

1-19
NURSERY SCHOOL
EDUCATION

4th Fl. Victoria Chambers
1 The Esplanade
JE2 4QA
Tel: 722622 Fax: 728359



Deputy Jennifer Bridge

<mailto:jfb@jerseymunicipal.gov.je>

12/08/04

Executive Summary

In a detailed 14-page response entitled "Bringing children's needs to the centre of States policy and action" to the recent consultation document R.C 35 published by the Education Sport and Culture Committee, I am proposing that early years care and education should be the subject of a scrutiny enquiry.

I offer the following terms of reference as a suggested starting point:

"A review of the rationale, effectiveness and implementation of Early Years Care and Education in Jersey which particular emphasis on detailing base line information and matching the service to the needs of children".

It may be argued that it is not the function of Scrutiny to be a shadow government or produce alternative policy. However, it is the function of scrutiny to look at policies in the round and be a critical friend. The current ESC Committee have been in office for a reasonable length of time and in the absence of specific proposals in the Jenny Spratt report, which is has to be said was initially driven by Education's desire to review the JCCT rather than examine their own navel – I feel the most effective and indeed cost effective solution is to offer the issue to scrutiny whilst pursuing some interim measures.

I suggest that Jenny Spratt's solution of mean-testing nursery education for 3 to 4 year olds is premature when we haven't fully understood the question.

I propose that the Scrutiny Panel investigate the feasibility of offering free term-time only early years education for a minimum of one year prior to starting school, with the opportunity for parents to pay for wrap around care – with the potential tax relief and commensurate benefit to enable this to be of use to the less well off.

I propose a partnership between Education and the Parish and charitable nurseries. Currently Avranches, Westmount and Centrepoint Trust combined provide 130 nursery places. I propose that Education provide teaching support to the nurseries to work together with nursery staff. The average 30 space nursery costs £550,000 to build and £80,000 a year to run – so this proposal saves £1.65 million capital expenditure and allows the current generation of children to access good quality nursery provision. This is

considerably less than the figure of £10million that has become common currency when discussing this issue.

I call for an overhaul of the budgetary process and FSR process in order that future savings can be quantified in making what might seem like an initial growth bid. For example, to my knowledge no one has disputed the findings that for every £1 invested in early years there is an economic return of £4.

Source: Daycare Trust 1996

I recommend that the Scrutiny Panel consider whether the Education, Sport and Culture Committee's remit should be broadened to include care and whether the artificial divide does more harm than good – in promoting in some peoples mind the idea that an educational establishment should not also be caring and also playful as it has long been recognised that children learn through play.

I recommend that the Scrutiny Panel investigate the feasibility of conducting our own longitudinal research on both the implementation of the Kathy Bull report and all the implementation of a future Early Years Policy that must not run in isolation of each other.

I recommend that the Scrutiny Panel investigate whether the JCCT's remit fits more closely with the States approved Strategic Plan, in which case its funding would fit better with P&R, in the same way that the Community Relations Trust is a trust whose remit is Island-wide and cross Committee. This would enable the JCCT to be an equal partner with ESC in discussions, which at present it cannot be as it depends on ESC officers' recommendations to the Committee as to its fate.

– Once the Scrutiny Panel has delivered its findings I recommend that the Early Years Forum be activated. Once Education have responded to the Scrutiny findings I propose that Education bring a revised Early Years Policy and any other relevant legislation to the States for debate. This proposition should also include SMART objectives, namely - Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time specific.

Conclusion

Assuming that a Scrutiny Panel agrees to tackle this issue, any findings must not be separated from the findings of the Kathy Bull report. Kathy Bull advocates a Children's Centre (a sort of one stop shop) and the old St. Mark's School would seem a good site to put all the agencies together. In addition, I recommend that as part of the Scrutiny review the feasibility of the JCCT moving to that site should be considered.

I would hope that once Scrutiny has made its findings and Education has responded that a proposition would be brought to the States – potentially by P&R enabling debate of the key changes necessary to meet their own Strategic Plan targets and thus bring children's needs to the centre of States policy and action – rather than the periphery.

