taken back to the start of the process. This was expanded upon by the Acting Director General for Justice and Home Affairs:

Acting Director General, Justice and Home Affairs

As the Minister says, there will be some further work that we can do in terms of feasibility, but I would expect that we would not be able to get into the full feasibility and design stage that we need to do until 2023, which is where the bulk of this work kicks in, the bulk of the money kicks in, and that we would then be looking to do full design and planning in 2023. We profiled in the £500,000 for next year to see if there is some more work we can usefully do on the current design, but conscious that if we did need to change site, we would have to start all of that from the beginning and we would not have wanted to do nugatory work next year. We also want at least part of that £500,000 to be used for feasibility and potentially, hopefully, delivery of a real fire facility.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021


¹¹¹ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

The Panel was informed by the Minister for Home Affairs that the outcome of the Rouge Bouillon site depended upon the outcome of the school site review which is currently being undertaken.¹¹² It should be noted that the schools site review, as discussed in the previous project, has yet to be completed and the details of this particular site are included within this review. Until such time as the outcome of the school site review is known, there can be no certainty over the siting of this project and consequently the funding levels required in 2022. For that reason, the Panel has identified the project as amber at this stage.

**FINDING 30**

The allocated funding for the Fire and Ambulance Headquarters in 2022 is based on the Rouge Bouillon site being allocated for the project. At present, the school site review is ongoing and there is no certainty as to which project the site will be allocated to as it is dependent on the outcome of this review. In the event the site is not allocated to the Fire and Ambulance Headquarters project, further work and funding will be required to identify and carry out pre-feasibility work on a new site.

¹¹² Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

CSP 1 --- Army and Sea Cadets Headquarters	
Minister(s)	Scrutiny RAG Status
Minister for Home Affairs	

Business Case: Overview

The Government Plan 2022-25 states: 'Following several previous relocation attempts, the Sea Cadets are temporarily located in the former Police Headquarters at Rouge Bouillon. Funding is available to develop a site for use by the both the Sea and Army Cadets that will enable a unification of the cadet services onto one site in a safe location, with the delivery of the project anticipated during this Government Plan'.

Panel analysis

Funding allocation requests in Government Plan 2022-2025 (£000):

2022	2023	2024	2025
494	1,939	960	-

The Panel notes that £494,000 is allocated to this project in 2022. As such the Panel questioned the Minister on what the allocated funding would be spent on within 2022:

Senator T.A. Vallois:

The funding for this area is £494,000 for 2022. Exactly the same question as the ambulance and fire; how is that allocated and apportioned, so that we understand the project? I think that is probably the best way to ask that question.

The Minister for Home Affairs:

Yes, it is very similar. It is also something that needs to be resolved by about 2024. That is how it fits into the schedule, so this is to keep it going next year. We cannot talk about the details because of commercial confidentiality but we are hopeful that we do have a site selected and that we will be able to do some work on it next year.¹¹³

The Panel understands from the Ministers answer that a site has been identified, however, pre-feasibility work is required in order to ensure it is fit for purpose. The Panel also notes that details of this site cannot be shared at this time due to commercial confidentiality. The following was noted, however, by the Acting Director General:

There is a real imperative to get this cadet H.Q. project delivered because of that, but also because of the history, which is well-versed. We are very committed to it. We are meeting regularly with the cadet leaders and we are just about to go into more detailed specification and pre-feasibility of what the facility would look like. As soon as the site that we are hoping will be agreed is available we will be able to develop that further, so I am as confident as I can be that we will be spending that money next year as intended¹¹⁴

Given the work that needs to be undertaken to identify the site, the Panel cannot provide further comment on the funding levels at this stage and whether they will be sufficient or not,

¹¹³ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

¹¹⁴ Public Hearing – Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021

although it notes that there is confidence in the spending allocation from the department given that the proposed site is not affected by other reviews (such as the school site review). Therefore, it has provided an amber rating for the project at this stage.

**FINDING 31**

A new site for the Army and Sea Cadets Headquarters is due to be selected so that pre-feasibility work can be undertaken in 2022. The current details of the site are commercially confidential, so the Panel cannot state at this time whether the funding identified will meet the requirements for the project in 2022 at this time.



9 Conclusion






The Government Plan 2022-25 was lodged on 21 September 2021 and notwithstanding a short and challenging timeframe, over the last 12 weeks, the Panel has endeavoured to undertake a thorough analysis of all the programmes allocated to it by the Government Plan Review Panel.


Our review has focussed primarily on whether the funding sought is sufficient or excessive, as well as how the funding proposes to ensure value for money. In addition, we have also scrutinised the progress and spend to date for programmes agreed in previous Government Plans.

Overall, the Panel is satisfied with the majority of programmes and the rationale for the 2022 funding bids, with four being assigned a red 'RAG' rating. 38 programmes have been assigned an amber rating and 24 have been assigned a green rating.

