

Minutes

Meeting title:	Jersey Care Commission Board	
Meeting date and time:	Wednesday 8 February 2023, 9:00 am to 14:45 pm	
Meeting location:	This meeting took place virtually via MS Teams	
Meeting chair:	Glenn Houston (GH)	Chair
Those present:	Jackie Hall (JH) Noreen Kent (NK) Angela Parry (AP) Siân Walker-McAllister (SW) Alison Allam (AA) Lesley Bratch (LB)	Commissioner Commissioner Commissioner Commissioner Commissioner Commissioner
Attendees:	Becky Sherrington (CI) Bradley Chambers (DCI) Tracey Fallon (TF) Andy Kean (AK) Alix Cordell (AC) Mark Silver (MS) Emilie Fisher (EF) Alaistair Jerrom-Smith (AJS) Lynne Capie (LC)  Lisa Phillips (LP)	Chief Inspector Deputy Chief Inspector Regulation Officer Regulation Officer Consultant Head of Business and Performance Finance Business Partner Advisor Project Manager Comms Lead, Switch Digital  Executive Administrator - Meeting Minute Taker
Apologies:		

Documents presented:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agenda</li> <li>2. Draft Minutes of Board meeting (16 November 2022)</li> <li>3. Chair's Report</li> <li>4. Chief Inspector's Report</li> <li>5. Budget Summary 2022</li> <li>6. Risk Framework and Register (3 papers)</li> <li>7. Project Update</li> <li>8. Communication Plan</li> <li>9. Business Plan and KPI's</li> <li>10. Annual Report Framework</li> <li>11. Inspection Handbook</li> <li>12. Workforce Plan</li> <li>13. Isle of Man – Feasibility Paper</li> <li>14. Forward Look</li> </ol>
----------------------	---

## PART A – PUBLIC SESSION

<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome, Apologies and Declarations of Interest.</b>	
	<p>The Chair welcomed a new member of staff, Tracey Fallon (TF) Regulation Officer. TF introduced herself to the commissioners detailed her background and experience as a nurse over the years.</p> <p>The register of interests has been recently shared amongst commissioners and the register has recently been updated in January 2023.</p> <p>The Chair briefly ran through the agenda and the attendees that will join the Board meeting that work outside the organisation.</p>	

<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of last meeting and Matters Arising</b>	
	<p>There were a few amendments made to the minutes of the meeting of 16 November 2022 (Document 2).</p> <p>SW proposed and JH seconded the minutes.</p> <p>The Board reviewed the action points arising from the previous Board meeting:</p> <p><b>P1</b> Circulate the Register of Interests, revised Draft Budget for 2023 and Inspection Policy to commissioners. Confirmed as completed.</p> <p><b>P2</b> Forward Look 2023 to be amended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove Children’s Commissioner to address the Board (postponed)</li> <li>• Whistleblowing Policy to be removed</li> <li>• Remove review of partnership arrangements for inspections of children's social work services. – to be included with Project updates.</li> </ul> <p>Consideration of invitation of Minister for Health and Social Services to address the board postponed to March 2023. Confirmed as completed.</p> <p><b>P3</b> CI to present an update on the Budget explaining the discrepancies in budget summary and in particular Premises and Maintenance budget. To be visited under item agenda 5. Confirmed as completed.</p>	

<b>3.</b>	<b>The Chair’s Report</b>	
	<p>The Chair tables a report (Document 3) and highlighted the following:</p> <p>The Chair and Chief Inspector (CI) met with Professor Hugo Mascie Taylor in December. Professor Hugo Mascie Taylor was tasked with undertaking a piece of work on Governance of secondary care services in Jersey, and published his report</p>	