Response to R.C 35 A VISION FOR THE FUTURE OF EARLY EDUCATION AND CHILDCARE IN JERSEY

“Bringing children’s needs to the centre of States policy and action”

My initial reaction is that this document is not a vision in itself and therefore its title is misleading. I concur with the recommendations in points 5.1 to 5.3 that:

- 5.1 A vision and overarching strategy for early education and childcare be developed to provide integrated, high quality services for children and their families.
- 5.2 An analysis of the necessary investment to support the strategy should be undertaken.
- 5.3 Principles of early education, as already identified in the Education, Sport and Culture early education strategy, should be reviewed in order to underpin the overall strategy for early education and childcare, providing consistency of approach, common ground and shared values across all settings.

Point 1

The absence of vital base-line data as to the needs and aspirations of children and parents in Jersey combined with the recognised need to review the overall education and care philosophy that must underpin policy, leads me to the position where I cannot see how the report can come to the conclusion that the solution is means-testing.

I recommend that in tandem with that vital initial research, the benefits of free early years education for 3 to 5 year olds should be fully explored.

Specifically, I am proposing that early years care and education should be the subject of a scrutiny enquiry.

Means-testing?

Our entire education system is based on a premise of free provision for all who need it. If Education our now saying that there are proven benefits of Early Years Education for 3 years olds then I believe that our first aim should be to try to provide free provision.

In response to a direct question by a journalist your Chief Officer made a comment in the media that the cost will be £10 million and this figure is now stuck in many members minds as a prohibitive factor.

Many JEP readers, myself included were unclear as to what the question was. Having researched this with your officers it is clear to me that the cost of free early years Education would be considerably less than that figure. In an answer to an Email your CEO explained as follows:

“The figure referred to offers is illustrative of the potential cost of introducing a universal benefit of around £50 per week in respect of all children aged 0-4, there being around 1000 children in each cohort. The arithmetic goes as follows: 4000 children @£50 per week over say 50 weeks per year=£10 million”.

Point 2

I propose that the Scrutiny Panel investigate the feasibility of offering free term-time only early years education for a minimum of one year prior to starting school, with the opportunity for parents to pay for wrap around care – with the potential tax relief and commensurate benefit to enable this to be of use to the less well off.

I accept that I have had to do a fair amount of guesswork with regard to my figures but I hope that if they are not quite right that we can work together to provide more accurate figures rather than demolish my entire argument in the first instance.

Depending on the month that the child is born, and other factors, some children may need nearly 2 years EYE (Early Years Education). My figures are based on one year.

Figures available from your Department show that the capital cost of building a new nursery is approximately £550,000, whilst the revenue expenditure is approximately £80,000 based on a 30-child nursery (roughly £2,666 for term-time only Early Years Education per child).

Bearing in mind that there are approximately 1,000 births a year and that currently 25% of the child population attend private school, I believe we could extrapolate the need downwards – to being a maximum of 750 places being needed. According to figures available from your Department, the programme you are currently rolling out will provide 580 places therefore; you are looking at providing 170 more places. The revenue cost in funding those places would be £442,000. The capital costs would be approximately £3 million. However, if Education forms a partnership with providers such as the Parish nurseries of St. Helier (70 places) and Centrepoint Trust (60 places) then I believe that up to 130 of those places could be provided by non-profit making organisations on Education's behalf.

Therefore the true capital cost would be one 40-place nursery (£550,000) plus ongoing revenue costs of £442,000, which you were presumably intending to ask for anyway as part of your role out programme.

If you wanted to include the private sector in the equation then I believe this could be done by a mechanism similar to that offered by the School Aged Discount Scheme. Essentially, you say to the provider – if you offer a service to the parents for under £x/hour then we will provide a benefit for working parents.

Can we afford not to do this?

Recommendation 1.11/2 proposes, “An analysis of the investment necessary to support the strategy should be undertaken.” Of course I concur. However, this must be done against the agreed Strategic Plan Policies and for once we must show the potential future savings to be gained.

A cursory glance at the Strategic Plan provides 14 areas of relevance to children and families – not least;

- Aim 3 all members of society have equal access to facilities
- Aim 3.3 eradication of financial and social exclusion
- Aim 3.4 encourage more flexible work practices
- Aim 3.6 ensure an integrated and sustainable approach to the provision of education.

To my knowledge no one has disputed the findings that for every £1 invested in early years there is an economic return of £4.

Source: Daycare Trust 1996

Point 3

A fundamental flaw in all budgetary processes is the fact that future savings, when for example, a person is diverted from the Criminal Justice System into a rewarding job and healthy life, are not factored in. So my question is – can we afford not to provide free early years education? I recommend a radical overhaul of our budgetary process and in particular the Fundamental Spending Review Process.

