



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 18th January 2018**

*All published Official Reports can be found on the  
official States of Guernsey website [www.gov.gg](http://www.gov.gg)*

**Volume 7, No. 2**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

**Present:**

**Sir Richard J. Collas, Kt, Bailiff and Presiding Officer**

**Law Officers**

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)

**People's Deputies**

**St Peter Port South**

Deputies P. T. R. Ferbrache, J. Kuttelwascher, D. A. Tindall,  
B. L. Brehaut, R. H. Tooley

**St Peter Port North**

Deputies J. A. B. Gollop, L. C. Queripel, M. K. Le Clerc,  
M. P. Leadbeater, J. I. Mooney

**St Sampson**

Deputies L. S. Trott, P. R. Le Pelley, J. S. Merrett, G. A. St Pier,  
T. J. Stephens, C. P. Meerveld

**The Vale**

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, N. R. Inder, M. M. Lowe, L. B. Queripel,  
J. C. S. F. Smithies, S. T. Hansmann Rouxel

**The Castel**

Deputies R. Graham L.V.O, M. B. E, C. J. Green, B. J. E. Paint, M. H. Dorey

**The West**

Deputies A. H. Brouard, A. C. Dudley-Owen, E. A. Yerby,  
D. de G. de Lisle, S. L. Langlois

**The South-East**

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, H. L. de Sausmarez, P. J. Roffey,  
R. G. Prow, V. S. Oliver

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean and S. D. G. McKinley, O. B. E.

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

S. M. D. Ross (H.M. Deputy Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur),  
Deputy C. N. K. Parkinson (*relevé à 9h 35*), Deputy J. P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 10h 06*)

## Business transacted

Evocation .....	85
<b>Billet d'État II .....</b>	<b>85</b>
III. The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick – Debate continued .....	85
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.24 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2 p.m. ....</i>	<i>121</i>
The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick – Debate continued .....	121
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.45 p.m. ....</i>	<i>167</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## **PRAYERS**

*The Deputy Greffier*

## **EVOCATION**

# Billet d'État II

## **COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE**

### **III. The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick – Debate continued**

*Amendment 2 (continued):*

*To delete Propositions 1 to 13 and substitute therefor:*

*1. To agree that the proposals set out in the report entitled *The Alternative Model – A Proposal for Opportunity & Excellence*, which was published by Deputies M.J. Fallaize, R.H. Graham, M.H. Dorey and R.H. Tooley in December 2017, are preferable to the proposals set out in the Policy Letter submitted by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and provide a stronger basis upon which to reform secondary and post-16 education in the Bailiwick, and therefore:*

*2. To agree that from the earliest date practicable secondary and post-16 education shall be organised as follows:*

- An 11 to 18 School in Guernsey operating as one organisation comprising two constituent colleges or campuses on different sites, both of which shall include sixth forms;*
- The College of Further Education operating as one organisation providing vocational, professional and technical education for full-time and part-time students, including apprentices;*
- St. Anne's School in Alderney; and*
- le Murier School and les Voies School operating as Special Schools for students with special educational needs.*

*3. To agree that the Education (Guernsey) Law, 1970, as amended, must be repealed and replaced with legislation setting out, inter alia, the educational aims and aspirations of a modern democratic society, educational policies adopted by the States in recent years and the powers and duties expected of a government in relation to education as it approaches the third decade of the 21st century.*

*4. To agree that the replacement legislation must provide for genuine devolution of governance and leadership from the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture (and by extension from the 'Education Office') to the 11 to 18 School and the College of Further Education; and further to agree that it must provide for the CfESC (supported by the 'Education Office') to focus on 'central*

government' functions – for example, education law, strategy and substantial policy, curriculum, funding arrangements and the accountability of performance and standards in schools and colleges.

5. To agree that the development of the replacement legislation provides an ideal opportunity to consider the most appropriate long-term relationships and governance arrangements between all providers of secondary and post-16 education, including in relation to provision for students with special educational needs; and further to agree that in any event there must be a firm requirement for the strongest possible collaboration between all providers of secondary and post-16 education, including strengthening collaboration between the 11 to 18 School and the College of Further Education for the benefit of students of all abilities and interests.

6. To agree that the 11 to 18 School, operating as one organisation comprising two constituent colleges or campuses, shall have a single board of governors and a single executive leadership team, but the constituent colleges or campuses shall each have a principal and the freedom to develop aspects of their own identity and make their own day-to-day decisions.

7. To agree that the College of Further Education shall have a single board of governors and a single executive leadership team; and further to agree that it shall be an objective of the College to integrate with the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and the GTA University Centre as soon as practicable, most probably to operate as discrete faculties within the same College; and further to agree that it shall be an ambition of the College of Further Education to form a partnership with a UK university, ultimately to replace the title College of Further Education with the title University College Guernsey.

8. To agree that in relation to the admission of students to secondary schools there shall be a two-phase approach to transition: in the first phase the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture shall publish the secondary school catchment areas (or feeder primary schools) for those students who will move to secondary schools in the earliest years which follow the abolition of selection at 11; and in the second phase, once the States have agreed the two sites to be used for the 11 to 18 School, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture shall publish the permanent secondary school catchment areas (or feeder primary schools) which would apply in the long term.

9. To agree that teachers and others working in the education service must be advised of the staff structure for the 11 to 18 School well in advance of the necessary changes to the estate and the inevitable relocation of some staff.

10. To agree that the creation of the 11 to 18 School, operating as one organisation in two constituent colleges or campuses, must be a collaborative endeavour between the four existing secondary schools.

11. To agree that as soon as practicable all students in secondary and post-16 education must have access to the best facilities the Island can afford in a purpose-built 11 to 18 School, operating as one organisation in two constituent colleges or campuses, and in a purpose-built College of Further Education.

12. To note that the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture commissioned architects to assess each of the four existing secondary school sites for use as part of one 11 to 18 School, operating as one organisation in two constituent colleges or campuses; and further to note that the existing secondary school estate is capable of accommodating this model of education; and further to note that the feasibility studies advise that more detailed work is necessary to determine the two most appropriate sites for use; and further to agree that this more detailed work shall be undertaken to allow the States as expeditiously as possible to determine the two most appropriate sites for use.

13. To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to submit to the States all Propositions (and Policy Letters) necessary to enable:

- the organisation of secondary and post-16 education, and
- the preparation of the detailed legislation necessary to implement the legislative changes, as set out above.

**The Deputy Greffier:** Billet d'État II, the continuation of the debate.

**The Bailiff:** And we continue with amendment 2.  
Deputy de Lisle.

**Deputy de Lisle:** Thank you, sir.

From where I stand, and what I have heard, there are good policy initiatives in both models and also in the alternative that the ESC put forward, which was option 2 actually, the three schools with attached sixth form and CFE moving to one site. And there has not been a lot of discussion with regard to that, so it is interesting. While there has been much finger-pointing with regard to infrastructure, both models will require major building works to accommodate the different visions.

Now, the issue with regard to Education during the election concerning the electorate was the scrapping of selection, or the preservation of the *status quo*, not the rebuilding of La Mare Primary School or the building of enhanced sports facilities at La Mare Secondary, or the revamping of post-16 education, or the College of Further Education. Nor did the electorate presume that this would lead to the closing of their community schools. There were pleas for the promised rebuild of La Mare de Carteret Secondary School.

We have at this point in time two educational Committees running head-to-head with two different policy initiatives and this has led to disruption, uncertainty and upheaval to our children's education at all levels and to those working in it, perhaps indeed for years to come. We have to get any change right.

There are risks of committing to either system; critical is the potential destruction of the excellent reputation in education that Guernsey holds, and the stability required for our young people to grow and prosper. There is nothing to suggest either model of transformation would lead to better outcomes here in Guernsey. What happens in other communities with a larger population base and greater financial resources would not necessarily succeed in Guernsey. Both models are controversial and untested in our community. The key objective must be to maximise excellence and opportunity for all our students in state schools.

Now, we are a divided Assembly and we need to initiate a call for new leadership to take us forward with a new strategy. It may be a composite of both policies to come back to the Assembly. The ESC Education Committee is unsure of their direction and is initiating new directions with amendments to gain support, and one of the main architects of the three-school model wanting a working party to restructure post-16 education. We need to pool ideas and work together to produce a successful model of educational reform that the community will stand behind.

I call at this time for ESC to consider their position in full, and a new Committee be formed to put forward the best educational strategy for our children's future.

Thank you, sir.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson, you wish to be relevé?  
Deputy Kuttelwascher.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Thank you, sir.

Where to start? I am going to start with a more general issue which I call 'Government blunders' and I think it is relevant because they are quite easily identifiable. This is my tenth year in this Assembly and I have seen a few, witnessed a few, and experienced a few.

Going back to the 11-plus debate in the last term and this term, I consider both the outcomes to be blunders for the following reasons: they have caused a lot of distrust of Government, there are financial costs, there are no definite plans on the table as to possible outcomes and we are still

55 talking about what might replace the 11-plus. I have got no issue with the 11-plus being debated but I do have an issue with it being, as it were, given a date when it will start, with nothing yet in its place.

60 I want to go back to a little story. It was 27th December last year and I was on the Clipper, and being a seasoned traveller I picked the right boat which was not cancelled. I met somebody, a local resident who recognised me but I did not know who they were, and he expressed his personal concern – he had both his young children with him – and he was so concerned he was even considering selling his house and going into rental accommodation to fund private education, because he did not know what was coming.

That is where we are with a lot of people. I have had emails recently pointing out that it is the uncertainty that is the problem; and this was caused by a majority of this Assembly. Like it or not, that was the decision.

65 I now want to go to last Thursday where I attended the presentation by the gentleman from the Cotswold School, as I am calling it, which I later found out is called the Cotswold Secondary Academy, not comprehensive. As for his presentation, as to the areas relating to the value of 0-18 education, I was quite impressed. And then he went off-piste big time. Not only did he suggest that if anybody in Guernsey wanted to send their kids to a grammar school, they should emigrate to Kent to make room for teachers to come here to feed our comprehensive system, which I thought was terrible, he also suggested we should not only – which is fair enough as a political point of discussion – decide whether or not to subsidise private education, he went further to say we should shut them down!

75 **A Member:** That is exactly what he said.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** At that point I shouted 'Shame', not too loudly, the last few rows heard it, and I left the room. In spite of all that I am going to support the two-school model, because I do not really take a lot of notice of the guy who came in support of it, it was his first visit to Guernsey.

