

# Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel

## Record of Meeting

Date: 4th July 2016

Present	Deputy L. M. C. Doublet, Chairman Deputy J. M. Maçon, Vice-Chairman Deputy T. A. Vallois Deputy S. Y. Mezec
Apologies	
Absent	
In attendance	Mr M. Robbins, Scrutiny Officer.

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
	<p><b>1. Records of Meetings</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 10th, 13th, 18th, 19th and 24th May and 6th, 8th and 9th June 2016 were approved and signed.</p>	<b>MR</b>
<b>Item 2 06.06.16</b>	<p><b>2. Conflict of Interest</b></p> <p>There were no conflicts of interest declared.</p>	
<b>Item 3 13.05.16  (Previously Student Loans)</b>	<p><b>3. Higher Education</b></p> <p>The Panel noted an email from the Jersey Student Loans Group which requested that the Panel launch a review into Student Loans. The Panel recalled that there were proposals of extra money being put into the Student Loans system within the MTFP. This was to be examined alongside all other areas of the MTFP, but work might still need to be done in a separate review later in 2016.</p> <p>The Panel also recognised that there were other areas of higher education that would need to be examined alongside the student loans, such as maintenance grants.</p>	<b>MR</b>
	<p><b>4. Teacher Survey</b></p> <p>The Panel noted the Teacher Survey published by the Education Department. Numerous questions were raised which could not be answered from the report. The Panel recognised a connection between some of the survey results and the proposal within the MTFP to reduce the salary of Newly Qualified Teachers. It required the raw data from the survey to draw its own conclusions.</p>	<b>MR</b>
	<p><b>5. Jerriais</b></p> <p>The Panel noted documentation provided by the Chairman which suggested that the situation in relation to the teaching of Jerriais in Jersey schools was serious. The Panel noted the following concerns</p>	

	<p>contained within the documentation provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the methods being employed by the Minister may not be best practice.</li> <li>• That the teaching of Jerriais in schools was being done as cheaply as possible.</li> <li>• Whether teachers should be trained to speak Jerriais in order to teach it, or speakers of Jerriais being trained to teach it.</li> </ul> <p>The Panel was to consider re-visiting this subject after the work on the MTFP had been completed. It was noted that the shortage of people teaching the subject in the schools was serious and likely to become worse unless the Minister resolved the situation.</p>	<b>MR</b>
	<p><b>6. Ministerial Decisions</b></p> <p>The Panel noted five Ministerial Decisions by the Ministers within its remit and considered that no Scrutiny work was required.</p>	
<p><b>Item 6</b> <b>06.06.16</b> <b>516/44</b></p>	<p><b>7. School Starting Age</b></p> <p>The Panel recognised that the timeline for the School Starting Age review was not pressing and deferred the report writing until after the MTFP had been completed.</p>	<b>MR</b>
<p><b>Item 1</b> <b>30.06.16</b> <b>516/36(3)</b></p>	<p><b>8. Medium Term Financial Plan Addition</b></p> <p>The Panel noted arrangements for additional meetings and briefings relating to the MTFP.</p>	<b>MR</b>
<p><b>Item 1</b> <b>14.06.16</b> <b>516/45</b></p>	<p><b>9. Nursery Education Fund</b></p> <p>In accordance with Article 11.21 Code of Practice for Scrutiny Panels and PAC, the Panel held a discussion to evaluate the effectiveness of the process with a view to reporting any problems to the Chairmen's Committee where appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel agreed that the time line for the review had been too short but had been dictated by outside influences.</li> <li>• All Members had dropped anything else they were doing to facilitate the necessary meetings for the review.</li> <li>• The Scrutiny rooms had proved to be inadequate.</li> <li>• The public meetings had been a great success but there was room for lunchtime meetings to allow attendance by those who could not attend in the evenings.</li> <li>• The media had been engaged regularly throughout the review and had therefore maintained a public interest. The JEP had headlined the issues on several occasions with numerous other articles during the review period.</li> </ul> <p>The Panel considered that the review had been effective in that it had provided good background information for the debate of P39/2016, Nursery Funding: Implementation Of Proposed Changes, which had been lodged by Deputy M. Tadier. The Panel agreed that it was to avoid such a tight timeline in any future work. The report had been hard hitting and concise, which made it easy for people to read. The Panel agreed</p>	<b>MR</b>

	that the single recommendation carried significant impact.	
	<b>10. Future Meetings</b> The next meeting was scheduled for 9.30am on Monday 12th September 2016 in the Le Capelain Room.	