
To: Scrutiny
Subject: RE: Early years provision

-----Original Message-----
From: Adam & Nichola
Sent: 13 November 2007 13:30
To: Scrutiny
Subject: Early years provision

This e-mail has been received directly from the Internet: you should exercise a degree of caution since there can be no guarantee that the source or content of the message is authentic.

If you receive inappropriate e-mail from an external source it is your responsibility to notify Computer Services Helpdesk (telephone 440440).

The Full States e-mail Usage Policy can be found here:
http://intranet1/aware/internet_email_issues.htm

To whom it may concern,
I hope that I am not too late to comment on the scrutiny investigation into the provision of early years debate. Can I ask why Jersey is still unwilling to consider the findings of other countries that have already investigated the impact to children and society that a pre-school provision makes? Surely we as an island are not that arrogant to believe that these findings, in so many countries, are not going to have any relevance here simply because "Jersey is different". And if this belief that the impact of high quality early education and financial provision IS different here in Jersey, then can I ask why Jersey has not had a government-funded longitudinal study of effective practice in pre-school education? Surely our government should not simply be asking for money to solve any issues. We should be sure that the money that is asked for, or already being provided is being spent in the right places. Countries such as America, Italy, Scandinavia as well as the UK have all done just this. America discovered a clear relation between early education and teenage/young adult crime - And didn't Kathy Bull express similar sentiments on her visit to Jersey? In England the government funded the EPPE project to not only determine where money should be spent but also on the type of provision that encourages well balanced, social children (who become well adjusted, balanced and social adults). Again its findings were related to the early years provision - it noted that sectors that had staff trained to graduate levels were providing a higher standard of education/care. But yet again I ask that if the belief is that this is different because "we are different in Jersey" then a study of provision here in Jersey is required. We cannot (and should not) be simply listening to an argument between two very different camps - of course they are going to say that the provision they are giving is better than their rival, that they are being run out of business, etc. I would like to end this letter by saying surely in Jersey we should not really be having a debate about whether a business is able to make sufficient profit out of Jersey children? Are our children not worth more to us than this? Adam