80 I want to focus on the word 'Academy' now, because there are two words which are toxic to some people: one is '11-plus' – well, there are three – another one is 'Grammar School', and another one is 'Comprehensive'. So let's get rid of the lot! Just get rid of it!

85 What we could have is two secondary academies – what is in a name? (*Interjections*) It will not be a grammar school. (*Interjections*) Well, there you go. (*Laughter*)

I also want to address something that I found particularly attractive about the two-school model and it was actually brought up by the guy who runs the Cotswold School. He said, 'Oh, the top stream in both of these secondary academies could be regarded as the grammar school stream' – and he used the words! And I thought, you would be pretty bold to try and do that. But the setting could actually be equivalent to a grammar school setting, and another setting to the high school setting, and all settings in between.

95 Now, this, I think, might upset Deputy Stephens because she feared that, but the difference is this: you will not be set by the 11-plus, you will be set by other means. And it seems to me that the only issue is, it is nothing to do with selection, it appears that selection is all right if you have both, shall we say, the grammar school set and the high school set on the same educational estate. That is all right. But sending them to different schools is not all right. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

100 Fine. (*Interjections and laughter*) So we are happy with selection, but calling it a different name. And I am dead serious! I am very supportive of what is being proposed in a two-school model, because what is better than one grammar school – than two?

And now I have put on what used to be my hat on Economic Development, this current situation is having a negative impact on our economy. I had a text yesterday from someone who went to England to interview somebody for a high-flying job and they turned it down because of the uncertainty over the education system, they were not going to come here because they were



not going to put their kids through that. It is causing a problem. And that is a piece of anecdotal evidence, but it is not the only one, and the colleagues of mine who are on the new Economic Development will soon find that out – and two of them voted for this chaos, as I call it. *(Laughter)*

Even in P&R at the time, two were supportive and two were not, and one abstained. We are split down the middle.

Now, I said I would vote for the two-school amendment, fine. I was going to throw a curveball initially, and I may still have to throw it, because what has happened since is that Deputy Ferbrache, in his wisdom, came up with an amendment which I fully support. I think to have an arbitrary date which we are trying to work to, rush to, and maybe come up with a bit of a hotchpotch of a solution, is really not the way to go forward. We should not stop what we have got until we know what is going to replace it – it is as simple as that.

My curveball was this: I would vote for the two-school amendment and at the end of the day they become the substantive Proposition, and I would vote against the lot, because I do not really like either of them completely; but the second one, the two-school amendment, is the better.

The reason for that is not to just stop the process, it is just to say that the two-school model has got a long way to go to be completely transparent in everything that it wants to do. And we have now found out that the three-school model has not got all its 'i's dotted and 't's crossed – it reminds me a bit of Deputy Roffey. I opposed the first amendment that was passed yesterday which was proposed by the Education Department, because I consider it what I call an 'appeasement amendment' – they found a problem and they are trying to paper over it. It is a bit like a patch after you have been hacked, it just patches the problem. The problem may still be there but it patches the effect. I do not like it, I did not like it, I voted against it.

Now, their second amendment is even worse because that then includes bits of money, some figures plucked out of the air, about 'Oh it will cost £3 million to £4 million here and so much there'. And why are they doing it? Because there is a fear of now losing the three-school option, purely because it is not quite as complete as was hoped for.

So you know my position, I intend to vote for the two-school option. I also intend to vote for the amendment put forward by Deputy Ferbrache, because to me that is part of the issue. To me it is a common sense amendment. I did say previously that common sense was not very common in this Assembly – well, we have got the opportunity soon to bring it back.

So there we are, I support the two-school amendment, it is the better option longer term, and we will not call the top stream a grammar school stream. And when it comes to the amendment and whether we should actually work to this particular arbitrary date, I suggest that is not a good idea without actually knowing what is going to replace it.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Langlois.

**Deputy Langlois:** Thank you, sir.

At the beginning of his speech yesterday, Deputy Roffey made a very important point which I think is lost on Deputy Kuttelwascher. Anyway, it bears repeating. It was not the end of selection that has caused the uncertainty; we had and still have four 11-16 schools on the Island, one with a sixth form centre attached. All removing selection did was replace the allocation to one of those schools by test and to the remainder by catchment area, with the allocation to all four by catchment area. It was that simple.

Complications only arose initially from three secondary issues, not directly attributable to the decision to end selection. Firstly, one of those four schools was in a poor state of repair and due to be rebuilt. Secondly, the four schools have the capacity to accommodate 21½ entry forms, when the current school population only requires an 18-entry form estate. Thirdly, predicting future capacity requirements depends on many variables. The ending of selection offered the tantalising prospect of a more efficient resolution of those issues which were essentially about buildings.

After consuming a great deal of debating time in the last States, the March 2016 three-schools resolutions emerged. Inevitably they were vague on some specifics, but that was not due to the decision to end selection, it was because the premise that extending the three newer schools would be more cost-effective than rebuilding La Mare de Carteret had not been fully tested.

The Committee for Education, Sport & Culture took on the unenviable, perhaps impossible, task putting flesh on those Resolutions. They did try lateral thinking – their option 6, revealed at the workshop in January last year, was almost identical to what is now known as ‘the alternative model’. Back then I imagine a majority of States’ Members would have agreed with the five head teachers’ contemporary comments on the option: ‘It has many merits; however, we recognise this would not be acceptable due to large school size and the number of school closures this would entail.’

Possibly only Deputy Dorey, a long-term advocate of two 11-18 schools, used up his red dots on that option. *(Laughter)* But I stand to be corrected.

What has changed since the workshop is that the Committee has worked up the favoured three-school option but important aspects of the proposal have faced criticism. Crucially, rather than abandoning La Mare, they propose rebuilding it with a capacity some 45% higher than Les Beaucamps, disappointing both those who were originally attracted to the potential saving and those for whom schools of a broadly comparable size is important. The Committee also resurrected an idea first mooted then dismissed in the 2001 policy letter, a full-time 16-plus college. That has not gone down too well with the College of Further Education.

In that context, when the alternative model was revealed with its outcomes before building sub-text, it seemed very fresh – the Gordian Knot was being cut. I do still have some concerns about the practicalities and costs of the alternative model, but that might be due to my long background in construction industry. The problems that bedevil many decisions in a small island are often related to scale, for instance determining an appropriate scale of provision and achieving an optimum solution given the constraints of scale.

Our secondary education system is a prime example of this, there is never going to be a perfect secondary education system in Guernsey but, in my view, the authors of the alternative model have wrestled with the problems our school size throws up more successfully than the Committee. They and their supporters in the education professions have shown that the merits of option 6 make it more than acceptable, that the losses inherent in consolidation are worth paying.

I will therefore be supporting the amendment.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I would like to just declare an interest as Governor of the Ladies’ College. However, they have no opinion on this matter. I am speaking as an individual Deputy and my opinions are my own, as they say.

I have grown to detest Education debates. For me, the nearest equivalent is having your wisdom tooth out. *(Laughter)* It starts off with a dull ache and then you hope it is going to be okay, but it gets worse and worse and you know you have to have that appointment. You know you have to have a date with destiny that cannot be put off. When you get there, much like the debate itself, it can be uncomfortable with lots of weird noises all around you. *(Laughter)* Afterwards you are still numb until that wears off and then there is that residual bit of soreness and the hole in your life.

However, the lead-up to this debate has, to use another dental pun, capped it all. We should not be where we are, we have two models in front of us, both of which have flaws. We have a teaching workforce which feels it is not being listened to, parents who want certainty and children asking both of them, ‘What’s going on?’

This should not have happened. What we should have seen is a single policy letter being the culmination of proper consultation, and not of the tick-box variety, and working together. I remember well working together with Deputies Condor and Fallaize in the last term to get a solution to the Machinery of Government changes insofar as they related to the Scrutiny Management Committee. We could have fought it out in the media but we did not, and ended up with a solution acceptable to all.

The problem has been for too long the obsession over buildings. Once St Sampson was built there was an expectation for every school to be replaced. Les Beaucamps should not have been rebuilt, at least not before La Mare.

The amendment seeking a three-school model perpetuated the problem, but it does have to be seen in the context of the debate in March 2016. But to argue that funds should not have been made available to investigate the alternative model at this stage are false. I believe it is probably to save time and money. The alternative would have been that we would only have had the policy letter in front of us today but also an amendment directing that there would be an investigation into the two-school model.

The policy letter does not provide a slam-dunk argument for the three-school model as we have already heard before and during this debate, and it is highly likely that there would have been sufficient doubts for such an amendment to be successful. As such, it would have resulted in a much longer delay before a final decision was made.

Anyway, we are here now, and can and must make a decision now. So what should it be? Well, I am not an educationalist. Now, they are interesting beasts and if you put two together you will more likely than not get two opinions and that is not quite as impressive as economists who, when you put them together, you are more likely to come up with three. But still, it is not helpful to those of us who have not lived in that world.

We had two people over from the UK recently, which has been spoken about – one representing an 11-18 academy and the other, sixth form colleges. Both believe their model makes sense. The figures prove it! And today and yesterday we have heard from those who believe passionately about one structure or the other based on 'evidence', in inverted commas.

I do not care where the buildings are. On an Island of 25 square miles it really is the least important issue to be worried about. I used to have to walk and take a bus to school every day further than Guernsey is long. It really is not what we should be worrying about.

This is not really – it really isn't – about bricks and mortar. It has become obvious to me that the number of schools is really a red herring. You can play around with the number of rooms as much as you like, but it is the organisational structure that will make a far bigger difference to educational outcomes than the physical structure.

There really is no reason to get hung up on which school will be closed or which will be rebuilt. In our brave new world we need to consider all the schools we end up with as new, whether they are completely rebuilt or not. They will not be community schools but Island schools.

The recent presentations from Messrs Morgan and Watkin were very interesting. I did not agree completely with what either said although there was useful information to take on board. However, the most telling comment for me came from Mr Watkin, when he was asked why, if sixth-form colleges were the answer, was Mr Morgan's Cotswold Academy doing so well?

His response was, 'Well, that is just because Mr Morgan is a very good head teacher'. Now, that really did stand out for me because isn't that what it is all about? Effective leadership! **(Two Members: Hear, hear.)** It certainly has a huge role to play: through the right leadership, the right culture develops.