If we don't invest in a proper service we know the consequences will cost a lot more than £10 million. In particular, we will see;

1. Less people available for the work force
2. Lower long-term academic achievements
3. Increase in anti-social behaviour and youth crime
4. Increase in drug and alcohol related difficulties
5. Increase in prison population
6. Increase Health and Social Services Costs
7. Increased benefits costs
8. Increased Welfare costs
9. Less tax income

If early years education and care is properly funded I believe we will see in addition to the opposite of the points above;

1. A reduction in public and private sector sickness levels
2. A reduction in accidents
3. Increased productivity

Source: JCCT 2002

The Terms of Reference of the Review

Given the precise terms of reference I think that Jenny Spratt did a good job in interpreting them in the broadest sense. Nevertheless, I feel that she poses more questions than she answers. The research findings are based on the UK. Even the research into the dis-benefits of pre-three year old nursery provision needs to be analysed cautiously. The headlines and sound bites look and sound great but the fact is that the likelihood of anti-social behaviour as a result of nursery care under three, runs at 1.5% increased chance. As Pam Simmons, co-Director of the EPPE project at the University of London says in a recent edition of Nursery World;

“It is the one area that came up less favourably but we found positive effects such as peer sociability, reduction in anxious behaviour, improved independence and concentration when starting school, increased cooperation and ability to follow instructions and improvement in areas such as language and pre-reading”.

The UK research sited staff turnover of up to 40% as a key factor. We need to establish the issues that face Jersey. My daughter has had the same consistent care at Avranches nursery since she was 7 weeks old to 3 years. We need to do our own research.

When I met Kathy Bull, I proposed that Jersey should be supporting its own longitudinal studies in conjunction with proposed changes. I recommend the same for early years. In the mean time, I believe a cost effective solution would be to offer this area up for scrutiny.

Point 4

I offer the following terms of reference as a suggested starting point:

“A review of the rationale, effectiveness and implementation of Early Years Care and Education in Jersey which particular emphasis on detailing base line information and matching the service to the needs of children”.

In addition, I propose that detailed economic research is carried out by F&E and EDC. Since my election in 1999 I have been campaigning for the appropriate tax relief and

allowance system to support working parents. We need to be serious about this coordination! The recent example, whereby ESS turned down initially the funding for the benefit for the pilot after-school project must not occur again. Every one must be aware of the Strategic Plan aims and stick to them.

The key themes

Whilst not meaning to be disparaging – who could not agree with many of the conclusions? Of course we want what is laid out in points 2.4 and 2.5. Any provider or parent with an ounce of common sense knows this. The difficult question has not been answered – **HOW?**

- 2.4 Bennet also found that, in developing integrated services, the Council of Ministers Recommendations^{1[10]} proposed specific objectives for developing cohesive services for young children –
- Affordability.
 - Access to services in all areas, urban and rural.
 - Access to services for children with special needs.
 - Combining safe and secure care with a pedagogical approach.
 - Close and responsive relations between services, parents and local communities.
 - Diversity, flexibility of services and increased choice for parents.
 - Coherence between different services.
- 2.5 The British Government, in planning cohesive services in England considered the EPPE research and has established the Sure Start^{2[11]} approach, which has the vision to provide –
- Better outcomes for all children, reducing the effects of poverty.
 - Better outcomes for parents, increasing labour opportunities, ensuring pathways out of poverty and strengthened families and communities.
 - Better outcomes for communities – less crime, higher productivity.
 - Stronger labour market and building of a civil society.

Point 5

I recommend that the Scrutiny Panel consider whether the Education, Sport and Culture Committee's remit should be broadened to include care and whether the artificial divide does more harm than good – in promoting in some peoples mind the idea that an educational establishment should not also be caring and also playful as it has long been recognised that children learn through play.

^{1[10]} Council of European Communities, 1992 in Bennet, J., *Starting Strong* (2003).

^{2[11]} *Sure Start Delivery Guidance 2003 DfES.*

As the former Chairman of a charity providing after-school care I have had many discussions with Education about this issue – especially in times of budgetary restraint. The answer is “It’s not our core business, we’re here to educate”. So my questions is “Whose business is early years care and after school care?”

Who could not agree with recommendation 2.7?

