
STATES OF JERSEY



SECONDARY EDUCATION FUNDING REVIEW (S.R.10/2024): RESPONSE OF THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND LIFELONG LEARNING

Presented to the States on 24th January 2025
by the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning

STATES GREFFE

**SECONDARY EDUCATION FUNDING REVIEW (S.R.10/2024): RESPONSE OF
THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND LIFELONG LEARNING**

Ministerial Response to:	S.R.10/2025
Ministerial Response required by:	23rd January 2025
Review title:	Secondary Education Funding Review
Scrutiny Panel:	Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel

Minister’s Introduction:

The Minister welcomes the Panel’s review and report into secondary education funding and thanks them, and all the stakeholders, who provided their considered views on this important subject. Education is fundamental to society and the prospects of individuals and indeed the Island. I consider every pound spent on education as an investment in the future prosperity of individuals and Jersey. Significant investment has taken place since the 2020 publication of the Independent School Funding Review, but it is important to continually assess funding levels and areas of spend to ensure they remain sufficient and are invested effectively to provide the best opportunities and outcomes for all.

Findings:

	Findings	Comments
1	The right for parental choice of school is embedded in the Education (Jersey) Law 1999, subject to provision of efficient education or the efficient use of resources. However, there appears to be inconsistency between the right to choose a school and public perception that choice is a ‘postcode lottery’, where the understanding is that choice for secondary education is only available to those with financial means.	<p>Parents have a right to express a preference as to the provided school at which the parent wishes education to be provided for his or her child. However, the Minister is not required to comply with any preference if this would prejudice the provision of efficient education or use of resources.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some parents will not be able to choose Hautlieu or a fee-paying provided school due to academic selection and / or ability to pay.</p> <p>In practice, where spare capacity exists, places in the 4 provided non fee-paying schools can, and are, allocated outside of catchment.</p> <p>The Minister notes that the Panel’s analysis of the survey responses “is not clear if the strong sense of frustration in these responses was at the system or the way the question was worded to imply choice.”</p>

2	<p>The Jersey Curriculum is closely linked to the national curriculum in England, which is currently under review. Public sentiment, captured by the Government's own consultation 'The Big Education Conversation' and the Panel's work has captured a desire to ensure that the secondary curriculum is broad and prepares students for their future.</p>	<p>The Jersey Curriculum Council (JCC) and Minister have agreed the definition of curriculum as outlined in the revised Jersey School Review Framework (JSRF) and this will be added to the Jersey Curriculum (JC) in 2025 when the 2025 JSRF is launched. This makes the JC a wider document than the current directory of subjects, or the English National Curriculum, and extends it to encompass the whole curriculum diet – the extra-curricular, vocational, technical and academic curricular and wider personal and social development options that schools offer to meet the needs of their cohorts.</p>
3	<p>Some Government provided non-fee-paying schools offer support with vocational studies pre-16, but this is not provided universally across secondary schools and access to the schools is dependent on catchment area.</p>	<p>Every school provides some vocational option, and it is agreed that there is no universal consistent offer across them all as schools tailor their offer to meet the particular needs of their cohorts.</p>
4	<p>For 2023 there is a £27 million (47%) difference between the £41 million spent by Government on provided and fee-paying secondary schools (not including the special schools) which is funded by CYPES and the £68 million reported spend on secondary education by Jersey's Classification of the Functions of Government report.</p>	<p>The Classification of the Functions of Government is calculated following a method described in detail in internationally applicable guidance. Manual on sources and methods for the compilation of COFOG statistics — Classification of the Functions of Government (COFOG) — 2019 edition - Products Manuals and Guidelines - Eurostat</p> <p>In brief the following steps were followed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1> take direct secondary school gross costs from the accounts - £53m, excluding fee income 2> add a proportion of relevant CYPES' costs including direct support services such as Educational Psychology and an estimate for Mont al 'Abbe secondary - £7.4m 3> add a proportion of GoJ central services provided by the COO – e.g. HR, IT - £5.6m 4> add depreciation on the school estate- £4.9m 5> remove cross charging from other depts featuring elsewhere in the report - (£0.5m)