It is as true for Education as it is for Health & Care, it is not the buildings that matter, it is the people. Those people are the teachers, but they are also the parents and young people. No education system will reach its potential unless each is engaged and empowered, and transformation will not happen unless there is a culture of empathy, integrity, honesty and respect. Therefore, whilst I have of course considered the merits of two- and three-school models and believe one to be preferable to the other, how I vote is ultimately going to be based on which

260 model will enable real transformation to take place, which is informed by what we are trying to do at Health & Social Care.

For me, a key enabler for change is replacement of the Education Law. It was put in place in 1970, before I started school and before a few in this Assembly were even born! Times have changed somewhat in the last 47 years, as has legislation in other areas – a clear example being the Children’s Law which puts the interest of the child at the centre, not the Education Office.  
265 (Two Members: Hear, hear.)

Where you have a Law that has the following as a clause, you know it needs updating:

No woman shall be disqualified for employment as a teacher in any States’ school or voluntary school, or be dismissed from such employment, by reason only of marriage.

Is that really necessary in 2017? Okay, I get it for 1917, I get it for 1967, possibly, but 2017?  
(Several Members: 18!) 2018, sorry – (Laughter) I am already behind the times.

270 A Member: It has been a long speech! (Laughter)

Deputy Soulsby: I will finish off about 2019!

275 There are also pages over religious instruction but nothing on mental, physical, social and emotional wellbeing. It also includes requirements for the Medical Officer of Health which are past their sell-by-date and will need to be considered in line with the Propositions approved by us only last month, and I quote:

[The Committee] may, by direction in writing issued with respect to all States’ schools and voluntary schools or with respect to any of such schools named in the directions, authorise the Medical Officer of Health to cause examinations of the persons and clothing of pupils in attendance at such schools to be made whenever in his opinion ...

– his opinion –

... such examinations are necessary in the interests of cleanliness.

Really? In 2018? (Laughter)

280 I was really pleased to see that the alternative model calls for rewrite to the Education Law. This was something I called for in my 2012 manifesto and have been disappointed nothing has been done in the last five years. In reality we should have had a policy letter on this Law before we decided the number of schools. But anyway. Only the alternative model appreciates how important this change is, which really bothers me. Why don’t Education, Sport & Culture make  
285 much of it? It seems obvious to me – but then I am not an educationalist.

The other thing that surprises me that is not in the policy letter, given that it had come through loud and clear from the conversations I have had with teachers from a range of institutions in the last few months, is how little there is in the policy letter about the governance and leadership structure other than to say:

... senior management ... [will be able to] focus on educational outcomes.

290 Now, this is odd, given the first sentence states that:

First and foremost this Policy Letter is about transforming education in Guernsey.

We had an eleventh-hour amendment but that just causes delay. We really do not need an advisory panel. The College of Further Education has a shadow board already; it just needs a switch turned on.

295 What was clear from both speakers recently was the autonomy that schools have now with head teachers being responsible for multi-million pound budgets and held accountable for them. We hear from the Committee that they cannot make savings and their budget is too low, and they may well be right. The percentage cuts to budgets are not themselves evidence based. However, I

do believe that savings can be made or greater value can be obtained through the devolution of governance and leadership.

300 I suppose my disappointment with Proposition 3 in the alternative model's amendment is that there is not a deadline set for a policy letter to come to the States.

Now, I am not going to repeat what has already been said in terms of the benefits of the two 11-18 versus the three 11-16 with a sixth-form college that really is not a sixth-form college and a technical college which is only a part-time college. Deputy Roffey is the one that has summed up  
305 best, to date, the benefits of the former over the latter.

However, the best arguments in support of the two-school model have come from the senior teachers in the recent letter from Denis Mulkerrin, with the current themes being resilience, breadth of curriculum, ease of recruitment and inherently greater effectiveness and efficiency. Education, Sport & Culture talk a lot about costs – what is the cheapest? But they ultimately are  
310 silent on value for money, cost-effectiveness, efficiency.

In his trip down memory lane yesterday, Deputy Inder did not mention the fact that was something I brought up during the 2016 debate. The cheapest does not necessarily mean the best – 'throwing good money after bad' being the operative phrase.

It is not that I do not think the Committee sincerely believes their model is the best, I just think  
315 their mind-set is wrong. This is not a growth mind-set but a closed mind-set. One particular statement bothers me which exemplifies the problem, and I quote:

Research evidence indicates that students in Sixth Form Colleges do better at A-level than those in both school sixth forms and FE colleges.

Really that is a nonsense statement: how on earth can you prove that statement beyond reasonable doubt? You cannot unless you can specifically do a controlled experiment. The reality is that every school in the world is unique and dependent on the cohort, catchment, staff and  
320 other external factors. There are so many variables and you cannot state that is the case for every single student. If it were the case there would be no sixth forms attached to 11-16 schools – and it is not the case anyway, as Deputy Fallaize made clear in his speech.

I think part of the problem is the obsession with equality of opportunity, that phrase beloved of the Education Department for many a year – again, something I picked up on in March 2016. It  
325 appears 24 times within the policy letter and the ESC President mentioned it more than once. But what does it actually mean? What values are they seeking to use to judge it? We do not know. It can mean more than one thing and my concern is what the Committee means by it.

I use the example of how they helped out with 'gifted and talented' in their policy letter to demonstrate it. Now, it is my amendment that is referred to. At the time I laid it, the Education  
330 Department said it was not needed. If anything demonstrates why it was needed it is when you read the section entitled 'Stretch and Challenge' and more specifically paragraph 3.43, where it states:

All our children and young people have their own unique gifts and talents. It is the job of every education system to nurture and feed these unique talents.

Paragraph 3.44 talks about the amendment and 3.45 says how it would draft and publish a policy, but apparently a considerable amount of work has already been done to provide the  
335 opportunity for young people to be – and I quote:

... stretched and challenged ...

Reading that, it felt like they were saying, 'Get in your box, Soulsby, this is about selection and we do not want any selection'. And no, it was not, it was absolutely nothing to do with selection. All it tells me is that they paid lip service to this amendment and have done no research whatsoever. It is clear to me that they have entirely missed the point that those who are gifted  
340 and talented often have other challenges, including autism, anxiety and mental health issues. If

any of them had actually met such children and spoken to the teachers who absolutely do nurture them, they will hear how such children need extra support and not just in developing their gifts and talents but for their mental wellbeing.

345 Such children can suffer a synchronous development. They are often seen as awkward, perfectionist; they have the imagination and ability to see beyond the obvious which can make them feel very different.

As I said when I spoke to the amendment, a review of gifted and talented provision in Scotland suggested that the focus on equality of opportunities and reluctance to consider any form of selection in the Scottish education system meant that the needs of gifted and talented pupils had  
350 largely been ignored. That was written, incidentally, before the PISA figures showing the problems facing the Scottish education system. So I was pleased that a better appreciation of what a policy for gifted and talented children might encompass was provided in the Alternative Report.

Now, similar to equality of opportunity and not quite understanding how to deal with it, there is the other buzz phrase – ‘parity of esteem’. Apparently there is an issue between academic and vocational routes – that is news to me. Anyhow, I fail to see how this can be resolved by putting  
355 all full-time students in one building. What is more likely to achieve parity of esteem is to rebalance funding and put more money into the College of Further Education, give staff long-term contracts and let the Board of Governors and the head just get on with it.

The relation to page 16 there is the *tiniest* mention of two levels in the policy letter, and this is  
360 surprising as it looks like they represent a revolutionary change in technical education. Indeed based on what Mr Watkin said it would appear sixth-form colleges, far from providing all level three courses in the future, are likely to end up just teaching A-levels, with technical colleges teaching T-levels. That would imply this idea of having one school teaching full-time courses and another part time would be out of kilter with where qualifications are going, and that is even  
365 ignoring the fact that we were told that sixth form colleges are level three establishments designed to get students into university.

So finally and in summary, I said I was not an educationalist, but I do not need to be able to make the right decision through taking a logical approach. It is self-evident that the alternative model provides the best option for the future of secondary education. This is not just because  
370 having two 11-18 schools plus the College of Further Education is more advantageous than three 11-16 and two other unique institutions, but because it is providing the environment for transformation. And transformation will only be a success if it has the people behind it; and you cannot get everyone behind it but at least sufficient to make it happen. My real concern is that, should the policy letter be passed, the Committee are going to have an uphill battle in getting  
375 people to that point.

We know teachers are concerned, we know industry is concerned, and others, and that does not bode well. Ultimately this is about change management, not buildings, and for me the alternative model creates the environment for that change to happen and the model that will provide the potential for a step change for education in the Bailiwick. It provides a basis for a  
380 really exciting future for star students and ultimately for the Bailiwick as a whole.

**The Bailiff:** Yes, sir, do you want to be relevé?

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Could I be relevé? Thank you.  
385

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

**Deputy Green:** Sir, thank you very much.

In many ways, the proponents of this amendment have come up with a very impressive vision.  
390 It is a very impression vision. It is at a late stage. I do not think in any way amendment 2 is a programme for government that is ready to be implemented and ready to go now; I think it is a work in progress, as others have said. I think essentially the two-school model that we have

presented by way of this amendment is not really a properly worked-up programme that can be implemented from day one.

395 I had sympathy yesterday with what Deputy Laurie Queripel said in terms of we were not faced with two fully worked-up models. We have the model that the Committee *for* Education, Sport and Culture has presented and I think that has some significant flaws in it, and we have, on the other hand, what is a fairly impressive vision, as I have said, but without some of the crucial lacking detail.

400 I do think in many ways amendment 2 and the proponents of that amendment make quite a strong intellectual case, or philosophical case, for 11-18 schools as such, but I do not believe I can necessarily support this amendment now because I think some of the crucial practical questions that are not fully answered, or certainly have not been answered to date, mean that what we have here is incomplete, the answers are not there, and I am not sure I can vote for something that is  
405 incomplete at this stage.

As I say, sir, there are undoubtedly many positive points in this amendment. The case that has been made by Deputy Fallaize and others about the overwhelming number of the top-performing academy and comprehensive schools in the UK being 11-18 schools is a powerful point and I have tried to wrestle with that as best as I can, but what I really want to hear on that point is from  
410 members of the Education Committee and Members of Education, Sport & Culture on why we should not make the obvious inference from that data that has been supplied by Deputy Fallaize and others. Is it really a case that those schools are highly successful schools because they are 11-18, or is it for other factors? Is it for other reasons?