“Agencies are open and transparent in the planning and delivery of services with targets set against measurable, relevant performance indicators”.

However, I believe that not enough was made of the value of the independence of the JCCT. I believe that it should strengthen its research arm – perhaps even supporting students who wish to partake in longitudinal studies. I believe we should be encouraging students to research our system and that the Island would benefit from an independent JCCT that can when necessary be that critical friend.

To this end I am not convinced that Education is the correct Committee for the JCCT’s funding to be aligned to.

Point 6

I recommend that the Scrutiny Panel investigates the potential role for the JCCT as a critical friend. The potential should be explored for the JCCT to sponsor and co-ordinate longitudinal studies, in conjunction with Highlands College, such as the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Study of Early Child Care that tracked 1,300 children in nurseries in the US and the Effective Provision of Pre-school Education Project (EPPE) that studies 3,000 3 to 4 year olds in the UK.

I recommend that the potential to develop Educational and research links already in existence between Highlands College and UK universities such as Plymouth, should be explored further. Local students could be encouraged to work collaboratively for a longitudinal study not just in Early Years but also, on the implementation and effectiveness of the Kathy Bull Report.

Whilst I do have comments on the effectiveness of the JCCT in meetings its objectives as outlined in 3.3 I feel uncomfortable sharing those views with members of ESC and would prefer to address my comments directly to its Chairman.

Promote high standards of childcare.

Monitor and seek to improve the accessibility and affordability of childcare facilities and services in the Island.

Promote and encourage improvements in the status and conditions of service of childcare staff.

Promote the training and development of staff in the childcare sector.

Provide information and advice to all interested parties and coordinate childcare provision across all public and private sectors.

Sponsor and support research into childcare needs.

Identify market needs, stimulate and facilitate new developments and encourage and facilitate partnerships which enhance childcare provision.

Attract funding to pump prime initiatives for all of the above.

Whilst the report is correct in pointing out that the objectives 4 and 5 of the Five Year Strategy do not reflect the Trust's original Constitution. The report fails to take the next step of identifying the value of these options and if the trust isn't going to action them – who is?

Objective 4: create a child-friendly Island environment.

Objective 5: support parents and carers in their role.

For my part, I have comments on the Trust's efficacy in meeting those targets – specifically objective 4 but I shall save my comments for the Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

As to the findings of 3.11 I would like to know exactly how many of the respondents were ESC staff, providers and parents before commenting further?

3.11 Analysis of the data suggests division between those who do not feel the Trust meets the original intention, against those who feel that it does. Closer examination of the statistics indicates the high level of those thinking the Trust meets the original intention is influenced by those who represent the Trust itself.

Point 7

Rather than the proposal in 3.14 I recommend that a Scrutiny Panel consider the Trust's constitution within the broader context of a review. It is possible that the Trust's Constitution may need to be amended to reflect a new position in light of experience.

3.14 to re-focus the Trust on its original purpose and be more cost effective.

If ESCC are to remain the financial sponsor of the JCCT then I must disagree with 3.16.

3.16 It is recommended that the Trustees of the Jersey Childcare Trust and senior members of the Education, Sport and Culture Department consider the structure and function of the Trust, with the intention of ensuring targets are relevant, transparent, cost effective and measurable.

I believe that the strength of the Trust should be in an arms length relationship from Education with independence from its financial parent.

Point 8

I recommend that the Scrutiny Panel investigates whether the Trust's remit fits more closely with the States approved Strategic Plan, in which case its funding would fit better with P&R, in the same way that the Community Relations Trust is a trust whose remit it Island-wide and cross Committee. This would enable the JCCT to be an equal partner with ESC in discussions, which at present it cannot be as it depends on ESC officers' recommendations to the Committee as to its fate.

I concur with 4.7 and whilst I do not dispute the findings of the research as laid out in 4.5 nevertheless, I have my own opinion based on my experience as former Chairman of a charity that is a major provider of after-school care, as a political campaigner on tax relief and allowances and as a parent. I feel that this area would benefit from more detailed examination by a Scrutiny Panel before firm conclusions are made.

I concur with the one stop shop recommendation in 5.5. I believe that this can be expedited quickly with a modicum of cost.