		<p>6> remove social security contributions which are shown elsewhere in the report - (£2.2m)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Secondary schools excl income</td> <td>53,803,714</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Add:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>relevant CYPES costs</td> <td>7,381,162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>COO costs</td> <td>5,648,670</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Depreciation</td> <td>3,941,749</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Remove</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eliminations</td> <td>- 503,430</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Social Security Elimination</td> <td>- 2,227,995</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>68,043,870</td> </tr> </table>	Secondary schools excl income	53,803,714	Add:		relevant CYPES costs	7,381,162	COO costs	5,648,670	Depreciation	3,941,749	Remove		Eliminations	- 503,430	Social Security Elimination	- 2,227,995	Total	68,043,870
Secondary schools excl income	53,803,714																			
Add:																				
relevant CYPES costs	7,381,162																			
COO costs	5,648,670																			
Depreciation	3,941,749																			
Remove																				
Eliminations	- 503,430																			
Social Security Elimination	- 2,227,995																			
Total	68,043,870																			
5	<p>Between 2018 and 2023 there has been a £9.840 million increase to funding provided by Government to non-fee-paying secondary schools, equating to an increase of 31%. Comparatively, the funding provided by Government towards the provided fee-paying schools has fluctuated slightly but overall it has increased by approximately £676,000, equating to a 13% increase over the same period of time. Comparatively, Jersey's Retail Price Index (RPI) over the period March 2018 to December 2023 was 33.3%, so Government provided funding has not kept pace with RPI, despite additional funding provided for Education reform.</p>	<p>It is fair to say that government budgets have not fully kept pace with RPI in this period, including secondary school budgets.</p> <p>Additional budget for pay awards and non-pay inflation funding was allocated to Departments each year through the Government Plan process. However, the non-pay element did not fully cover the higher RPI in this period, or the above inflation price rises, particularly in contract services and utilities.</p> <p>It is important to note that, unlike fully-provided schools, fee-paying schools benefit from a co-funding model (i.e. direct Government funding through AWPU and parental fees). The fees charged by fee-paying schools went up in this period above RPI. These schools are more resilient to inflation pressures because of this but are more vulnerable to reductions in pupil numbers than non-fee charging schools. Pupil numbers have increased by 9% over this period (from 2,706 in autumn 2018/19 to 2,972 in autumn 2024/25).</p> <p>A significant proportion of additional funding for fully provided schools is predicated on the needs of their cohort in accordance with the recommendations of the Independent School Funding Review (ISFR). It is to be expected that schools with higher levels of multilingual learners, low prior attainment, SEN and Jersey Premium will have seen higher budget increases than fee paying schools which have much lower numbers of these cohorts.</p>																		
6	<p>The financial deficit has decreased for the non-fee paying provided secondary schools since the introduction of the Jersey Funding Formula for Schools ('funding formula') (in 2022) but</p>	<p>The school funding formula is the allocation mechanism for available base budget, it does not, of itself, increase funding. The reduction of structural deficits was one of the explicit ISFR recommended investments, others relate to addressing unmet needs in the system.</p>																		

	has not been totally removed. The deficit for the fee-paying provided secondary schools has fluctuated over the same period of time (2018-2023), but they are not subject to the new funding formula calculations.	
7	Jersey Property Holdings is the Corporate Landlord for the Government provided fee-paying and non-fee-paying secondary schools in Jersey and is responsible for capital works that are not considered day-to-day requirements, or as defined by the Service Level Agreement. Expenditure for maintenance in the schools has varied greatly in the last five years. Grainville received the highest amount, £11.8 million between 2019 and July 2023, and in comparison, over the same period Hautlieu has received the lowest, at £296k.	The Minister notes the figures quoted in this finding come from a letter the Panel received from the Infrastructure Department. The high spend attributed to Grainville includes £9.9 million in 2019 for large scale capital works carried out during phase 5 of the school's redevelopment.
8	The introduction of the funding formula has replaced the previous Average Weighted Pupil Unit formula, following recommendations made to Government in the Independent School Funding Review conducted in 2020 for a more transparent and less complex formula to be used for calculating school funding.	Correct for all fully provided schools. Fee-paying and grant funded schools remain on the AWPU methodology. Work is underway to move these remaining schools to a new methodology / formula, ideally from 2026.