Deputy Fallaize had a visual aid yesterday that was so small I do not think any Members of the  
415 Assembly, apart from myself because I sit next to him, could have seen it – I believe all of the 11-18 schools were in blue and the 11-16s were in yellow ... I am now trying to find it, sir. It was the other way round, yes. Here we are, yes, the vast number of the schools in the top – top 100, I assume – are in orange and the ... Sorry, the top-performing 11-18 schools in this league table are in orange and the 11-16s are in blue. That does at least imply that there are some 11-16 schools  
420 in operation in the UK which are successful.

The point I am driving at here is that I really want to hear from Members of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture how they rebut that obvious point, the obvious inference that there is a substantial wait – a real platform for success, if you like – in having an 11-18 school, and I think until we have heard that we are not really having a proper debate here.

425 As I say, much to admire in amendment 2. The strong, positive endorsement of ‘a genuine devolution of governance and leadership’ as per the Proposition at paragraph 4 at this moment is very encouraging. It is an unambiguous and firm commitment to proper devolution; and, for whatever reason, I have just never had that impression that the Committee have really had the same kind of positive encouragement about devolution. I know there has been that amendment  
430 now which has changed the term slightly, but I have never really got the impression that it is ever more than slightly half-hearted with the Committee, I am afraid.

There is also the point about the educational ... which others have mentioned, and the key point here is that you cannot really deliver on devolution and local management of schools unless you do have legal reform. Deputy Soulsby was entirely right, the Education Law in Guernsey is  
435 1970. It was based upon the 1944 UK Education Act, which was actually itself based on the social conditions of the 1930s. One of my greatest disappointments in politics is having not been able to do much more on the previous Committee in terms of LMS in particular but also in relation to the Law, so there is unfinished business that absolutely must be progressed if we are serious minded about genuine reform and transformation of the education system, and we need that new law in  
440 place to give us that platform because essentially you cannot devolve powers properly without that legal platform.

So one of the key problems with the proposals from the Committee is that I think it is wrong in principle for the state to withdraw 100% from 11-18 educational institutions, and again that is a key strength of this amendment, no doubt.

445 The strongest case that can be made for schools which take full advantage of the so-called  
economies of scale is really the key argument for 11-18 as an approach rather than 11-16. In other  
words, the larger the schools the greater the possibilities, is the way that I would put it, and I will  
not go into the detail of that but the points have been made well, particularly by Denis Mulkerrin's  
recent letter to the *Guernsey Press* on that. That is, if you like, how you maximise your bang for  
450 your buck in terms of educational opportunities.

So all of that, sir, makes a strong intellectual foundation for two 11-18 schools and I do not  
have any problem in acknowledging that and accepting that, but I, nonetheless, have strong  
reservations about this amendment because for me these concerns that I am going to set out in a  
moment do weigh very heavily on my mind and do mean that I feel I ultimately cannot support  
455 this amendment.

First of all, all of the implications seem to suggest the totality of the capital expenditure for this  
two-school model would be substantially more expensive than any other option that is on the  
table: substantially more expensive than the Committee's proposals, substantially more expensive  
than the 2016 proposals that the previous Department advocated but were rejected. We are  
460 talking about a model that would involve substantial extension and adaptation of two schools. It  
would require, as I understand it, a purpose-built further education college. We are talking about  
the strong possibility of compulsory purchase of land surrounding the site at Beaucamps, if that  
was deemed to be one of the appropriate sites, which it may well do, and it would indeed  
potentially imply that the current school at the Mare de Carteret would become something of a  
465 white elephant, which would be a problem for Government in a different way.

I will come to the key point right now, which is that we are being sold the potential educational  
benefits of this particular model, but at this stage I do not think we can make a proper analysis of  
whether those potential educational benefits on offer are present and whether they justify the  
costs that we are potentially looking at, because there is no real position about the capital costs or  
470 indeed the revenue implications further down the line.

The costs in terms of capital expenditure are unknown and undetermined at this point and I  
keep on hearing members of the public say to me, as an individual Deputy, that the States needs  
to be more fiscally prudent. I wonder whether it is genuinely fiscally prudent to endorse this  
model at this present time when the totality of the capital costs of this model are unclear. How  
475 can we know whether this is affordable? As others have said, it is not just a case of the cost, as  
important as that is. If you do not know the cost you cannot begin to assess the value for money,  
and that is why we need to be able to make a proper assessment about what the benefits of this  
potentially are against those costs – and we are not in a position to sensibly do that today so I do  
not really believe that we should be writing a blank cheque for this amendment, even if it is in  
480 many ways a very powerful platform for future reform in Guernsey and perhaps a much more  
powerful platform than the proposals from the Committee. Getting the actual principles of reform  
is obviously all well and good, but we do need to make sure that we are doing this in a way which  
represents true affordability and value for money.

Secondly – and this is a point about logistics – it is disappointing to me that the proponents of  
485 this amendment have not been able to put all their cards on the table in terms of which schools  
should close or be repurposed and which should remain open and be extended or adapted. We  
are being asked today to make a definitive decision on the principle, on the concept, of a two-  
school model. I am not entirely comfortable with the idea of positively endorsing that two-school  
model today without knowing the full feasibility analysis and without knowing the full details and  
490 the full costs involved of potentially a big programme of extensions and renovations. Essentially, I  
think the cost and the practicality of the two-school model really turns on the actual sites chosen,  
but we do not know that detail.

What happens if the States does endorse this amendment today and then at a later date down  
the road we discover that the costs are entirely disproportionate or certain sites are not truly  
495 feasible for what we are envisaging? We do not have those details now. I understand why we do  
not have those details now, but as ever ... I am trying to think of a way of putting this without



using a cliché. I am going to have to use the cliché: the devil is always usually in the detail with this sort of thing. So I do not want to overlook the logistical difficulties. I am not sure we have sufficient information to make a fully informed decision. I do not think we should downplay the logistical difficulties that this amendment has to confront.

I understand that the proponents of this amendment are pursuing a very laudable when they say that policy and structure should be driven wholly or mainly by educational outcomes. I think in an ideal world that is exactly right and it is certainly true that policy and structure should not be led solely by the buildings in your estate; that cannot be right. I am afraid the Committee, I think, to some extent are guilty of that latter remark.

Can I refer, sir, to paragraph 5.5.4 in the alternative model, which is luckily a very brief statement? Paragraph 5.5.4, page 92 in the document 'The Alternative Model – Proposal for Opportunity and Excellence – Because our students deserve better', and I quote:

What is right educationally must take precedence. Sites and buildings should follow, not drive, educational policy.

It is difficult to argue with that at a conceptual level, but what it is calling for really, in my view, is a council of perfection to say that we should design the system essentially from scratch as if we had a blank sheet of paper. We know that we cannot really do that. We know that we do not have a blank sheet of paper. I do not believe we can entirely disregard the existing state and I think to virtually do that is to take idealism one step too far.

The future plan for secondary education has to be a practical one and to that end we need to aspire for and to the best educational outcomes, but in light of the estate legacy that we have and the hand that we have been dealt by our predecessors. I do not think this Assembly can really say, in effect, never mind the logistics and the financial implications. There has to be much more of a meeting of minds – of trying to achieve the best educational outcomes, of course, but within a logistical, sensible, affordable plan. That is where the consensus needs to come around. We need a kind of practical idealism, not conceptual purity. I am afraid amendment 2 to some extent ... Maybe it is the way I am reading it. I am sure Deputy Fallaize will have lots to say when he sums up – he usually does!

I want him to deal with this point. Is one of the key criticisms of amendment 2 the fact that they are putting too much weight on conceptual purity rather than the realities of the system that we have to confront? We do need to approach those difficult questions. Signing up to a concept without the details, in my view, just is not practical and I find that on the basis of the incomplete information ... and I am not sure we are doing things in the right order.

The third argument is I accept the case to rationalise the educational estate. That was not my position in the debate in March 2016, for obvious reasons, but I do completely acknowledge the case for rationalisation and I do accept that we should be trying to take advantage of greater economies of scale. But I do think that trying to ... Somebody made this point yesterday and I cannot remember who it was but I do think trying to conflate a number of different issues in a change programme is always quite difficult for the States to do. We are obviously going to consider the best way to try to transition to a non-selective system but we are also going to be trying to rationalise significantly the education estate at the same time. This equally applies to the Committee's proposals as it does to the two-school model.

I think it was Deputy Roffey yesterday who said in some ways it is actually easier to do it moving from four to two than four to three, and I accept that but it is still an issue with the two-school model as it certainly is with the Committee's proposals and I have always thought ... I thought this is March 2016 and I still think the same thing, and I understand why it makes sense to rationalise at the same time as moving to a non-selective system but I do think the States is in danger of biting off more than it can chew. We do not have the best record in big change management programmes and I do think we have to be realistic about this. Trying to do everything at the same time does not always work well and when we have to confront that upheaval and that disruption it must come back to whether the case has actually been made for the educational benefits that amendment number 2 is saying will happen. We have to weigh that

in the balance: on the one hand, the upheaval and the disruption; on the other hand, the benefits that may or may not actually be forthcoming. And what is the quantum of that impact? If we do move to 11-18 schools, what is the actual level of the impact, the beneficial impact that children will actually see, that parents will actually see? We do not know.

Sir, I think I have probably gone on long enough. In these circumstances, given my practical concerns about upfront capital costs, the lack of clarity in terms of which schools might have to close and the dangers in the States biting off more than it can chew, I cannot really support this amendment at this stage, even if I do recognise its conceptual advantages.

I will just conclude by saying I think the reason why we are in this position ... we are in a very difficult position because we have this amendment in front of us that does have many advantages. I do not feel that I can support it today, but the chances are that in different circumstances I might have been able to support it. But I am afraid the reason why we are in this position is because the policy letter that has been produced by the Committee is just not up to it, and that is why we are in this very difficult position today. Nonetheless, sir, I cannot support this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, sir.

Five years ago I would probably have supported a four-school model with retention of selection at 11 – sir, I have been on a journey, as many of us have. In my speeches in the previous debates, in particular at the March 2016 meeting, I said the advice which finally swung me over to non-selective schools came from my eldest daughter, a qualified teacher, who now works for the UK civil service. When I asked her for her views she said, ‘Dad, it is all about the teachers, if you have good teachers you will have great schools.’ She explained that other factors that were controllable, such as school size, made little difference to performance. Most of the other factors which do make a difference, such as parental influence, are not controllable. And it was a fact that a majority of teachers at that time, including the head teachers, were strongly in favour of all-ability schools. It was said that Guernsey’s selective system was a disincentive to UK teachers to come to the Island, with a clear implication that this inhibited recruitment and retention of the best. It was also clear that the existing system does not serve the bottom 20% of the ability range well.