	<p>which identified concerns, particularly at the higher levels of healthcare structures in Jersey. He was then appointed on an interim basis to be Chair of what the Minister is proposing to be a newly established healthcare Board. The Chair and CI explained the role of the Care Commission to Professor Hugo Mascie Taylor, he is familiar with the workings of the Care Quality Commission (CQC) in England, so understands the potential impact of regulation. It was noted that there's a fair distance to travel before hospital services are sufficient quality to demonstrate through inspection that there are fit for purpose.</p> <p>The Commission issued an invitation to the Minister for Health to come to the next Board and the Minister has accepted.</p> <p>The draft standards were published in November and appear to have been well received.</p> <p>In November the Controller and Auditor General (CAG) published the report on Governance and accountability of independent bodies. There is a challenge for the Commission in that report around the Annual Report and particularly having an independently audited set of accounts. The Chair and CI met with Tracy Duncan (TD), Francis Walker (FW) and Emily Fisher (EF) just to establish what can be done to move closer to a position that concurs with the Regulation of Care Jersey Law. The financial report for the Commission for 2022 will be audited as part of the whole of Government of Jersey accounts this year. No independent auditors have been appointed for the Commission. There are differing views around the cost impact of every arm's length organisation in Jersey publishing its own accounts. The Auditor General has identified a threshold of about £100,000. The Commissions turnover, particularly in 2023, will significantly exceed that.</p> <p>TD, since the meeting has confirmed that auditors of the whole of Government Jersey's accounts cannot provide a separate schedule for the Commission. This leaves the Commission to consider what else, if anything, can be done do to improve financial reporting in the preparation of the Annual Report.</p> <p>The Chair has organised a virtual meeting with Minister Renouf, in February, and will use this time to discuss a range of things, including the succession planning for the Commission.</p>	
--	--	--

4.	Chief Inspectors Report	
	<p>The CI tabled a report (document 4).</p> <p>The Commission continued meetings the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and all the other UK regulators. CI also met with the Jersey regulators recently.</p> <p>CI attended the Safeguarding Ministerial Board which provided the opportunity to talk about the Commission's role in Safeguarding.</p> <p>CI met with Dame Anne Owers (HM Prison), previous Chief Inspector for prisons. They discussed culture and shining a light on the dark corners of institutions.</p>	

The Commission has received no new complaints. There is one resolved complaint Andy Kean (AK) Mark Silver (MS) had responded to. To be discussed in more detail in the confidential section.

Workforce was discussed. Tracey Fallon (TF) Regulation Officer, has joined the Commission in January. The Commission recruited a Project Manager Alistair Jerrom-Smith (AJS), who is working 2 days a week.

All statutory inspections have been completed and the reports are scheduled to finish the report writing by full by the end of this week.

Following the issue of the improvement notices for the Secure Children's Unit, an unannounced inspection occurred at the beginning of January. The five areas of improvements have been resolved other than transition planning. Social Care Services are leading on the challenges that exist. The Commission will be lifting the improvement notice and are planning to do a factual press statement around that. CI has provided the details of this to the Children's Commissioner.

The Commission published the report on the current findings on recruitment and capacity. The Minister then announced that there would be an increase in the funding into Social Care. CI subsequently had a meeting with Megan Mathias, within the Cabinet Office. Megan Mathias who has been tasked with looking at the Social Care paper and looking at the ways in which recruitment can be supported within Children's Social Care and within not only the Social Care sector, but also Children's Social Services.

No enforcement action has been undertaken, although the Commission is busy as part of inspections, but no enforcement action has been undertaken. We have, however, had unregistered regulated activity which is currently being investigated. There will be more to follow in the confidential part of the meeting.

Legal advice has been sought related predominantly to do with the unregistered regulated activity. The Law Office Department (LOD) have provided some valuable training sessions for regulation officers. There were two sessions, one full day and half a day in January, which looks at the Commission's powers, how to collect evidence, how to produce statements and witness statements.

The Commission provided an event to the sector in respect of Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). This was delivered as an online event which Mark Silver (MS) chaired and was well received. The presentation was posted on social media and received two and a half thousand hits on the Commission's Facebook page. This was a good engagement event for providers.

Lynne Capie (LC) from Switch Digital has now joined the Commission as Communications Lead. LC has experience crisis management. LC has devised a communications plan for the next few months and has been meeting with CI each week.