9	89.68% of secondary school costs are attributable to staff costs and 10.32% is attributable to non-staff costs.	Agreed.
10	There is a disparity between contracted hours for teachers (26.25 hours per week as per the funding formula) and reported hours worked (53 hours per week in 2022 per the Teachers survey). The funding formula assumes 2.6 hours (10%) of time is taken up by Planning, Preparation and Assessment, however, the 2021 Jersey Teachers survey indicated that there was an average of 18 hours a week taken up by lesson planning, general administration and marking.	<p>Hours worked by teachers fall into different categories and working patterns. The review of Teacher's Terms & Conditions will address the apparent differences between contracted hours, pupil contact hours, teaching hours and PPA by clarifying requirements for each. It will also seek to clarify how these hours are/can be worked across the school and/or calendar years. The new school workforce survey (which, unlike the previous iteration, will include all the school workforce) will also include questions to elicit working hours and practices so workload challenges can be supported by data.</p> <p>The funding formula references contact time, teaching hours and PPA, not all hours. The funding formula allows for 10% PPA. The survey, in 2021, reflects that 53 was the average hours worked for full time teachers, including senior leaders, in the week prior to the survey.</p>
11	The average budget for teacher learning and development is calculated by the Department as £2,034 per teacher, which includes centrally held funding used for programmes such as the Jersey Graduate Teacher Training Programme. £2,034 is lower than the equivalent funding recommended by the Independent School Funding Review and the average funding per teacher in England.	Funding for learning and development exists in three places: 1. training budget is allocated directly to schools through the formula, 2. travel and accommodation costs associated with training are allocated to schools through the formula and 3. there is a centrally held budget.
12	The funding formula provides a calculation for	The formula is used to derive the budget quantum and, for the majority of the budget, Headteachers have

	<p>a cash limit which is the budget available to schools. There are a few ringfenced elements, however, the Headteacher has discretion on how to spend the majority of the budget. The funding formula does not clarify which of the staff roles are provided with ringfenced funding and which roles do not have to be recruited to, so that funding can be repurposed by Headteachers for other uses.</p>	<p>discretion on how to spend it. This ensures that school leaders, who have the best understanding of the context and requirements of the school can, for example, build a workforce that best fits their needs. However, the model school for inclusion staffing structure requires all mainstream provided schools employ a core set of staff, supporting a more inclusive education.</p>
13	<p>Funding allocated to expenditure on premises is provided on an actual cost basis, however, some values of non-staff costs, such as the core rate of minor works expenditure and exam costs have not been adjusted with revisions of the formula.</p>	<p>There are multiple budget allocations linked to premises in non-staff costs in the formula including Grounds Maintenance, Cleaning (Contracts/Materials), Utilities and Minor Works. Minor works are funded at rates informed by the building age (as advised by Jersey Property Holdings) which provides a £ rate per m². Additionally, there is a centrally held capital budget for school premises improvements. Exam costs have been increased in 2025 to better reflect actual costs and volumes.</p>
14	<p>The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning has advised the Panel that school budget for Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has not changed in the last 10 years. The Panel ascertained that £105,000 was attributable to the provided secondary schools for ICT and has calculated that in 2023 they spent an average of</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

	0.29% of their budget on ICT (excluding staff costs). There is an additional £250,000 held centrally for all schools to access for ICT, if required.	
15	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning has acknowledged the importance of technology for students to become digital citizens, however also indicated that “significant investment” is needed in order for teachers and students to be able to effectively use technology for education in the immediate and long term.	The network upgrade has total budget of £1.4 million split between 2024 and 2025 to cover WIFI upgrades.
16	Each provided non fee-paying secondary school receives funding for a Mental Health and Wellbeing coordinator and the Minister has advised that there are plans to increase support between Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and schools in future.	CAMHS Early Intervention Service has Mental Health Practitioners assigned to each secondary schools. These Practitioners will work closely with the mental health and wellbeing co-ordinators in schools to offer consultation, brief input, training and courses for staff, and navigation / support for wider CAMHS services.
17	The funding formula for schools has provided funding for children with a Record of Need (RON).	Agreed.