As we now consider the structure of secondary education I have found myself on a similar journey. My view is that either of the models before us today could produce good results and that three schools of around 700-800 pupils could perform as well as two schools of 1,200. Instinctively I prefer smaller schools, where teachers can know the names of most of the pupils and a school can have more of a family feel. But this debate is not just about school size it is also about the organisation of post-16 studies, and the two interlinked issues present me with a dilemma.

Considering the number of schools catering to the 11-16 age range in isolation, my preference would be for three schools and not only for the reasons already mentioned. Three schools would result in less concentration of traffic and less impact on neighbours than two larger schools, even if there are no showstoppers in the two-school model. And, importantly, the three-school model would make better use of our existing estate. I know the purist will say that we should plan to achieve the best educational outcomes and then decide the shape of the estate around that plan, but I share Deputy Green’s concerns that Guernsey cannot afford to ignore the substantial investment it has recently made in new schools. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

If operating costs were the determining factor I do not believe that the case for two larger schools has been made. By the time one factors in the additional cost of capital, in what would certainly be a more expensive development programme, I think the annual revenue savings, if any, of moving from three schools to two schools would be insignificant. And incidentally, I cannot help remarking that I think this would be true of the four-school model as well.

Education, Sport & Culture estimated the cost of refurbishing the Grammar School, as it is, at £17 million, and we can assume that the cost of building a 600 pupil school at La Mare would be

similar to the £35 million cost of Les Beaucamps. So we could have had four new schools for about £50 million. I accept that further investment would be needed at the Les Ozouets site, but I doubt that we will recover the additional capital investment in either the three-school or four-school models through revenue savings within the design life of the schools. But the States was offered the opportunity to support a four-school model, when I stood for President of Education, Sport & Culture in April 2016, and rejected it – so I will move on!

On balance, purely looking at the 11-16 provision, I prefer the three-school model, for the reasons given.

However, when we consider post-16 provision the issues are somewhat different. Here the choice is between the horizontal integration that the Education, Sport & Culture Committee proposes, merging the Sixth Form Centre with a full-time provision for students under 19 from the College of Further Education, with the vertical provision proposed by the supporters of the alternative model. The alternative model merges the sixth form into the secondary schools and keeps the College of Further Education separate. Supporters of the Education, Sport & Culture model say that horizontal integration would create larger merged faculties, for example, embracing various art subjects from photography to design and so on. But supporters of the alternative model point out that there would be many specialist A-level courses with insufficient students to need more than one teacher and, in some cases, less than one teacher, leaving the provision of education very exposed to single points of failure. By merging the sixth forms with the secondary schools a teacher of A-level chemistry, for example, would be employed part of the time teaching GCSE chemistry and one could potentially have more than one chemistry teacher to create resilience. It is clear to me that the majority of secondary school and tertiary teachers, perhaps not including the teachers at La Mare de Carteret, which would not be rebuilt under the alternative model, strongly support the alternative model.

Taking this into account, and bearing my daughter's advice in mind, I prefer the alternative model proposals for post-16 education. The problem is that one cannot pick and mix. It would not be practically possible to have three secondary schools, each with a sixth form – there just are not enough pupils. One could have two or three schools, with one sixth form attached to one of them, but supporters of the alternative model say, with some justification, that would not provide equality of opportunity. And, arguably, it would not make best use of the specialist teachers required to teach A-levels because the A-level teachers would only practically be able to provide support to GCSE courses at the school to which they were attached.

So what is the deciding factor for me? Well, in the end it is all about the teachers. I just have to hope that the States can find a productive use for whichever schools will become redundant under the two-school model.

I wish we had greater certainty over costs, timelines and transition plans, but simply on the fundamental issues, I think the post-16 provision in the Education, Sport & Culture proposals are too flawed to be supported. Sir, unless the Education, Sport & Culture Committee can show me that they have a better solution to this issue, I cannot support them.

I think the alternative model offers the potential for a better performing system than the ESC proposals. I recognise that this potential can only be realised at a significant and unknown cost, and that is a concern. But Guernsey's main natural resource is its people, and we risk undermining our competitiveness in an increasingly competitive world if we do not aim for educational excellence. The alternative model is something of a leap of faith, but it is a leap that I have been persuaded to support.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater and then Deputy Smithies and Deputy Yerby.  
Deputy Leadbeater.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, I would just like to start with a little excerpt from my manifesto from 2016, from the section 'Key Election Issues at a Glance'. On education I said:

I do think that selection at 11 needed to be improved or removed, but it would have been better if Education had offered an alternative first.

I will move on to my speech, but I will refer back to my manifesto further on in my speech.

Sir, I, like the rest of States Members, have consulted many on the run up to this massively important debate, including teachers, parents, grandparents and young people, those in or not long out of our education system, and I have read and taken on board all of the letters and emails that I have received. And just as during the selection debate, much of the correspondence consists of completely opposing views and opinions. There are also some I have spoken to that are completely opposed to both models. Those who feel this way believe that they are being completely disenfranchised by these two options. It feels like we are saying to them, 'Okay, you are going to be water-boarded, but you have got the choice of either still or sparkling'. So many have different views and very few have shown to be optimistic that whatever is decided today will be the best option.

The only group that I spoke to which stood out in favour of one model over the other were the young people themselves, I am not saying that those I spoke to are totally representative of all young people in Guernsey, but those I have spoken to much prefer the three-school model as proposed by the Committee of Education, Sport and Culture.

Some Members may have heard a group of students from the College of Further Education talking on the *JKT Show*, earlier this week. They were each asked by Jenny which of the two models they preferred. All of them preferred three smaller schools as opposed to two larger ones; they each had their own reasons why. Now you may have had a completely polar response if the group being interviewed were products of the Grammar School system and currently at the Sixth Form Centre, or we may have had exactly the same response, I cannot tell you this.

Sir, firstly I will briefly speak on the Committee's proposals: out of the two options I have favoured three smaller schools from the beginning, for many reasons. But the post-16 offering from ESC and the lack of clarity regarding LMS and an expedient change to the Education Law are concerns. The fact that the vast majority of post-16 educationalists believe that the Committee's plans are unworkable have to make you sit up and listen.

The alternative model, one school over two sites, 11-18, has one major flaw for me: it is not 11-18 at all; it is 11-18 for some – those opting for an academic route – but it is 11-16 for the rest, and because it will only be 11-18 for the more academic students I feel it will only provide mentors and role models for this group of young people and the less academic – historically those mainly from less well-off backgrounds – could find themselves isolated from the higher achievers, and this is a major concern for me. Young people from more disadvantaged backgrounds are the ones that would benefit most from mentors and role models within their school environment. I would like to hear how this will be mitigated in summing up.

Sir, the alternative two-school model entitled, 'A Proposal for Opportunity & Excellence', in my view, does not provide equality of opportunity and excellence for all students. The post-16 models and mentors that the two-school lobby outline as being a fundamental part of this system completely ignores those students, like I was – those who are not academic at school, those that will enter into an apprenticeship or take another pathway apart from an academic one will not have the opportunity to mentor those younger and much like them will be mentored by those older and much like them while at school. Sir, because of this I believe there is absolutely no parity in this part of the plan. Not the equality for all that a non-selective system is supposed to provide.

To me this is actually a selective system or a de-selective system, whichever way you want to look at it. It is not the type of selected system that we have now, but is selective in the equality of opportunity and excellence it offers to all students between the ages of 11-18. The more academic young people will get a better deal than the other students and for me that is not acceptable. That is, however, only if you believe the importance of post-16 mentors and role models, as outlined by Denis Mulkerrin in his letter. Equality for all our young people is not just an option; it is an absolute must when designing an education system for the modern world now and for the future.

705      Whichever system we adopt has to be flexible. It has to work closely with the likes of Skills  
Guernsey and the business community in order to foresee the skills that will be needed to further  
underpin and develop industry in Guernsey for years to come. By the time children entering into  
our education system now are ready to leave school there will be new careers, jobs and skills that  
have not even been invented yet. Our society is evolving at a massive rate and we need to ensure  
our education system stays ahead of the game. Our education system is a production line for the  
future staff of Guernsey businesses and I believe there needs to be more involvement from  
business in general. But this is no ordinary production line – we do not want to put students on a  
conveyor belt and just remove the imperfect ones – we need to put far more effort into  
710      maximising the potential of those who would not be considered perfect, giving them the extra  
support they need in whatever pathway they choose.

715      Sir, I fully agree with Deputy Stephens, there needs to be a timely review of the Education Law  
and there has been little mention of SEN schools going forward in either proposal. I would like to  
hear concrete plans for special educational needs provision that can demonstrate to me that  
improvements will be made. And by this I do not mean integration with mainstream, I mean more  
support and training for SEN teachers and staff, which I believe is lacking. I would have loved to  
have seen mention of much needed vast improvements in transitional arrangements for SEN  
students post-16 into either further education, work or adult disability service. There are massive  
problems here and everybody seems to want to avoid the issue – I do not and believe me I will  
720      not.

Transitional arrangements, with any changes to our education system, have been at the  
forefront of my mind, even before I was elected. I will quote you from the last line of my piece on  
education contained within my manifesto:

We must be careful those students who will be in or entering secondary education when the changes are introduced  
don't suffer during the transition.

725      Sir, this remains a priority for me regardless of whatever is decided today. We cannot let these  
students down just because others in the future may benefit.

It seems pretty obvious to all that nothing any of us says during these and the closing  
speeches will have any effect on the final vote. But whichever way it goes, I would urge the entire  
Assembly to unite, demonstrate to the public and educationalists that we are professional and  
then to put our heart and soul into making whatever model is chosen be the best it possible could  
730      be.

Thank you, sir.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

735      **The Bailiff:** Deputy Smithies. (*Applause*)

**Deputy Smithies:** Thank you, sir.

I take it the applause was for the speech which has just concluded rather than the one that is  
to come. (*Interjection and laughter*)

740      Neither model we are considering at the moment is perfect, nor in fact was the system which  
we have agreed to abandon. But ultimately we are trying to achieve the impossible; we are trying  
to find a system which fits in with outcomes equal to the UK or particularly England and Wales,  
but the UK is useful shorthand. There are several reasons for this: employers need to recruit staff  
based on comparable qualifications, students need transportable qualifications, teachers need  
745      continuity and similarity of syllabus and other reasons as well, which I will not go into. But trying  
to find this system, which is similar to that in England and Wales, is made hard because we do not  
have the population or the demographic or the budget, or indeed the legal framework, to mirror  
the UK.