	<p>The website has been refreshed and updated, the site has been split into two parts, one for professionals, one for Islanders. The launch coincided that with the new Children's Standards.</p> <p>CQC confirmed their support with working together. CQC have agreed to meet with CI and regulation officers in February. CI will visit CQC in London for a show and tell.</p> <p>The assisted dying public consultation has ended. The public consultation is not due to be published until March.</p> <p>MS is leading on memorandum of understanding (MOU) with professional regulators.</p> <p>The Government provides every staff member a survey to complete to share anonymous reviews of their employment, the overall survey shows that the Commission has good engagement and high levels of employee satisfaction.</p> <p>The Commission took part in an Away Day which was the opportunity to review the previous year, what's going well and forward planning. It was well received, and another Away Day is planned in six months time.</p> <p>CI attended SPPP's Awayday and presented the Commission's key priorities for the year.</p> <p>CI discussed registration numbers and presented charts comparing 2021,2022 and 2023. This included Care Services, Medical Professional, Health Professionals, Dental Professionals, Yellow Fever and Piercing and Tattooing.</p> <p>Every year feedback is provided from services following the inspection process and is compiled in a report. It was noted that the responses are positive. Similar responses were noted last year.</p> <p>The Commission collect the activity for Yellow Fever Centres and liaise with the practices each year to report on the number of vaccinations given and to ensure that their Standards are being met. An inspection is not carried out.</p>	
--	---	--

<b>5.</b>	<b>Budget Summary 2022</b>	
	<p>The Chair welcomed Emilie Fisher (EF), Finance Business Partner, to the meeting. EF meets with the Commission each month to discuss the budget.</p> <p>EF presented (document 5) and discussed an overview of the 2022 outturn and the overview for 2023 budget.</p> <p>The overall position for the Jersey Care Commission was an overachievement at the end of 2022 of £73,000. This is mostly driven by the overachievement of income collection, which is £76,000. We saw a slight overspend of £3000 on staffing cost and the operating expenditure was a break even position.</p> <p>Something to note, in 2022 the Jersey Care Commission received an additional budget transfer of £291,000 from the Children, Young People, Education and Skills</p>	

	<p>(CYPES) budget, and this was to support the regulation of the Children's Services. This budget was spent in full as projected in the year, and this additional budget received including an expenditure, such as additional regulation officers, the rental of larger offices.</p> <p>Overall in 2022, the Commission performed well and adhere to the expenditure budget set.</p> <p>Looking ahead at 2023, EF provided a breakdown of the budget and what changes were expected in 2023.</p> <p>The Commission is starting the year with a base budget which was £387,000. The Commission will receive the recurring budget from CYPES, so from 2023 the base budget will be adjusted with the £405,000 relating to Children's Services regulations.</p> <p>In addition to this, within the Government Plan the Commission is receiving an additional £726,000 investment. A one off payment has been removed from the budget (a one off payment to staff was paid out in 2022, which will not reoccur)</p> <p>The rational for the increase in the budget was discussed. EF confirmed this is because of income increases, staff costs increase, recruitment of new roles and operation expenditure increase.</p> <p>Brackets in the budget plan were discussed and explained by EF. The credit line brackets are relating to income. This is where it is reflected between income received and then the expenditure line, what's important to look at with regards to these reports is the variance analysis. If brackets are shown in this area this will mean an overspend. If no brackets are seen it means overachievement.</p>	
--	--	--

<b>6.</b>	<b>Risk Framework and Register</b>	
	<p>MS, Head of Business and Performance presented an update to the Board in respect of the risk register (document 6). MS highlighted some of the changes made.</p> <p>MS detailed the standard way the Commission rates risks, two red categories, an amber category and two green categories. This was compared with Government of Jersey likelihood table, the Board approved to adopt that. The banding is slightly more descriptive.</p> <p>The impact assessment was reviewed, and it was noted that as the Commission has specifics that work well and so there was no need to change this. However, the Commission should adopt the way the Government of Jersey describe the different levels of impact as catastrophic, major, moderate, minor and negligible rather than very high, high, medium, low and very low.</p> <p>The way the Commission score risks, there's a major inconsistency that it's possible to have a risk that scores nine, that is amber and a risk that scores ten that is green. This is an oversight when it was first drawn up. The Government of Jersey scoring matrix is similar to almost every single organization that MS has compared to with a</p>	

few very slight discrepancies. MS requested the Board's approval to adopt as removes the inconsistencies. This was agreed.