	For 2024 base funding per child with a RON is £10,000, and there is top up funding to this where the child has high level needs.	
18	The objectives of the Jersey Premium funding are to improve educational outcomes. In 2024 a secondary school will receive £1,060 per student who is eligible for the Jersey Premium, which surpasses the equivalent pupil premium benefit in England. Schools are given discretion on how to spend the money and are required to prepare strategies and evaluations for the use of the funding, however, the Panel has been advised that schools can potentially use it to support families with the cost of uniform.	Agreed. Jersey Premium rates for 2025 have been uplifted and are: Primary £1,625 Secondary £1,150 Looked after and previously looked after children £2,820 Service children £370
19	The Minister has confirmed that there is further work to be done to assess the support available to multilingual learners. £134,000 was allocated to support multilingual learners in secondary schools in 2024. In practice this funding was allocated to schools for the supplementary allowances, specialist	£134,000 was allocated directly to secondary schools through the formula. Secondary schools will also benefit from the additional investment in lead teachers. Training to enhance school workforce capability to support MLL (multilingual learners) can also be accessed through the central teacher learning and development budget.

	training and the release of the MLL (multilingual language) Lead teachers who provide support to other teachers across the school.	
20	£663,000 was allocated to support students in secondary schools with low prior attainment. In practice, the funding is used to employ well trained teachers and teaching assistants who are deployed to undertake full class teaching or bespoke interventions and support.	Agreed.
21	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning is responsible for providing a ‘first class education system’ but the definition of this, or relevant measurable objectives are not clear. There is alignment between the views of the Minister and public sentiment collected by the Panel, which agrees that the suitable outcomes of secondary education are more than exam results.	<p>The Minister agrees that outcomes for Jersey schools should not be limited just to examination results. The Education department has for some time evaluated schools through analysis of pupil achievement, but also through the analysis of the effectiveness of teaching, of the quality of personal development, behaviour and welfare provision, and the evaluation of the leadership and management that each school offers. School review reports have been published since 2018, and all Government of Jersey schools have a published review report on gov.je.</p> <p>Over the past year the Jersey School Review Framework has been updated with new benchmarks outlining the expectations for schools in the following judgement areas: Curriculum, Teaching and Learning; Behaviour, Attitudes and Attendance; Personal Development; and Leadership & Management. This update has included consideration of review and inspection systems used by a range of jurisdictions including England, Wales and the Independent Inspectorate for British Schools overseas. It has been subject to ongoing consultation with teachers, school leaders and education unions, and comes into effect with its publication later this term.</p> <p>The definition of Curriculum used in the revised review framework is far wider than the named subjects</p>

		delivered in schools or the examination results in these subjects. This updated framework gives detailed definitions of the 'four pillars' of the curriculum: the development of the child; entitlement; equity; and quality. These pillars have been discussed and agreed at the Jersey Curriculum Council.
22	There is a disconnect between the current system of academic selection in secondary education and the Government's ambition to provide an inclusive education.	Noted.
23	The Independent School Review Framework, which provides for evaluations of schools is being reviewed.	After a full cycle of reviews (one for each school) the framework is being reviewed and updated to further improve it based on feedback and experience gained through this first cycle of reviews.
24	When asked about how secondary education should evolve in the next ten years, the public have provided the Panel with a wide range of suggested improvements in areas across education, teaching, leadership, the curriculum, facilities and resources.	The Minister acknowledges the public feedback provided to the Panel.
25	The 14 plus transfer to Hautlieu School is a divisive system which is unique to Jersey. There is no evidence to show if it is the optimum way to structure the secondary education system and it is contrary to other aspects	The Minister notes the Panel's survey responses on 14+ which are similar to previous findings from the Big Education Conversation. There continues to be polarised opinions on this matter, and it is agreed there is no conclusive evidence to show whether it is the optimum way to structure secondary education or not.

	of Education policy relating to Inclusion.	
26	Whilst the deficit for non-fee-paying provided secondary schools has been reduced and further additional funding has been provided by Government for Inclusion support in schools, there remains a perception from the public that schools are underfunded, in some cases may be due to reflections on the resources and facilities that are available.	The independent analysis of public feedback to the Panel, confirms that non fee-paying schools are often considered underfunded <u>in comparison to fee paying schools</u> .
27	The Government provided fee-paying schools (Jersey College for Girls and Victoria College) continue to receive Government funding based on a rate of 47% of the Average Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) formula, however, this could be changed for 2026 onwards.	Agreed.
28	Between the academic years 2021-22 and 2024-25 the school fees for Jersey College for Girls have increased by 21% and the school fees for Victoria College have increased by 20%. These rates are below the Retail Price Index inflation rate.	Agreed. However, a comparison over a longer historical timeline, September 2008 to September 2024, shows an RPI increase of 66.3% compared to fee increases for Jersey College for Girls of 112% and Victoria College of 104%.

