

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

(86th Meeting)

13th June 2011PART A

All members were present, with the exception of Senator T.A. Le Sueur, Chief Minister; and Senator F.E. Cohen, Minister for Planning and Environment, from whom apologies had been received.

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf, Minister for Treasury and Resources - Chairman  
 Senator A.J.H. Maclean, Minister for Economic Development  
 Senator B.I. Le Marquand, Minister for Home Affairs  
 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade, Minister for Transport and Technical Services  
 Deputy A.E. Pryke, Minister for Health and Social Services  
 Deputy J.G. Reed, Minister for Education, Sport and Culture  
 Deputy I.J. Gorst, Minister for Social Security  
 Deputy A.K.F. Green, M.B.E, Minister for Housing

In attendance -

Connétable J.M. Refault of St. Peter, Assistant Minister for Treasury and Resources  
 Deputy C.H. Egré, Assistant Minister for Planning and Environment  
 Deputy A.T. Dupré, Assistant Minister for Education, Sport and Culture  
 Deputy E.J. Noel, Assistant Minister for Treasury and Resources  
 Deputy T.A. Vallois, Assistant Minister for Education, Sport and Culture  
 M. Lundy, Director, Education, Sport and Culture  
 J. Richardson, Acting Chief Executive, States of Jersey  
 J. Morris, Policy and Research Manager  
 M.N. de la Haye, Greffier of the States  
 P. Monamy, Acting Clerk to the Council of Ministers

Note: The Minutes of this meeting comprise Part A only.

Grant Aided  
 Schools:  
 Grants -  
 proposition  
 and  
 amendment:  
 comments and  
 debate  
 strategy.  
 548/4 (31)

A1. The Council, with reference to its Minute No. A2 of 26th May 2011, considered the report and proposition "Grant Aided Schools: Grants" (P.72/2011) which had been lodged 'au Greffe' on 11th May 2011 by Senator B.E. Shenton and which was set down for consideration by the States on 14th June 2011.

The Council recalled that it had presented comments on the proposition which set out its concerns regarding the significant negative financial impact which Senator Shenton's proposals would have on the savings presently envisaged under the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR). It was noted that the total shortfall on subsidy reduction for the period 2011-2013 had been calculated as £4.218 million, with a further loss of Property Occupancy Charge of £0.4 million. In addition, it was recognised that an Amendment to P.72/2011 had been lodged 'au Greffe' on 31st May 2011 by Deputy D.J. De Sousa, upon which the Council had also commented on 7th June 2011 setting out its concern regarding the further shortfall on the CSR savings target amounting to a reduction in 2013 of £3.3 million arising from the proposals in relation to Non-Fee Paying Schools.

The Council agreed that it was preferable for budgetary matters not to be discussed by the States prior to the Annual Business Plan debate, particularly as all previous statements on the matter by the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture had indicated that a decision would be made by means of the 2012 Annual Business Plan.

The Director of Education, Sport and Culture confirmed that his department would be unable to meet its CSR savings target in the event that P.72/2011 and the amendment thereto were to be adopted by the States. It was recalled that in its comments on P.72/2011 the Council had indicated that, in order to ensure that the overall savings target of £65 million in the 2011 Budget would be delivered, all other States departments would have to identify additional savings to bridge the shortfall. It was agreed that it was apparent that this would give rise to serious difficulties for many of those departments.

Having recognised that the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture's confidential discussions with schools in the fee-paying sector had led to a certain level of agreement as to the way ahead for those schools, the Council considered the implications that would arise from the adoption of the proposition and/or the amendment, including the potential extent to which students in fee-paying schools might move to the non-fee paying sector and the additional costs arising therefrom. **The Council ultimately agreed its strategy for the forthcoming debate and urged members to support the view that the hands of the States should not be tied before consideration of the Annual Business Plan.**