Because the evidence presented in support of both models is valid, the only true evidence I can draw on is indeed my own experience. I have taught. I retrained as a teacher 20 years ago – at the Mare de Carteret and the Grammar School and at all three of the independent colleges – and all were excellent. I personally – and this is going back into ancient history – attended a 13-18 school and the sixth form of that school was seen as a goal to be achieved and it actually provided an incentive to the pupils at the school. From a teacher's point of view, sixth form teaching helps to inform and enhance teaching lower down the school.

So my conclusion is to support this amendment, but I will continue to listen to other speeches to find out if there is any subsequent speech which will convince me otherwise. What will not persuade me is the argument that we must make a decision today, even if it is the wrong decision. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) If this amendment falls I will probably support Amendment 7, the Ferbrache, Kuttelwascher amendment.

We really must get the future education right and we must not be railroaded into taking the wrong decision. What will not convince me either is to go with the Education, Sport & Culture recommendation which has been well thought out, well researched and is well presented, but I cannot go down that route because I think it is a little bit ... to quote Belloc 'Always keep a-hold of Nurse; for fear of finding something worse.' *(Laughter)*.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

**Deputy Yerby:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy Smithies has put me in a slightly awkward position as I was about to put it to Members that we cannot walk away from here today without having made a clear decision. I do not think that we have that luxury.

There were, at the start of this process, three choices before us. One of them would have been to go with ESC's proposal. Another would have been to support the alternative model, which we are now debating and the third would have been to dust off old proposals or develop new proposals that we favoured ourselves. If the 32 of us, 31 of us, who have not done any work developing alternative proposals now say that we cannot support either of those on the table then that is to our great discredit. To defer a decision now, sir, is absolutely unconscionable. We owe the people of this Island, the future of our educational institutions and, above all, the children and their families' certainty. We owe them the clarity of a way forward. And since I have not come up with a model of my own, and since others here have not done so, it falls to us now to evaluate the two that are on the table. And so, sir, I want to address particularly those colleagues who have already spoken, whom I respect, and to whom I hope I can address some of the points that they have raised when they are wavering in terms of making a decision, to help encourage them to come down in support of the alternative model.

Beginning with the speech that was made by Deputy Green, it seems to be that he missed one fundamental point, which was more or less reflected in Deputy Leadbeater's speech when he said the majority of post-16 educationalists fear that ESC's proposals are not viable. That seemed absolutely unambiguous from the email that we received from the Deputy Head of Sixth Form at the Grammar School, who set out the curriculum modelling that he had done on behalf of the Committee which absolutely, unequivocally, demonstrated that the post-16 proposals, as put forward by the Committee, are not viable. At the simplest we have one set of proposals on the table which will not work so does the alternative model offer us a proposal which will work? Because if they do then the decision is already made, one that won't and one that will – we may or may not like it. It is fashionable this morning to say it is not perfect and it is probably not the system that I would have designed, if I had had the energy and conviction to put into designing a system – but I did not, and this is what we are facing. And to be honest, if I had done as much research as the group behind it, I would probably have found myself much closer to them than I expected to be 18 months ago.

800 Deputy Laurie Queripel said that he was very reluctant to make a decision in support of the alternative model that would allow it to steam on ahead without all the practical detail in place for its implementation and I understand and completely sympathise with that position, but what I think the research paper and the proposal on the table before us have shown is that there is at least enough evidence to demonstrate that it is viable. What remains to be determined is what configuration of sites are optimal. So we know we can do it, the question is how do we do it best to get the best use out of States resources and the best longevity out of the next stage of our educational development. For me that satisfies the question, 'do we have a workable alternative on the table in front of us?' And we do.

810 But to give Deputy Queripel a little more comfort, the capital costs of either the alternative model or the Education, Sport & Culture Committee's proposals are sufficient that, following due States process, the business case for the redeveloped educational estate would inevitably have to come back to the States for approval. So we will reach a point in this process where we have all the financials, all the practical details for implementation and we are asked to sign off on that. We are asked to sign off on the cost benefit analysis, we are asked to sign off on the specifics, we finally stamp it and say yes, we can do this; it is the right thing for Guernsey.

815 Deputy Jane Stephens is right, we cannot just put the small details away and talk about the high level principles. But so long as we know that the shape of what we are planning to do is viable, then we do have a second decision point further down the line where the bits of missing information, that are causing some Deputies concern in the process of this debate, will come back to the table and we will finally have the chance to sign off on them. I think that is really important to bear in mind because if that question of the detail, the practical implementation is a showstopper for some Members of this Assembly it should not be. There will be a real opportunity for proper scrutiny and good governance in relation to that.

825 There is, of course, also ... and I had this conversation with Deputy Queripel before the States meeting, but it is relevant to all of us. If the Assembly approves the amendment and the alternative model proposals become the substantive proposals, we have the opportunity to amend them, just as we would have done the original proposals. Now, I may regret saying this, but if Members feel very strongly, for example, that this meeting needs to put more emphasis on the need for public engagement, that needs to be absolutely clearly spelt out in the final set of resolutions, then it is entirely within Members gift to call for a recess, to work up the necessary amendment, and to make sure that becomes one of the final set of propositions that is agreed by this Assembly. So to let these proposals fall because they fall short of perfection in some regards, which can be fixed through the process that we have in front of us today would, I think, be a great shame and, again, a let-down for the children and futures and families of this Island.

835 When Deputy Prow spoke yesterday he was critical of the process that has led us to this point, on a number of grounds. One of them was that P&R was funding an official opposition and I think that does need to be addressed because the composition of the team who have put together this alternative amendment is made up of half Deputies who supported the removal of selection and half who did not. If we were a party system it would be an entirely cross party working group – it is not an opposition; it is made up of people who are trying, as sincerely as the Education Committee, to deliver the best educational outcome for the children of this Bailiwick.

845 It is far better, as Deputy Soulsby has already said, to have done the research beforehand, to have arrived at a point today where we know that a two-school model would be viable. Yes, we do not know exactly what configuration of the two schools is optimal, but we have tested the concept; we know that if it is approved it will work and we do not have to introduce unnecessary delay into the process. Far better that, than for an amendment to have been sprung on us at the last minute to say actually go away and think about a two-school model, because 18 months later the Committee could have come back and said, 'Well, that is not going to work', and what is another 18 months of uncertainty? We know from past experience that all that does is drive up cost, drive up the emotive nature of the argument – it does not solve anything. It is completely

850

remote from the commitment that most incoming Members of this Assembly made to no flip-flop government. So although the process was unorthodox, in my opinion, it was entirely constructive.

I will remind Members of this Assembly that there was an attempted amendment to the Policy & Resource plan update last summer, where Deputies Fallaize and Tooley asked for Education to bring their proposals back to the States much earlier, as a green paper. That would have meant that the Committee's proposals would have been at a less complete state of development but it would also have meant that there was time, at an earlier stage in the process, for the Assembly to be entirely clear about its preferences and for the work to go into preparing a more detailed alternative model if that had been the outcome. So it is not fair to say that this amendment is an abuse of democratic process. Every attempt, I believe, has been made to make it constructive and to use the tools available for this Assembly to bring the debate forward in a way that will be inclusive and informative and help us to reach the necessary conclusion.

Deputy Laurie Queripel spoke yesterday about local management of schools and I completely agree with him that there needs to be a supportive and well thought through process to achieve this, but it is a million miles away from privatisation of public services. It is much more like when we have talked about the Financial Transformation Programme, Members of this Assembly, including Deputy Laurie Queripel, have been more than a little disappointed that it has resulted in ... if not cuts to frontline services, then at least changes that negatively affect frontline workers. Deputy Laurie Queripel is one of the Members of this Assembly who most of all recognises the value of the frontline. And what local management of schools does is it empowers that frontline. It gives much more flexibility to those who are working with our school children on a day-to-day basis to meet their needs, to deliver what works best and to be flexible.

Deputy Leadbeater spoke about the need for flexibility and local management of schools which comes through much more strongly in the alternative model than in the Committee's proposals. It is definitely one of the things that will help us to achieve this. I would I add to that that I feel the two-school model is structurally more flexible as well. It will be easier, for example, if we discover in future that 11-16 education delivers better outcomes to reverse from the models that include sixth forms than it would be to add in sixth forms to a three-school model, both in terms of the physical sites and the staffing arrangements and so on. So I think if flexibility is a key consideration for Members, again, the two-school model has got to be the way forward.

Deputy Jane Stephens spoke early, as I often do when I am genuinely in need of convincing and of hearing the arguments in favour of one model or another. One of the first things that she spoke about was her concern that 11-18 schools might be costly to run, with lots of travel between the two sixth forms. I cannot, of course, speak with the authority of those who are proposing this model, but my reading of the proposals is that that is very unlikely. From my reading of the proposals it seems plausible that the majority, if not all the subjects, will be capable of being taught on each site. The one school, two site model is much more about one school in terms of governance and senior leadership than it is about one school in terms of the day-to-day experience of the pupil or curriculum sharing. Of course, there will be niche subjects, particularly at A-Level and IB, and possibly further down the school, where pupils may need to travel between schools, but I imagine that those pupils will be more like I was in school and in quite a significant minority rather than in the majority of the educational cohort. From everything that I have read in the proposals I certainly am not worried about a lot of travel time for either students or teachers between the two sites.

I am also extremely sympathetic to Deputy Stephens concern that neither model is satisfactory in respect of SEN. Deputy Leadbeater has spoken more fluently on this than I could, and I am sure that other Members of this Assembly will after I have spoken. But what I must do is credit the leaders of the alternative model with at least putting the issue on the table. From my experience looking as SEN from my early days when Deputy Stephens and I were working on the Visibility and Inclusion Strategy, she as a politician and I as an officer, I know that this is a fraught area, I know that transitions, as Deputy Leadbeater has said, is a particularly difficult area, and it is absolutely one that is worthy of much more attention by this Assembly. It is worthy of a policy



letter in its own right, it is worthy of constructive, inclusive debate which brings the community along with it.