29	The Government provides grant funding to private secondary schools, namely, Beaulieu School and De La Salle School on the basis of 47% of the Average Weighted Pupil Unit calculation for secondary students. Additional funding has been provided to Beaulieu School through various means since 2019.	Agreed.
----	---	---------

Recommendations:

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
1	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should assess the legal right to parental choice for their child's education and policies which relate to school admissions and transfers to ensure that flexibility is built into the secondary education framework, particularly for students who do not have the financial support to attend a private or a fee-paying setting.	MELL	Reject	<p>Parents have a right to express a preference as to the provided school at which the parent wishes education to be provided for his or her child. However, the Minister is not required to comply with any preference if this would prejudice the provision of efficient education or use of resources.</p> <p>In practice, where spare capacity exists, places in the 4 provided non fee-paying schools can, and are, allocated to students living outside of the school catchment area.</p> <p>The Minister notes that the Panel's analysis of the survey responses <i>"is not clear if the strong sense of frustration in these responses was at the system or the way the</i></p>	

				<i>question was worded to imply choice.”</i>	
2	The Government should undertake a thorough refresh assessment of how the Education (Jersey) Law 1999 and the Government’s policies relating to secondary education are compatible with the United Nations Convention on the rights of the Child (UNCRC) and current best practice from other jurisdictions. This should include consideration of the compulsory age of education and the education of young people who are held in detention.	MELL	Accept	The Minister agrees a comprehensive review / assessment of the Education Law is required. Whilst it will not be possible to complete this within the term of office remaining for this government, the Minister will make best endeavours to make some progress on this between now and the next election in 2026.	Next political term
3	Any evolution to the English national curriculum may provide a suitable opportunity for the Jersey Curriculum to be reassessed. The Minister should ask the Jersey Curriculum Council to provide formal advice on this matter, to be published in a report to the States Assembly, by the end of December 2025.	MELL	Partial Accept	The Minister agrees a reassessment of the Jersey Curriculum will be required as and when the English National Curriculum is updated. However, the anticipated date for publication of the English report is not until Autumn 2025 at the earliest. Due to this timeline, it would not be feasible for the JCC to provide formal advice with a report to the States Assembly by December 2025. If the English report is published before October 2025 the Minister will aim to lodge a Report with the Assembly within 6 months.	May 2026
4	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should confirm how the £27 million difference between the department for Children, Young People, Education and Skills (CYPES) figures and the Classification of the Functions of Government report for secondary education spend in 2023 is calculated and confirm	MELL	Accept	The Classification of the Functions of Government is calculated following a method described in detail in internationally applicable guidance. Manual on sources and methods for the compilation of COFOG statistics — Classification of the Functions of Government (COFOG) — 2019 edition - Products Manuals and Guidelines - Eurostat	

	how this impacts expenditure in comparison to other jurisdictions.			<p>In brief the following steps were followed:</p> <p>1> take direct secondary school gross costs from the accounts - £53m, excluding fee income</p> <p>2> add a proportion of relevant CYPES' costs including direct support services such as Educational Psychology and an estimate for Mont à l'Abbé secondary - £7.4m</p> <p>3> add a proportion of GoJ central services provided by the COO – e.g. HR, IT - £5.6m</p> <p>4> add depreciation on the school estate- £4.9m</p> <p>5> remove cross charging from other depts featuring elsewhere in the report - (£0.5m)</p> <p>6> remove social security contributions which are shown elsewhere in the report - (£2.2m)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Secondary schools excl income</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Add:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>relevant CYPES costs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>COO costs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Depreciation</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Remove</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eliminations</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Social Security Elimination</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Secondary schools excl income		Add:		relevant CYPES costs		COO costs		Depreciation		Remove		Eliminations	-	Social Security Elimination	-	Total		
Secondary schools excl income																							
Add:																							
relevant CYPES costs																							
COO costs																							
Depreciation																							
Remove																							
Eliminations	-																						
Social Security Elimination	-																						
Total																							
5	The Government should publish details on the outcomes of the Education Reform Programme and confirm how the additional funding has been spent in the last 4 years.	MELL	Partial Accept	The Comptroller and Auditor General plans to carry out an audit of the Education Reform Programme in 2025 to investigate value for money and corporate governance. The findings and recommendations from this report will also be published and responded to by government.	31/12/2025																		
6	The Children, Young People, Education and Skills Property Asset Management Plans should be provided to Scrutiny to review on a regular basis once these are in place. The Panel would like to assess how	MELL	Reject	Property Asset Management Plans are a Jersey Property Holdings responsibility and as such it would be their decision if these can be shared with the Panel in a regular basis.																			