What is missing from the current risk management framework is an actual explanation of the different colours to explain what would be expected to happen when for example there is a red or extreme risk. The Board confirmed to add this.

The risk appetite response was discussed, and it was agreed that phrases such as could and should have to be avoided. MS noted that depending on the nature of the risk that may actually be very much that can be done. Where the risk rating is extreme the wording will be amended to 'must consider putting contingency plans in place'.

The review process was discussed and a point that was picked up at the last Board about making changes to the risk register. Some risks are quite fast moving and therefore the Commission staff will make changes to the register to manage risk between Board meetings, anything that was particularly high risk would be advised to The Chair. The Provisional register would then go to the Board to endorse. It has been confirmed that Board approves when a risk can be removed. It was agreed that there should be an audit trail of removed risks.

MS confirmed that the risk register is shared with the Commission staff monthly.

The terminology of Residual Risk and Target Risks were discussed, and it was confirmed by the Board that the understanding of the risk is far more important than the terminology of the risk and so Residual Risk was agreed with how the risk should be described.

Risk description was discussed, an explanation about how the Commission describes risks and adopted from the Government of Jersey Risk management framework breaking them down into three. What's the underlying cause? What might happen? and what might the impact be? It's one of the best tools for descriptions, but it doesn't really change the framework.

The Risk Register was then discussed.

Risk 1 – Digital – proposed to close as this is a separate project and the Board will be sited on how the project is running. A separate Board is developed for the project. It was agreed to close.

Risk 2 – Workforce - the actions and progress has been updated, current risk remains 9, the risk has not changed significantly.

Risk 3 – Data Governance – Satisfactory progress has been made on this risk but remains at a 9 level which requires more monitoring until further progress is made on key issues.

	<p>Risk 4 – Capacity - Risk for capacity due to expansion, new areas and demand of Commission resources. This remains a risk of requiring the Board intervention. There is satisfactory progress on the control, this is an ongoing risk. It was agreed that skills gap should be added to the register and meeting with Isle of Man should be removed. Isle of Man meeting is to be discussed later in the meeting.</p> <p>Risk 5 – Standards Children’s Services – MS suggested that this risk can be removed and replaced by another risk focusing on how the inspection methodology is introduced and used. Certain progress is made as an Inspection Handbook has been created.</p> <p>Risk 6 – Engagement with Children’s Services - This a new risk with no current risk controls. This can be included in risk 5 but it is a specific risk. The Board discussed the risk. The Commission will continue to reach out to services. The description may need to be amended to there is a need to engage directly with Children's Services and planning for new regulation and inspection’. This is to be reviewed.</p> <p>Risk 7 – Unregulated Registered Activity Risk and Risk 8 Impact of Standards on Care Providers are ongoing issues.</p> <p>The Board thanked MS for the comprehensive overview of the risk register.</p>	
--	--	--

7	Project Update	
	<p>CI introduced, Alastair Jerrom-Smith (AJS), Project Manager, to the Board. Last year the potential changes in the laws that would mean more registrations be required and the higher work load that this brings. The project will create a portal for the end user to complete instead of a form, an authentication process and a way to pay through the website.</p> <p>Alastair mapped out the current and future process involving Modernisation and Digital (M&amp;D) and Prosperity (Customer Relationship Management (CRM) database that holds registrations).</p> <p>AJS presented (document 7) and described the overall project plan and has up until the end of February to finalise conversations with M&amp;D and with Prosperity to get the final project plan and Governance in place.</p> <p>The system is to go live round about the end of October or thereabouts and then snagging, etc.</p> <p>The next step is finalising project Government specifications, design authority sign off and looking at the CRM upgrade initial timelines with Prosperity.</p> <p>The proposed project Board has been looked at, Project Sponsor will be CI, Lisa Phillips (LP) as the Senior User, Senior Supplier is Michael Luce (ML) at Prosperity</p>	