Point 9

I recommend that P&R sanction the States Computer Services Department to assist in the development the JCCT website. The JCCT is a small organisation and I believe that an efficient and well-organised website could be central to it meets many of the terms in its constitution. I strongly recommend ESC to devise a central computerised nursery place availability and waiting list system, which can be shared with JCCT. No doubt someone will tell me why with Data Protection this isn't possible!

Effectiveness of funding

Doesn't 6.5 present a paradox? The Trust is criticised for moving away from its original intention and Jenny Spratt says there is duplication – but surely if parents knew where to get the help and support and felt they were getting it – they would not have looked to the Trust in the first place!

6.5 By surveying parents, the Trust identified the need to support them in their role as parents/carers. In so doing, the Trust has moved beyond its original intention, into areas of work that are covered by other organisations.

6.5 goes on to say;

“If, however, the Trust were an equal partner of a co-ordinated, interagency approach, its role would be defined”.

However, how can it be an equal partner with its funding body?

Jenny Spratt mentions Surestart in the UK as a useful model. I concur that there is much merit in this Government programme. However, members should consider whether problems highlighted in the UK where Surestart nurseries have been built in close proximity to Council or Private nurseries are relevant indicators of what might happen in Jersey if ESC's current planned programme of expanding nursery provision continues.

The National Day Nurseries Association (NDNA) in the UK is gathering evidence currently on the impact on private nurseries of the Surestart programme. Interestingly a DfES spokeswoman was recently reported to say that the Surestart Unit has "already begun discussions with some national private sector providers and local authorities about how the non-maintained sector can play a greater role in the children's centre agenda".

I do not have to look into a glass ball to prophesise the closure of a private nursery that currently feeds into a local primary school – when the ESC free nursery next door is built. I am not necessarily saying this is a bad thing – I believe that ESC should be explicit with their motives and the consequences of their actions.

Point 10

I recommend that the ESC Committee read further about the impact of Surestart before using it as a template for Jersey.

6.11 Jenny Spratt highlights some successes such as;

“the Pathways Project at the Le Squez School and for older children, Centrepoint, that links to schools such as Janvrin for wrap around and after school care”.

It is particularly galling that only 2 months before the start of the pilot project ESS turned down the necessary benefit funding that would ensure these places would go to those in most need as opposed to the better off. I understand that this issue is now being resolved but these things simply shouldn't happen.

Point 11

I concur with 6.12 about the need to provide choice to parents but alongside that I recommend that choice should include the choice for Early Years Care and Education within the nursery that some children will have attended since a very young age. I believe significantly more independent research on the value of this type of care (such as at Avranches, Westmount and Centrepoint Trust) should not be discarded.

Whilst scare stories about nursery care for pre-threes have emerged – these must be seen in our own context and in the context of the individual child and family.

Eva Lloyd, senior lecturer in Early Childhood Studies in the School for Policy Studies at Bristol University said in a recent edition of Nursery World;

“The NICHD study which identified adverse effects of early day-care beyond a certain number of hours, did in fact state that it was difficult to untangle the effects of early group daycare per se from possible effects of altered family dynamics”.

In particular, I feel that Jenny Spratt’s report fails to take into account the particular nature of charitable Trust or Parish nursery and fails to take into account the emotional stability for a child being able to remain in one consistent nursery environment until s/he becomes of school age.

This is an especially relevant solution to the lack of continuity caused when children attend one States nursery but their parents find there are no places in reception and the child has to move again the following year..

6.12 A range of provision is important to give parents a choice in the services that they need. However, the more that the vision is linked to schools, the more secure, in financial terms, it tends to be.

It is easy to become emotional about this issue so suffice to say – more research in Jersey needs to be carried out before firm conclusions can be drawn.

If there are “quality issues” in the private sector or as others would have it “States nurseries are second to none” – then this must be quantified and addressed through enhanced registration and support. No parent wants to feel his or her child has second best.

Jenny Spratt says in 6.13;

“ ...where a partnership with a private/voluntary provider to provide integrated early education and childcare, would be cost effective for both sectors. It would also provide services for families at the heart of the community.”

The private and charitable sector have the opportunity to support Education by running wrap around care in States nurseries but equally, Education can support the charitable and private sector by providing teaching staff..

I wholly concur with 6.14 as I have been campaigning for over a year since the new policy for full-time places was introduced. As a politician I am aware of parents devastated at their inability to access part-time places – for example the mother who is a twilight carer and has been put under huge emotional pressure for her child to attend full-time. Is it

really better for that child to be at school in the afternoon – when he could be spending time with his mother? The school knows her situation and that she will barely see her son and yet continues to advocate a full time place for her child!

