

**SOCIAL AFFAIRS SCRUTINY PANEL**  
**Meeting held on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> December at 09:30am**

Present	Deputy F.J. Hill, B.E.M., Chairman Deputy J.A. Martin, Vice Chairman Deputy D.W. Mezbourian Deputy A.E. Pryke Deputy S. Pitman
Apologies	
Absent	
In attendance	Mrs. K. Tremellen-Frost, Scrutiny Manager Mr. C. Ahier, Scrutiny Officer Mr. W. Millow, Scrutiny Officer  Channel Television and Channel 103 [Item 1 only]

Item No.	Agenda matter	Action
1.	<p><b>Chairman's Welcome and Introductions</b></p> <p>The Chairman welcomed Panel members who introduced themselves.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Discussion of Modus Operandi</b></p> <p>The Panel discussed forms of address and agreed that official forms should be maintained in official circumstances.</p> <p>The Panel agreed future meeting dates and decided that all meetings would start at 9:30am.</p> <p>The Panel considered its relationship with the media. It was advised that the Draft Code of Practice for Scrutiny Panels stipulated that the Panel Chairman would undertake contact with the media on that Panel's behalf.</p> <p>The Panel was requested not to use the term 'chairman' for any Panel member who may be given responsibility for a particular area but to use the term 'lead member'.</p> <p>The Chairman requested members to check e-mails at least twice daily.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that Deputy J.A. Martin would take on the rôle of Vice-Chairman.</p> <p>The Panel was advised that business should be conducted through the Chair at meetings and also at</p>	

	<p>Public Hearings.</p> <p>Panel members were requested to give prior notification if they were to be absent from a Panel meeting.</p> <p>The Panel was advised that the agenda for a Panel meeting would normally be ready one week prior to that meeting.</p> <p>The Panel noted that the quorum for a meeting was three members.</p> <p>The Panel considered whether the Chairman had a casting vote and Scrutiny Officers agreed to clarify this.</p> <p>The Panel was asked whether it would be able to act as a set of individuals. It was advised that Panel members would be able to act without recourse to the Panel as individual members of the States. The Panel was also advised that each Panel member could do their own research before bringing their work back to the Panel in order to make suggestions regarding review topics. However, if any work were undertaken independently, there would not be the same access to officer support as that available for the Panel itself.</p>	<p><b>CA WM</b></p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Discussion of Areas of Responsibility</b></p> <p>The Panel considered whether to designate areas of responsibility and how their future work programme might impact on this. It agreed that it would be appropriate to undertake initial reviews as a full Panel rather than to assign areas of responsibility to individual Panel members.</p>	
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>To consider potential Review Topics</b></p> <p>The Panel considered a list of outstanding propositions relevant to the Panel's remit. It was agreed that the following propositions might merit the Panel's attention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Criminal Justice Policy</i> (P.201/2005)</li> <li>• <i>Draft Criminal Justice (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No. 2) (Jersey) Law 200-</i> (P.197/2005)</li> <li>• <i>Housing Trading Organisation: establishment</i> (P.211/2005)</li> </ul> <p>With regard to <i>Private hospital development: Scrutiny Review</i> (P.221/2005), it was agreed that the Chairman would contact Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire to discuss the</p>	<p><b>Chair</b></p>

	<p>current situation regarding the proposition.</p> <p>The Panel considered correspondence dated 13<sup>th</sup> December 2005 from the Minister for Social Security. It was agreed that the matter would be discussed with the Minister during his future attendance on the Panel.</p> <p>The Panel considered the recommendations in the Scrutiny Report [SR1/2004] entitled “Responding to Drug Use” and whether some follow-up was required. It was agreed that the matter would be discussed with the Minister for Home Affairs.</p> <p>The Panel noted that there had not been a review of the transition from primary to secondary care during the Shadow Scrutiny Process.</p> <p>With regard to public engagement in the scrutiny process, the Panel noted that a booklet which explained the Scrutiny process had been prepared for circulation to the public. This would be considered by the Chairmen’s Committee at a future meeting.</p>	
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p><u>Media Training</u></p> <p>The Panel considered the benefit of undertaking some media training. It was agreed that this matter should be investigated with regard to possible training for all Scrutiny Panel members.</p> <p><u>Conflicts of Interest</u></p> <p>It was suggested that each Panel member should determine whether there was an issue of personal conflict of interest but that it would be appropriate to raise any matter where such a conflict might exist.</p> <p><u>Meeting the Relevant Ministers</u></p> <p>It was agreed that all relevant Ministers should be contacted to invite them to attend the next Panel meeting in order to discuss those Ministries’ future work programme. The officers were instructed to prepare a schedule of meetings allowing forty-five minutes per Minister.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that the Chairman would approach the media once meetings with individual ministers had been</p>	<p><b>KTF</b></p> <p><b>CA WM</b></p>

	<p>undertaken and a work programme agreed.</p> <p><u>Training Feedback</u></p> <p>The Panel agreed to complete feedback forms in respect of the training on Scrutiny Induction held on 15th December 2005 by Frances Taylor, Head of Scrutiny, Cumbria.</p>	<b>Chair</b>
<b>6</b>	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>The next meeting would take place on Monday 9<sup>th</sup> January 2006.</p>	