	<p>and there are M&amp;D representatives who will form quite a large part of how this project is carried out, Paul Francis (PF) from Cabinet Office will be on the Board as well as Mark Silver (MS) from within the Commission looking over data protection and the overalls of governance.</p> <p>Full project documentation will be kept up to date, including a risk log. There are few risks noted and this will be updated with new risks as they appear, scoring them along with putting in mitigating actions.</p> <p>There are no issues at present. The project will rely on how the Government authenticate people and part of that is using Yoti. This is now a mature verification and authentication method used by Government and can use it to prove the identity of someone who is registering or renewing.</p> <p>The online payments integration should be pretty routine using Civica and it's the go to payment option for Government of Jersey departments and it's well integrated into the Government of Jersey.</p> <p>Stakeholder communications became quite apparent and would be required to communicate throughout the duration of this project.</p> <p>The Chair thanks AJS for the update and invited to update the Board again in May.</p>	
--	---	--

<b>8</b>	<b>Communication Plan and Introduction</b>	
	<p>The Board welcomed Lynne Capie (LC), Communications Lead, Switch Digital, to the meeting. LC described what the business does and provided her background and experience to the Board.</p> <p>LC presented (Document 8). In January 2023, Switch Communications was engaged by the Jersey Care Commission to undertake a review of their current position in relation to communication channels and approach. Over the last few weeks LC has worked with CI and the team to understand more about the organisation, its purpose and the way things are changing in terms of the services that are regulated in Jersey.</p> <p>Switch are looking at the Commission's objectives, which is about the positioning of the Jersey Care Commission and the independent nature of the Commission, its purpose, values and demonstrate the team living those values. Switch has developed a timeline and shared this with the Board.</p> <p>Objectives highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate the independence of the Commission, the purpose and the values of the Commission.</li> <li>• Communicate the new standards for children and young person services. Highlight the consultation process that underpins the implementation of these Standards.</li> </ul>	

	<p>Communication priorities highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helping the public and relevant providers understand the ten new areas which will be regulated.</li> <li>• Managing the public and media interest in the newly regulated Children's Social Services.</li> <li>• Supporting the Commission in recruitment making the vision and purpose of the Commission clear to support prospective candidates in understanding the role they will play in the regulation of care in Jersey.</li> <li>• Helping children understand the role of the Commission and how they can contribute when Children's Services are inspected.</li> <li>• Supporting the public and the media in their understanding of the progress providers have made in relation to their improvement notices and implementation of recommendations made.</li> <li>• Raising the profile of the Commissioners and their role on the Board.</li> <li>• Actively engaging the social media community in Jersey to help facilitate the understanding that the Commission is an independent body.</li> <li>• Helping the public, media and the providers of Children's Social Services understand the new Standards.</li> <li>• Using every opportunity to point the public to the updated website and the benefits of using the site including selecting their care providers through the find a care service option. Communicating inspection reports and managing any resultant queries.</li> <li>• Supporting CI in promoting the Commission, handling public and media communication requests, and developing internal communications to support the team as the organisation develops and grows.</li> </ul> <p>Switch has developed a three month timeline and shared this with the Board.</p> <p>The Chair thanked LC for the detailed presentation and invited back to update the Board in March.</p>	
--	---	--

9	Business Plan and KPI's	
	<p>MS, Head of Business and Performance, presented (Document 9). It was noted that KPI'S have been renamed as Performance Framework and used the phrase Delivery Plan.</p> <p>During the last Board CI introduced the Business Plan without Key Performance Indicators (KPI'S), to allow MS to Review.</p> <p>MS introduced the Framework and suggested a delivery plan over three years and described the re numbering of the KPI's for better presenting.</p> <p>The Board discussed each KPI and queries raised were:</p> <p><b>KPI 1.2 – 80% of inspection reports completed in draft form, within 28 days of an inspection having concluded.</b> There was a discussion as if 80% good enough. CI advised that 80% is a good target as would need to consider sickness, annual</p>	

leave etc within the team, a target higher can be a set up for failure. It was also noted that the terminology can be amended to 'No fewer than 80%'. MS to consider.