In closing, we have provided a summary of the various programmes where the Panel's main concerns lie:

Program / Capital Project	Reason	Scrutiny RAG Status
Education Reform Programme	From the evidence received by the Panel in this review of the project, it holds concerns that the Education Reform Programme appears, at this stage, to be a structural reform of education rather than a reform of the system as a whole. The additional funding, whilst welcomed, is apportioned to projects which mainly focus on project implementation, continuous professional development and training for teachers, reducing the structural deficit within education and bolstering SEN services. In terms of additional funding going directly into schools to support teachers and students, beyond the additional £1.6 million 2021 identified in the hearing, the Panel is not able to provide any certainty as to whether the amount allocated in the Government Plan will meet the outcome of the new funding formula. Furthermore, without the outcome of the Inclusion Review, the Panel cannot state at this stage whether the additional funding provided in the £11.2 million for SEN provision is adequate. It has therefore rated the project as red at this stage.	
Improving Educational Outcomes: Early Years	The Panel has brought forward amendments to the Government Plan which seek to allocate funding to meet the overall estimated costs of the NEF for 3-4 year olds in 2022, provide further funding for the targeted support for 2–3-year-olds from the NEF, reinstate the full grant amount for the JCCT, move the Best Start Partnership Funding from the Covid-19 Heads of Expenditure to CYPES and provide additional funding for degree level training courses in the private nursey	

	settings. As such, the Panel has rated this project as red given the concerns raised.	
CAMHS Redesign	The Panel notes that the service is undergoing significant changes as a result of this restructure and it is pleased to see that a number of additional roles are being recruited to. It would, however, caution that recruitment challenges within this area exist at present and this must be considered and factored in as the service develops over the coming year. The Panel has therefore rated the project as red at this time.	
Young People Intensive Support	The funding allocated to this programme will require ongoing evaluation to ensure that it is being targeted effectively and meeting the needs of the children and young people it is centred around. As such, whilst the Panel welcomes the support for the children and young people affected, it cannot at this stage identify the full tangible benefits of the support and state whether the allocated funding is sufficient. To that end, the Panel has recommended that the Minister keep the programme under constant evaluation and report back to the Panel on a quarterly basis the tangible outcomes of the programme. It has therefore rated the project as amber at this time.	
Education Demographic Pressures	The Panel notes the rationale for the demographics funding and understands the requirement to fund students appropriately as they move through the system. It would, however, raise concern in relation to the current AWPU which is nearly 30 years old, and this in turn links to the work being done to bring forward a new funding formula. As such, the new funding formula may highlight increased costs in relation to demographics compared to the current formula. Without the details of the new funding formula, the Panel cannot state at this stage whether the funding provided for in the Government Plan is sufficient to manage the demographic increases that are occurring in schools. The Panel has therefore rated this project as red at this stage.	
Brexit Transition – Policy and Legal Support	The Panel notes that £172,000 is estimated in the general reserve for allocation to the Brexit transition project. The concept of fund as required is a new feature of the Government Plan and whilst it is understood that the implications of Brexit cannot be fully planned for given uncertainty over a number of aspects, the Panel would caution that this must be monitored closely.	
Schools Estates	The Panel notes that only £1.2 million of funding is allocated to this project for 2022 and understands the majority of that will be spent on feasibility work, rather than actual physical building work. This increases from 2023, to a total of £14.2 million in	

	2024. Further review of the figures associated with later years will be required in the next iteration of the Government Plan 2023-26. As such, the Panel has rated this project as red at this stage.	
Fire and Ambulance Service Headquarters	The Panel was informed by the Minister for Home Affairs that the outcome of the Rouge Bouillon site depended upon the outcome of the school site review which is currently being undertaken. It should be noted that the schools site review, as discussed in the previous project, has yet to be completed and the details of this particular site are included within this review. Until such time as the outcome of the school site review is known, there can be no certainty over the siting of this project and consequently the funding levels required in 2022. For that reason, the Panel has identified the project as amber at this stage.	

10 Witnesses and Evidence Gathered

Public hearings were held with the following Ministers:

- Minister for Home Affairs – 15th October 2021
- Minister for Children and Education (Children's Remit) – 22nd October 2021
- Minister for Home Affairs – 25th October 2021
- Minister for Children and Education (Education Remit) – 1st November 2021

Requests for written submissions were sent to 27 stakeholders and responses were received from the following:

- Barnardos
- Jersey Child Care Trust
- JCSA Prospect
- Jersey Police Authority
- Jersey Early Years Association
- Jersey Student Loans Support Group
- States of Jersey Police Force Association
- Probation and After Care Service

To view all the submissions, responses to written questions and public hearing transcripts, please visit the [review page](#) on the States Assembly website.

The cost of this review was £450.00

Appendix 1

Terms of Reference

Government Plan 2022 - 2025 Terms of Reference

1. To undertake a review of the sections/projects of the Government Plan 2022- 2025 which are most relevant to the remit of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel, using the following criteria as a guide:
 - Where funding over £500,000 has been allocated
 - Where funding has been withdrawn or decreased significantly from the previous year
 - Where funding has been increased significantly from the previous year
 - Projects which the Panels consider are of most concern (as a result of, for instance, delays, deferrals, overspends or because they are not in keeping with Common Strategic Priorities)
 - Projects which have been identified as of concern by stakeholders
 - Projects which are contentious and/or in the public eye.
 - Projects where insufficient information has been provided and more information is sought
 - Concern is held on the project's alignment with Common Strategic Priorities, social impact and impact upon children.
2. To determine whether those projects align with Ongoing Initiatives, Common Themes and, ultimately, Common Strategic Priorities.
3. To consider whether the resources allocated to the projects is sufficient or excessive.
4. To review of the success or otherwise of projects agreed in the previous Government Plan for 2021.
5. To assess the expected impact on the ongoing delivery of public services, by Minister, through rebalancing of Government finances.

Panel membership

The Panel comprised of the following States Members:



Deputy Rob Ward, Chair



Deputy Louise Doublet, Vice Chair



Senator Tracey Vallois



States Greffe | Morier House | Halkett Place | St Helier | Jersey | JE1 1DD
T: +44 (0) 1534 441 020 | E: statesgreffe@gov.je | W: Statesassembly.gov.je