6.14 The cost of childcare and the issue of free nursery class places in Jersey needs to be addressed. EPPE research shows that high quality nursery provision where a qualified teacher has direct daily contact with the child and is responsible for the planning of the learning programme provides the best experience for the child's cognitive development. Multi-professional teams are also important for the child's holistic development. In general terms, nursery schools/units have a long history of such provision. The research underpinning this review shows an overwhelming view (100%) that the current system is not equitable. One of the main issues being raised in the research is one of full day/part-time provision in the nursery units. It was generally felt that these should be more flexible according to parental need and child's age. For summer born children it may be more appropriate for such a placement to be on a part-time basis.

6.15 raises a number of questions that again I believe would be best answered by an independent scrutiny enquiry that would enable EDC and other Committees to work together with the JCCT and ESC to find the answers.

Point 12

I recommend that a Scrutiny Panel considers the following questions as part of a broader review.

- Is the market price for childcare right?
- Is it preventing people from accessing the market?
- Should there be better targeted supply and more generous demand?

I am not able to support recommendation 6.18 at present. I believe that preliminary research as outlined in my proposal for scrutiny must be done before thoughts of mean-testing. This seems to be an economic solution without first identifying the nature of the problem.

Value for money provided by current organisational structures supporting early education and childcare services

Turning to recommendation 7.8 I do not agree.

- The Foundation Stage teacher supporting the private nurseries, be contracted from the Trust, to work under the Education, Sport and Culture Early Education Advisor, providing a cohesive approach to the implementation of the curriculum and continuity in transition.
 - Areas of duplication in the roles and responsibilities of the different agencies/departments be identified, with a 'flatter', more equitable structure developed between the JCCT and the Education, Sport and Culture Department. This will involve a review of the job title/job description of the currently named 'Executive Director' of the JCCT
-

Point 13

I recommend that the whole staffing structure, and job descriptions at both Education (from Assistant Director to Adviser downwards) and the JCCT should be reviewed by the Scrutiny Panel. I need to be convinced of the benefit of contracting the Early Years teacher from the JCCT. I believe greater thought needs to be given to this role – if indeed it should continue in its present form.

Point 14

I recommend that in the interim Education provide Early Years teachers for three nurseries initially (Avranches, Westmount and Centrepoint Trust) with a joint funding arrangements.

As to the title Executive Director for the Head of the JCCT, I would like to know who has complained, before commenting further other than to say that to my mind the title adds gravitas to the job and if it makes a business or a States Department sit up and listen then I think it is a good thing.

I agree with recommendation 8.11.

- It is recommended that a partnership be developed, built on mutual respect, trust and identified common vision. The vision, supported by agreed principles will develop a co-ordinated overall strategy for early years and childcare services in Jersey. This should be established through open, transparent inclusive processes, ensuring clarity of purpose in which to benefit the children of Jersey.

Point 15

Specifically I recommend that the Chairman of the Early Years Forum should be independent of both Education and providers. A totally independent objective Chairman (not necessarily from the childcare field of expertise) would bring integrity to the process. I believe that providers (Education and others) should be counterbalanced by an equal number of parents representing the broad range of needs and views.

It will be the challenge of the Chairman to ensure that members each think beyond their own personal views and experiences and perhaps even explore organisational and thinking techniques such as De Bono's Six Hats method.

Point 16

Once the Scrutiny Panel has delivered its findings I recommend that the Early Years Forum be activated. Once Education have responded to the Scrutiny findings I propose that Education bring a revised Early Years Policy and any other relevant legislation to the States for debate. This proposition should also include SMART objectives, namely - Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time specific.

Conclusion

Assuming that a Scrutiny Panel agrees to tackle this issue, any findings must not be separated from the findings of the Kathy Bull report. Kathy Bull advocates a Children's Centre (a sort of one stop shop) and the old St. Mark's School would seem a good site to put all the agencies together. In addition, I recommend that as part of the Scrutiny review the feasibility of the JCCT moving to that site should be considered.

I would hope that once Scrutiny has made its findings and Education has responded that a proposition would be brought to the States – potentially by P&R enabling debate of the key changes necessary to meet their own Strategic Plan targets and thus bring children's needs to the centre of States policy and action – rather than the periphery.