**KPI 1.8 The Commission will, as part of its quality assurance process, undertake post-inspection consultation from 10% of its annual inspections with providers/managers of regulated activities. It will publish a summary of responses.** There was a suggestion to add something to say what the Commission do with the responses. MS to give this some thought of how to capture this in the KPI.

**KPI 2.1 The Commission will finalise 100% of applications for registration of providers of regulated activities within 4 weeks.** It was suggested that the KPI should read completed applications. MS confirmed that this is stated at the beginning rather than detailing 'completed application' these many times.

**KPI 3.1 Overall positive response to key survey questions to be at least 80%.** It was discussed if the word 'Aim for overall positive response' needs to be added. It was confirmed that all KPI's are aims and stating it as a target and we measure them whether we achieve it or there is a short fall.

**KPI 3.3 The Commission will work with the supplier to enhance the use of website statistic and consider feedback mechanisms to understand public engagement.**

There was a point made when talking about public engagement, as to who is the public, the service, user engagement or public or may be talking about all three. A higher aspiration is to talk about involvement.

**KPI 3.4 Engage with care receivers and families during inspections and provide an opportunity for them to give feedback on their experience of inspections. Ensure feedback form users included in 100% of inspections.** A typo was noted the sentence should be 'Ensure Feedback from care receivers included in 100% of inspections.'

There was a discussion about language. Stakeholders, service users etc. The language around engagement, involvement, stakeholders, patients versus public. This needs to be thought about who the KPI is referring to. It was also noted that the key stakeholder should be at the center of all KPI's.

**KPI 4.1 The Commission will consult with the sector to organise an engagement event for providers and professionals.** It was discussed if this should be clarified as an annual event if provided once a year. There have been some engagement events which have been very successful, which the team have led on behalf of the Commission. The Commissioners have not always been present at engagement events. When an event is organised such as the recent online training, this could count as an engagement event. These events could be organised across the year where we would have contact with representatives of those services that are regulated.

	<p>There might be one annual event which Commissioners would aspire to be there in force but should be counting other engagements that can be organised and facilitate as part of that process.</p> <p>There was a query with KPI 5 and the number of days to process.</p> <p><b>KPI 5 Professional Registration.</b>  <b>5.1 The Commission will finalise 100% of health and social care professional applications within 3 days</b>  <b>5.2The Commission will finalise 100% of health and social care professional renewals within 7 days.</b>  <b>5.3The Commission will finalise 100% of applications from piercing and tattooing practitioners completed within 3 days.</b></p> <p>It was confirmed that KPI 5.2 is relating to renewals not new applications and therefore have longer to process. It was suggested that KPI 5.2 would be moved to the end so it will be easy to differentiate.</p> <p>The Complaints Policy was discussed to be reviewed. The Chair commented that the view is that a policy should drive a KPI rather than the other way around. In other words, if our policy says 25 days, then the KPI should mirror the policy at least a further review of the policy is undertaken.</p> <p>The Chair noted that some organisations have what they refer to as Tier one and Tier two targets and the difference between them is that Tier one are published and Tier 2 are internal for board purposes and senior management team purposes. There are several targets that for example would be published in therefore covered and referenced in the Annual Report. There are other targets that would be deemed to be internal.</p> <p><b>KPI 4.3 Provide a response to emerging issues or themes within published reports as required.</b> It was noted that the Commission is proactive, survey seeking views etc. It should be not just reactive, but proactive.</p> <p><b>KPI 6.6 Number and outcome of social care reports commissioned internally to be recorded.</b> It was agreed it should read health and social care because at some point the Commission may report around health.</p>	
--	---	--