905 I would not be surprised if whatever review is done under the alternative model or by the Committee, ends up being taken this Assembly by an alternative model of its own because there are deeply and passionately held and absolutely incompatible views about SEN and they need to be aired and they need to be thought through. But I do think that at least with the alternative model we get this issue back on the table and I think that begins to give it the status that it  
910 deserves. But it will absolutely require the energy and the conviction, as Deputy Stephens and other Members of this Assembly to make sure that is carried forward and becomes an important part of our deliberations beyond this debate. So I agree with her, SEN should be much more than a bit player in this discussion but we have an open door and let's push it wide.

In closing, and referring to Deputy Stephens, I think wearing her head teacher's hat and  
915 marking the homework as the alternative model proposes, (*Laughter*) she said there was lots of use of 'should' and she would much prefer 'will' and I would too, but I think we have to be a little bit realistic about this. Deputy de Lisle has called for the Committee to consider their positions and for there to be new leadership. That may or may not happen; the Committee may or may not consider that to be necessary if the alternative model proposals are approved. Let's assume they  
920 do not, this would not be the first time that they have said okay we are going to set aside our convictions about what is right for education and carry on with delivering what the Assembly has told us to do. (*Interjection*) Members laugh but I intend that matter-of-factly and not with any degree of slight. Will the alternative model work even if the current committee who are presently opposing it are the ones implementing it? I believe it will, sir. I believe that, first of all, because it is  
925 one that is very much owned by the professionals. It is one that is owned by those who are going to be doing the day to day labour of making this transition succeed.

When we agreed to remove the 11-plus I felt strongly that it mattered, because the teaching professionals supported it. But I felt equally that it would only succeed if those teaching professionals continued to do the hard work, not only of campaigning it, but of reassuring that  
930 the transition worked well for their students and for those who would be coming in to their schools and from every contact that I had with those professionals I believe that that was at the forefront of their minds and I believed that they would do so. And so approving a model that is supported by the professionals is definitely one way of giving it its best chance of success.

The other issue is one of resources. Deputy Parkinson said ultimately any model could work, and to a degree, yes, any model could work, if we were willing to throw the right resources at it. But which model has the best chance of success in a difficult environment? Which model stacks the deck in favour of our children's education, even when we are operating in resource strapped times, even when this Assembly is perhaps not prepared to give the education system the support that it needs to become world class? Well, I think the two-school model is a hardier plant. I think it  
940 is structurally sounder and therefore better set up to ensure that our children thrive, even when times are tight, even when we are operating in a politically or financially difficult environment. And so, if I want to improve the odds of our children's success the only option on the table for me is to support the alternative model.

945 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Clerc, before Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Le Clerc:** Thank you, sir.

Many Members have said that they are not an educationalist, and I am not an educationalist, I am not a parent and I am never ever going to be a grandparent, but I do care passionately about  
950 our young people and I do spend quite a lot of time doing some voluntary work in some of our schools.

I will try and keep this short. There have been some very thought-provoking speeches and, for example, I might not agree with all that Deputy Prow has had to say but I thought he gave an excellent speech, as did Deputy Stephens and Deputy Soulsby today. However, I find myself most

955 aligned with Deputy Roffey's thoughts and I agree with almost everything he said in his rousing speech late yesterday.

I too was uncertain when I first read the alternative model, for the same reasons that he gave and in particular the view on the 16-plus education. However, after attending several meetings last week I now believe that the best way to deliver the best possible education for all our children, but in particular our 16-plus children, is to have 11-18 schools delivering academic qualifications but with the ability of pupils' desire to take some vocational courses at the College of FE. I understand that there are only a few people that take up this offer at the present time, and even with changes to what might be offered at 16-plus in the future with better planning and timetabling with the College of FE I think we could get some flexibility of choice into the two-school model. I have less concern than some about IB being delivered on just one site, as the numbers are relatively low at 17 – and thank you to ex-Deputy Peter Sherbourne for his email last night because he gave me that number. If this number increases, perhaps there would be the option to deliver on both sites.

The presentations last week also gave me an insight into the T-levels that will be introduced in the UK from 2020. This really was the lightbulb moment for me as we have heard very little about these forthcoming changes and only a couple of paragraphs in the ESC policy paper, paragraph 3.69. I think that the only way in which we will be able to deliver these much more work-focused qualifications is through one college and that should be the College of FE. They already have the strong links with the business community and will be working with the GTA and the Institute of Health and Social Care. I have some real concerns about the new T qualifications and how they will eventually replace current BTEC qualifications over coming years, but that is not part of this debate. However, what we must do is invest in the College of FE. It must no longer be the Cinderella part of our education delivery. The buildings must be fit for purpose and we need to change mind sets of parents and young people that it is not a second-class option; and most importantly, whatever we decide today, we must ensure that young people and their parents are given the correct guidance and the signposting to the right route of 16-plus education to reduce the dropout rates and engage them in post-16 education that is right for their ability.

Sir, I could continue but will only be repeating many of the points already made. Therefore, I would firstly like to congratulate my G4 colleagues for all the hard work they have put into their proposals for offering an alternative view, and although not quite perfect for me I will be giving them my support as I think it will give us both some consistency and potentially more flexibility for the future changes that will come along as academic and vocational qualifications develop over the years.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, I start with a question and I shall finish with three. The first question is: what is the collective noun for a trio of former lady Education Committee Vice-Presidents? I wonder, sir, if it is perhaps a 'delight', and if it is not, it is certainly a delight to see them in the Gallery here today. Same old Lyndon, ladies! Through you, sir! *(Interjection by the Bailiff and laughter)*

There can be no doubt that this debate concerning the structure of secondary and post-16 education is both complex and challenging and will have a significant impact on the Island in the future. There is no perfect model for the structure and shape of secondary and post-16 education, and the challenge facing the Assembly is to agree and commit to a model which best fits the Island's context and the strategic long-term priorities for the education and development of all of our young people.

The Island context has a significant influence on the outcome of this debate, and in particular the three key factors which make the context unique, namely the size of the Island's population and subsequent cohort size, the percentage of children within the grant-maintained independent

colleges and the clear drive for savings and efficiency. These three key drivers remain constant and in the face of numerous expert opinions should not be underestimated.

Those who say Guernsey is not different to other places are, of course, wrong: we are very different from the UK. Nowhere in the UK are a third of all students privately educated. We have one of the highest privately educated school-age populations in the world, leaving approximately 400 students in each year group in the state schools, and yet this key dynamic is pretty much overlooked in both sets of proposals.

Seven years as a director of an 11-18 school with oversight of a primary school has taught me – and I quote directly from Denis Mulkerrin CBE's letter – that I am able to agree with these points: it is easier to recruit staff in 11-18 schools as teachers are able to teach their subject at A-level for part of the week; it is easier to very accurately set pupils for subjects according to their ability in a particular area – as he says, set 1 for English, set 3 for Maths and so on – and this does allow for better teaching and learning; and there is a wider choice of subjects at GCSE; importantly, pupils can discuss A-level opinions with staff who have actually taught them. That is the experience of myself elsewhere, sir.

We are repeatedly told that it is not about buildings, it is about the quality of the teachers. If it was as simple as that we would simply pay teachers in Guernsey 50% more than their UK equivalents to attract the best. I say 50% because we already, according to independent reports, pay our teachers 30% more than their UK counterparts to start with. What remains so disappointing for me is the cavalier attitude towards privately educated students, whose sponsors save the Guernsey taxpayer more than £10,000 per student per year. These figures are not door numbers, sir; they are very substantial figures indeed.

I turn now to costs. Deputy Le Pelley stated in his opening remarks that ESC cannot sign up to a structure with no known price tag, and Deputy Fallaize was *very* careful to advise that from a capital cost perspective the alternative proposals are likely to cost more. We have no idea how much more, but clearly there is potential for – I think it was Deputy Green who covered this – compulsory purchase as one such traditional cost at premium rates; of that you can be certain.

Within its wider mandate the P&R Committee is also mindful of the impact on the Island's construction sector associated with the longer timeframes with the alternative model, or for that matter the delay to ESC's proposals if its own amendment is ultimately accepted to look again at comparative sites.

I would like to finish, if I may, with three questions for the proposer of the amendments, and it is becoming increasingly unusual in debate for Members to ask questions but these three I do think need to be addressed.

If the Assembly supports the alternative proposals it cannot be and it must not be with an open chequebook. Despite letting the train leave the station, the usual hurdles of affordability and availability of funds and value for money will need to be maintained. I cannot ever remember a proposal so bereft of detail before and as a consequence I ask this question specifically: does the proposer accept the above criteria will and must apply?

My second question is: does the proposer of this amendment believe that our community understands that two of our existing schools will actually close as a consequence of this amendment? Does he believe that our community understands with sufficient clarity that most relevant point?

And thirdly, does the proposer accept the irony that a move to two 11-18 comprehensive schools replicates the model of the highly academically successful Ladies' and Elizabeth Colleges, including in terms of their comprehensive intake in all cases but save in one respect: their respective size?

At the end of the day, in the absence of any overwhelming arguments in favour of either, this matter becomes entirely one of political judgement and I am at my most uneasy when I cannot evaluate something entirely objectively. Notwithstanding that, this is what we are paid to do; it is a matter of political judgement.

I make this point because I want it recorded for the future, sir: by the *narrowest* of margins I will support the alternative model.

1060       **The Bailiff:** Alderney Representative Jean, then Deputy Le Tocq.

**Alderney Representative Jean:** Thank you, sir. Excuse me reading from my iPad.

          I am delighted to see Alderney well included in the papers on the two-school model. I am also aware of the considerable achievement with regard to St Anne's School in this year. In talking to  
1065 the headteacher at St Anne's in Alderney, Martin Winward, although it has taken time he now has a full complement of teachers at our school, which means as selection falls away, Alderney's school is better able to take pupils through its all-age range to 16 and then on to further education in Guernsey. All this has been achieved by Deputy Le Pelley and his Committee.

          St Anne's School has passed validation inspections with flying colours, although selection and  
1070 loss of the 11-plus was back then a disadvantage for Alderney and formed part of my reasoning to vote for selection to remain. Part of my concern then centred around the fact that under previous committees St Anne's School was beginning to suffer from a misguided savings culture that was, in my opinion, causing the standard of education there to slip as part of the effort to save. Teachers were being flown in from Guernsey to cover certain subjects and they were trying  
1075 to do it by video-scan as well, relying on an airline that even then was sometimes not able to get the teachers where they needed to be and at the right time. Because of this I voted for selection to remain. As I said, years ago my own daughter – when I first spoke on this subject – passed her 11-plus but made a decision to remain at St Anne's School. In those days that was possible. The school sustained her well and she got good results.