	the Property Asset Management Plans for schools are planning capital expenditure to address any findings from accessibility assessments or audits.				
7	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should explore whether the funding formula for schools could be adjusted in order to provide better working conditions for teachers, particularly in respect of increasing non-contact time available for lesson planning, administration and marking and ensuring that there is suitable wellbeing support available.	MELL	Reject	The funding formula is not the correct stand-alone mechanism to review and / or update teacher's terms and conditions. A review of these is underway and the adoption of its recommendations will deliver better working conditions for teachers.	
8	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should consult teachers on the policy approach for teacher learning and development and reassess the budget provided in the funding formula for continuing professional development for teachers in order to consider: i) whether the structure used in the funding formula is suitable; and ii) if the amount per teacher is sufficient. Teacher participation in professional development should be considered as a metric for the Government's delivery of a first class education service.	MELL	Partial Accept	The Minister commits to providing a breakdown of the training budget allocated through the funding formula, that held centrally and the mechanism for increasing the budget. In addition, he will assess sufficiency, the method of allocation, its impact and to seek input from teachers on CPD requirements through the school workforce survey in 2025.	Q1 2025 Dec 2025
9	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should improve the transparency of the funding formula, for example, by outlining which staff roles are mandatory funded roles and which are the roles where the funding can be repurposed by	MELL	Accept	The school funding formula already specifies which roles are mandatory, but it is agreed this could be expanded upon to provide improved public information. The Minister will seek to make these improvements in the annual publication of the formula in 2025.	30/06/2025

	the Headteacher or school, if thought fit.				
10	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should determine how many of the staff roles named in the funding formula are fulfilled by individuals on zero hours contracts and, if relevant, assess the benefits of utilising zero hours contracts for the roles with regards to both financial and service stability. This assessment should be shared with the Scrutiny Panel and published.	MELL	Accept	The Minister will review the use of zero hours contracts in schools and make this available to the Panel.	
11	For clarity, where funding allocations in the funding formula for schools are not adjusted with a new revision of the formula (for example any non-staff costs) the document should confirm the last time the rates were adjusted for inflation, or otherwise reviewed for adequacy.	MELL	Accept	The Minister agrees with this recommendation as it will provide a more transparent historical record where financial constraints or other reasons have resulted in a formula allocation not being adjusted.	
12	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should consider how greater investment in technology could be made available across schools, accompanied by suitable training for staff and students in how to use it.	MELL	Accept	The Minister agrees to make this consideration.	
13	In addition to the Mental Health and Wellbeing role and the role of School Counsellors, schools should be provided with funding to provide resources and facilities to support wellbeing of the whole student population, for example specific training for teachers	MELL	Reject	In addition to funding for school counsellors, schools have access to the CAHMS Early Intervention Service and to the central L&D budget for training requirements.	

	and staff on how to address student bullying, or ways for the school to engage and support parents and families.				
14	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should change Jersey Premium funding to annually managed expenditure to account for fluctuating levels of need in the future.	MELL	Reject	The Minister does not want to make a firm commitment to change Jersey Premium to Annually Managed Expenditure (AME) currently. The Minister will keep a watching brief on factors that can affect the benefits and potential disbenefits of this approach.	
15	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should establish a separate funding source for provision of uniforms for families in need of assistance, as per obligations under the Education (Jersey) Law 1999 and Jersey Premium money should not be used for this purpose.	MELL	Reject	Charitable and government funding streams for uniform already exist. Help with school uniform costs The Minister does not want to prevent any Head Teacher making an executive decision based on individual circumstances which could see a child disadvantaged.	
16	For secondary education (and each key stage of education) the Government should define measurable outcomes for providing a 'first class education service' to students in Government provided schools. The Panel suggests that the outcomes be broad to include consideration of teacher retention rates, student access to resources and extracurricular activities, assessing academic achievement gaps, levels of parental engagement and, where suitable, school participation in the local community.	MELL	Accept	The Minister will review all existing indicators, including those from the Children and Young People's Survey and the School Workforce Survey. These will inform the development of any new indicators from 2026/7 academic year.	30/06/2026
17	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should	MELL	Partial Accept	This is currently being reviewed. The Minister supports	