<b>10</b>	Annual Report Framework	
	<p>MS discussed a report (Document 10).</p> <p>MS is currently drafting the Annual Report and this paper sets out the approach the Commission is taking and what is to be focused on. Following feedback on the 2021</p>	

	<p>Annual Report MS has set the proposed structure and contents for the 2022 Annual Report. These proposals seek to address the key findings and recommendations of the Comptroller and Auditor General's (CAG) report on Annual Reporting, the CAG Annual Reporting Good Practice Guide, and the CAG think piece on Governance and Accountability of Independent Bodies and Office Holders.</p> <p>The following were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk, especially Risk Assessment and Risk Management processes</li> <li>• Staffing Issues i.e. policies on well being, staff development, diversity</li> <li>• Remuneration policy and total costs for Commissioners and staff</li> <li>• Effectiveness/impact of the Board on outcomes</li> <li>• Consideration of our operating model and options (contractors, outsourcing etc)</li> <li>• How do we know we are delivering Value for Money</li> <li>• How do we contribute to wider Government of Jersey Objectives i.e. the Jersey Performance Model</li> </ul> <p>The work undertaken on the Risk Management Framework and developing new KPIs for the 2023-2025 Business Plan can be reused in the Annual Report.</p> <p>Work on analysis of the quality assurance feedback reports from inspections will be included in the performance section, and a thematic review of inspection reports.</p> <p>The Accountability section may require a little more thought as several of the areas identified for improvement fall within this section.</p> <p>One area still requiring issues to be addressed, as mentioned previously, are the accounts and financial report. How the accounts will be audited to meet the requirement of the Regulation of Care Law and CAG expectations have not been determined. There will also need to be a more comprehensive analysis of our financial performance against expectations.</p> <p>A draft of the Annual Report will be available for approval in the Board meeting in March.</p>	
--	---	--

<b>11</b>	<b>Inspection Handbook for Children's Social Care</b>	
	<p>The Chair welcomed Alix Cordell (AC), Consultant, and Andy Kean (AK), Regulation Officer, to the Board. AC presented the Inspection Handbook (document 11). The handbook contains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose and underlying principles of inspection and its statutory basis</li> <li>• The inspection approach, frequency and timing</li> <li>• The evidence that will be used to evaluate provisions</li> <li>• The activity that will take place before, during and after the inspection including what providers need to do to prepare and be ready for inspections</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How children, young people, their families and staff working with them can get involved in inspections</li> </ul> <p>The contents demonstrate what that cycle of activity is, comprising of an annual conversation with the Executive Lead of the provider, an annual survey with both staff, parents and carers as well as children, two different types of inspections, full and focused inspections and what the team might look like. The methodology and the ways to gather the evidence and what providers can expect in terms of publication and sort of feedback from the Commission.</p> <p>The Commissioners thanked AC for the presentation and thought this approach was well thought out.</p> <p>Noreen Kent (NK) wanted to clarify the foot note on the first slide of the presentation. It was confirmed that the sentence should read 'The Standards and Handbook should both be read in conjunction with the <u>Regulation of Care (Jersey) 2014 Law</u>, the Children and Young People (Jersey) Law 2022 and other relevant legislation that provide quality statements of effective services.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the handbook was designed for Children's Services but would be discussed moving forward for development of a handbook for other services.</p> <p>There was a query regarding the annual survey, if there are children and young people who can't participate for specific reasons, a question was raised would there be anybody independent that would be able to support them? It was confirmed by AC that an advocacy worker or advocacy services would be best placed to support.</p> <p>It was noted that this could link into adults and then specially service in learning disabilities. It has got already lots of scope not to be just about children and young people potentially or to allow a very easy springboard to have ones for those other areas.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the handbook will come to the Board in draft form for approval in March.</p> <p>The Chair thanked AC for her work on the Standards and the Handbook.</p>	
--	---	--

<b>12</b>	<b>Workforce Plan</b>
	<p>DCI tabled a paper (document 12)</p> <p>The workforce was discussed in detail regarding the Commissions current position and future needs.</p> <p>DCI discussed a workforce analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and a gap analysis pointing out where gaps of skills, knowledge, experience, training and development.</p>

	<p>In addition to the existing team the following posts were put to the Board for approval:</p> <p>Pharmacist x 1: a part time post may be sufficient. A Job Description for this role would need to be created and the role will need to be graded.</p> <p>Regulation Officer x 4:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) One Regulation Officer who possesses knowledge, experience and skills associated with both children/young people and adult mental health services.</li> <li>2) One Regulation Officer who is either a social worker or who has experience in working with or alongside adult social work services.</li> <li>3) One Regulation Officer who has knowledge, experience and skills associated with the regulation of a large-scale medical unit i.e., a clinic or hospital or ambulance services.</li> <li>4) A rotational or permanent secondment Regulation Officer role of either the existing Regulation Officers or the new recruits intended in 2023, there is a need for a staff member to adopt the role of Training Officer, on a part-time basis, integrated as part of their substantial role.</li> </ol> <p>Project or Programme Manager x 1. The purpose of this role is to coordinate the process associated with consultation for the new Standards, build the inspection team/s, facilitate the inspections by preparing inspection packs and ensuring that relevant data is collated, and to schedule an inspection programme. A Job Description and WEAR for this role would need to be created and the role will need to be graded.</p> <p>Standards Writer x 1: on a temporary basis or purchased external support for a limited period. A Policy Officer Job Description exists which could be utilised for this role. A WEAR will be required.</p> <p>Administrator x 1 (in 2024). The need for a pharmacist is immediate and urgent. The employing of a Regulation Officer with mental health experience is needed early in 2023.</p> <p>The Board agreed the need for the new posts. The Standards Writer post was discussed in depth. CI described that this would be a temporary role, initially for 2 years and discussed the work involved. The Board were then in agreement for the role on a temporary basis.</p> <p>There was a discussion regarding experience within the team. It was noted that The Commission have several staff members with a nursing background, the Board mentioned that other backgrounds should be considered for the new roles in particular with a social work background.</p>
--	---

<b>13.</b>	<b>Isle of Man – Feasibility Paper</b>
	<p>DCI tabled a paper (document 13).</p> <p>Manx Government (Isle of Man) approached the Commission last year with a view towards developing a relationship with them and sharing expertise and resources primarily around inspections. Isle of Man is structured different to Jersey where the Commission is independent, the Isle of Man is part of Government. The Isle of Man are required to provide</p>

	<p>inspection of day centres by an independent body. Two members of staff visited the Isle of Man in January 2023 and visited day services.</p> <p>DCI discussed the risks and benefits of assisting the Isle of Man with their ten day care services with inspections. DCI requested permission to explore.</p> <p>It was discussed and concluded by the Board that due to capacity, providing a service to the Isle of Man, deemed to be too much too soon. The Chair suggested that the relationship should remain open and can be considered in the future.</p>
--	---

<b>14</b>	<b>Reflections and key priorities</b>	
	MS reflected on the first 3 months of working at the Commission and discussed first impressions, the Commissions strengths, challenges, and priorities.	

<b>15.</b>	<b>Forward Look</b>	
	<p>The Chair presented the Forward Look for 2023 (document 14). The next Board meeting was discussed and was concluded that the Whistleblowing Policy can be removed. The website has been updated with how to raise a concern or make a complaint along with what the term Whistleblowing means.</p> <p>The review of the Publication Scheme will tie in with the communications strategy. The publication scheme identifies what documents are in the public domain and what remains private and confidential.</p> <p>It was confirmed that The Business Continuity Plan can be moved to July 2023. LP to update the Forward Look.</p> <p>The Minister has been invited to the Board in March. LP is organising the times with the Ministerial support unit.</p>	

<b>16.</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	None	



JERSEY CARE COMMISSION  
Action Points

	Action Point	Owner	Status
P1	Update Forward Look to remove Whistleblowing and move Business Continuity Plan to July 2023.	LP	Completed
P2	MS to update the Performance Framework and Risk Register as he sees fit considering the comments raised.	MS	Ongoing