	consider wider and more transparent publication of school exam results and the Jersey 8 analysis, to ensure that there are meaningful value add figures publicly available for each secondary school.			transparency for school outcomes and the use of value-added data. Any publication of school outcomes must reflect the different structures and contexts of schools within the Jersey system.	
18	The results of the review of the Independent School Review Framework should be published.		Accept	The updated Jersey School Review Framework will be published in the 1 st half of 2025. A summary of the iterative changes made, can be shared with the panel.	30/06/2025
19	The Education (Jersey) Law 1999, as the framework for the provision of education in Jersey should be reviewed to consider its suitability and adaptability for the future.	MELL	Accept	The Minister agrees that the Law needs revision and modernisation as it is now 25 years old. It is not possible at this time to commit to a timeline, but the Minister can confirm it will not be completed in this term of office.	
20	The system of academically selective transfer at age 14 should be reviewed. The Panel believes that the terms of reference for the review should include a focus on how to improve choice and the whole secondary school experience for pupils attending the non-fee paying Government schools.	MELL	Partial Accept	The Minister is not able to commit to a review of the 14+ transfer at this time. However, with the forthcoming challenge of changing demographics, it will be necessary to consider options for the delivery of secondary education through all Key Stages.	
21	As part of any work to review the structure of the secondary education system in Jersey, the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should place an emphasis on collaboration between all the schools and creating centres of excellence. The Panel believes that this could be achieved through Government funding free sixth form education where further collaboration can occur between the colleges and current on-fee paying sector.	MELL	Accept	The Minister is keen to start conversations on how a reformed 16+ offer could see greater collaboration between schools, maximising opportunity and choice for students with greater efficiency. The Minister will not predict the outcome of this work as there will be many options and opportunities to consider.	

22	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should publish regular figures which clarify any differences between the funding of students at the non-fee paying schools and fee-paying schools so that any changes or disparity in the per pupil funding rates, or overall spend per pupil, are open to transparent public scrutiny.	MELL	Partial Accept	The Minister will commit to publishing the total level of funding received by [groups of] schools with reference to their individual context and the school funding formula as a benchmark. He will also publish capital investment in school premises.	September 2025
23	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should establish a suitable long term and sustainable funding formula for the Government provided fee-paying schools for consideration by the Assembly in 2025. The formula should ensure parity with non-fee paying Government schools for inclusion support.	MELL	Partial Accept	<p>At this time the Minister cannot commit to achieve this in 2025.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate to ensure parity with non-fee-paying schools for inclusion support, as this funding is based on identified levels of need; spend increases when increased needs are identified.</p> <p>Individuals with a record of need get full funding in fee paying and non-fee-paying schools. Inclusion support roles are fully funded in non-fee-paying schools, but where need is very low the Minister cannot, in inclusion terms, spend money where it would not be an effective use of limited resources.</p> <p>By using the SFF the Minister can ensure a consistent approach is used to allocate available funding across all schools which also provides a benchmark against which to assess transparency across the system.</p>	September 2026
24	The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning should commit to making the grant funding and other financial	MELL	Partial Accept	Grant payments over £75k are published and issued in accordance with the Public Finances Manual and require the	

	support provided for educational purposes more transparent.			<p>recipients to publish annual accounts. If the Panel's recommendation is seeking any changes to this, they are advised to raise this request with the Minister for Treasury and Resources as she would be best placed to advise on the feasibility or otherwise of this recommendation.</p> <p>The Minister can discuss further with the Panel</p>	
--	---	--	--	--	--

Minister's Conclusion:

The Minister is pleased to accept and partially accept 18 of the Panel's considered recommendations. Investment in education is a continual priority for the Minister and the Panel's review and report are welcome additions to ongoing future development of policy in this area.