          I want to say thank you to Deputy Paul Le Pelley and his present Committee: you have achieved, together with Martin, a great deal and I am more reassured that as selection goes I am able to say that one reason is that Alderney's school has the capability to take its own pupils right through to 16, and that is good and I thank you for it. Alderney's school is more secure in keeping pupils of all ages. Because of its low number of pupils it is essential that our school does. If either  
1085 of the proposals were to attempt to increase incoming numbers to Guernsey, this could jeopardise the future of our Alderney school as the roll could drop below a viable number, so that does create a difficulty. Each scheme can only offer a certain amount to Alderney, but what I would like to know from the two-school model is that they would sustain the amount of support that is present now, which enables the Alderney school to do its job. I am very grateful to know  
1090 we will be involved in whichever process is chosen and you are all including Alderney in that process.

          That is the Alderney part of my speech. I now want to centre remarks on the bigger picture and on Guernsey too. I realise that both the three-school model and the two-school model can do what is required. I want to centre my remarks around the existing Education Committee first. They have not buckled and nor have they given way. Under enormous strain they have survived a vote of no confidence and have produced a three-school model, though it is perhaps not as complete as some people would like. Although they did not support that concept then, they have done it. I have nothing but praise for this Committee and their Chairman, Paul Le Pelley. They are a feisty group and they are survivors.

          But this cannot be just about that. How did such a momentous change come about which led to the two-school option? I may be wrong and if I am I will duly apologise, but my belief is this: if the two-school model is adopted, the present Chairman, Paul Le Pelley, and his Committee should be sharing in the credit for that too, and it is my strongest feeling that they should remain in place to assist in implementing the two-school model. I believe full access was provided by Education Committee and the funding for the two-school model was provided by P&R.  
1105

          We all remember the truly excellent speech by Deputy Graham supporting selection and the 11-plus not long after his election to this Assembly. Since then his views have changed, by his own admission in an interview on Radio Guernsey. I put it to you that all those changes took place

through the learning curve and being a Member of this Education Committee, and so some credit for this must be due to the present Committee, its own efforts and work.

I believe the two-school model will succeed in this Assembly. Most Members of the present Committee say they will leave. I should, by right, vote for a Committee that has definitely delivered the goods for Alderney and I will say this now: I am in a difficult situation. I am also aware that we have been well included in the two-school proposal and would like to know that they would sustain the level of support. I would like to vote for it and I have changed my mind too about selection at 11 for St Anne's, and that change only comes about because St Anne's School can do its job again as it properly resourced again with the tools to do its job right through to 16, entirely due to this Committee. If I knew that this good Chairman and most of his Committee would remain, I would place my vote more easily. My decision, if they would say that this Committee for Education, Sport and Culture could stay and implement either scheme chosen by this States ... I realise I am asking for the best of both worlds, and in my opinion at least I should let the present Committee know that this will not be an easy decision for me to make, only to say as well that my mind is on what is best for Guernsey and the future provision of education for the generations to come. The decision I must make must be a rational one and sadly cannot include personality.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I will be brief. I know it is dangerous to say that because normally when people say that to begin with they end up going somewhere else, but I think I will be brief primarily because a lot of what I would have said has been said already. I think it has been good that Members have not drifted into other areas. I will be brief as well because I have to confess the run up to this debate I have found particularly depressing, depressing for politics and for Guernsey, and I think we owe it to our community to move forward expeditiously and effectively and, if possible, together as far we can because this particular issue, perhaps like the issue of selection itself, has divided our community and polarised people and, as a result, some very unhelpful things have been said and some things have been done that I think are very difficult to undo. However, I will have to give a little bit of personal history to begin with to explain how I have come to the conclusions that I have.

I think I am the only remaining person in this Assembly, not in this room, who was on the Education Committee – Education Council, as it was known then – back in 2000-01 in that first term that I was elected. During that time I changed my views on selection very quickly but I also supported a model then that was three schools with a tertiary college, that was put to this Assembly and this Assembly rejected. Instead there was a pretty much eleventh-hour amendment without a lot of evidence behind it to build a sixth-form centre to extend the Grammar School sixth form to what it is today. I continued on the Committee for the rest of that term and we began to implement those particular proposals.

I say that as background to what I am about to say because the amendment before us now is something that was considered in the run up to that debate back in 2001. Two schools at the time, two 11-16 schools, was considered to be something that Guernsey would not accept and would certainly have been much larger than the projections of today because the figures in terms of population at that time were different than they are today, and so three ... Even then three were considered to be large, but things have moved on since then.

When the Committee for Education, Sport and Culture came and presented its ideas to P&R back in the summer I have to say, as someone who had supported a vote of no confidence a year ago, back in January 2017, that I was encouraged because what I thought I heard then was very much a tick in the box of the things that the States had on two occasions resolved to do in terms of the restructuring of secondary and post-16 education and also, surprisingly to me, it seemed to

me that what they were saying was that they were coming to the conclusion of three schools and a tertiary college, which for me had been the thing I had supported 17 years ago. So, when people talk of delay and 'we must move forward today', I think, 'Well, I want to get this right.' In my mind, I have already been waiting 17 years for this, so a few moments more does not make a lot of different; I want to get it right.

I have to say I was encouraged at that point, and yet when their substantive proposals came to light in October what I saw there was not what I thought I had heard back in the summer, and I think particularly, as others have mentioned, post-16 did concern me quite significantly. Basically, and it has been said, it seemed to me we were risking a model that has no comparator elsewhere, and even those who currently work within the institutions we have got say it would not work here. I am very concerned about that and I certainly am not happy with that going forward at all; I could not support that.

Also, things have changed very much since those days when I supported a tertiary model. I did so at the time because I had my children who were coming up to their 11-plus, had chosen to go into secondary education and then move forward into the sixth form. We were living in an era back then where it was very difficult to do, for example, what my youngest ended up doing, which was courses such as photography, art and media studies and mixing and matching. Much more of that is possible now and is done in sixth forms and that is certainly the sort of modelling that ... I can see we do not need that any longer and the sort of sixth forms being proposed under the alternative model would provide that sort of continuation of choice of a variety of different subjects and pathways.

So I was not content with the Committee's proposals when they were published. There have been some amendments since then and I know that seems to have at least tried to address the concerns which the Committee very late in the day have realised, I think, many of us have with their proposals. What I am saying is I could live with a three-school model with some form of tertiary college. It would not be the best but I could live with that, and I did consider very strongly, as Deputy Roffey similarly, bringing some sort of amendment to that effect, but I realised very soon that there was no appetite for that for some of the reasons that I have already given.

I am faced therefore with this seemingly binary choice; and like others have said, given that we have some detail to this amendment before us but not enough to do the normal things that we would do in terms of comparing the two options before us, we are left, I think, in quite a difficult position. There are risks both sides and so it comes down to where am I willing to take the risk. The risks with the alternative model are particularly in terms of costings, and my reservations on that are similar to Deputy Trott's and I look forward to some of the answers to the questions he has already raised, but also there is a risk, I think, in terms of the governance. I am not convinced at all that one school on two sites will work very well. I do understand the sixth form will need to be federated in some way in terms of that working and I do think that is possible, but I do not think there is any intention for the 11-16 parts of the schools to work in that same way and I think it would be very difficult, bearing in mind that schools are communities, for that to operate. However, that is not such a problem; that is a problem that can be resolved as we move forward. It is not the biggest problem around but I just have not got a lot of confidence in that particular modelling.

In terms of size of the school, I think it has already been said but again it would be quite a leap forward for Guernsey, but in terms of the proposals that the Committee had already brought for the Mare de Carteret School, which I have always supported the rebuild of and potentially may not get rebuilt under the alternative model, that will be a similar size and I think probably Guernsey is ready for such a thing but we need to manage it effectively. It certainly provides the best opportunity in terms of educational outcome and provision for the teachers that we need, which so many people have said are essentially what makes a good school.

So I am coming down on the side of supporting this amendment and the alternative proposals. I do so because, as I hinted at just before, a school is a community, not primarily buildings. Schools can operate very well when they have got the right teachers and the right support and

the right community is made. It is an emotional subject, I realise that. The closing of any school, because it is a community, is emotional; it raises our emotions. That is why I think we need to have it in mind that, whichever way forward we go, we are closing four schools, we are closing four communities. They all have to basically die in order to be resurrected. *(Laughter)* There needs to be safe ground ... I can keep you for a long time on that one. *(Laughter)* But that is the best way forward for us because that would equal everyone, because we need to see it happening that way. I do understand that in a sense it is the most disruption, but if we are going to move forward effectively and if we are going to have parity of esteem and parity of opportunity and all these other things we have to see it in those terms and we have to communicate that somehow to our community, which has been divided over this. There was a division over the issue of selection and of effectively what people said, the closure of the grammar school. I am not in the same camp as Deputy Kuttelwascher but I understand his arguments when he said effectively the alternative model sort of gives us two grammar schools, two opportunities, for everyone. There is that appeal to it, I think, in terms of some in our community – it helps galvanise them back into a way forward that we can all espouse.

I support this amendment because it offers the best chance of reuniting our community, working towards these issues that we believe all children should have and all teachers should be given the opportunity of teaching in a way that they want to, equal opportunities for teachers so that they provide their best. But also it provides the best opportunities for much needed flexibility in the future rather than what I see as the Committee's proposals currently, which may well tick the boxes but are effectively designing something that was maybe the best we could have offered 17 years ago, may possibly do the job now but has *huge* risks for the future.

We would, I believe, not be doing the best for our community if we did not move ahead with this leap of faith into the alternative model. We want to – I believe all of us want to – and that is why I urge those who are perhaps sitting on the fence to seriously consider the two risks and to be willing to swallow the risk of moving forward with less detail but with greater opportunity for the next generation, not just these children now but their children's children, in order for us to have a greater degree of unity in our community and support from all of our constituents.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

I was not really going to be speaking at this time, but it was basically Deputy Yerby who has brought me to my feet slightly earlier than I was hoping to; I was perhaps leaving it for the main debate.

First of all, can I just say what a tremendous amount of work that the 'four school modellers', 'gang of four', 'group of four', 'four aficionados', or whatever their name ... *(Laughter)* But joking apart, we do not have a secretariat that works individually for us, we do not have backups at home and offices to work from. To put out a 100-page document like that ... And there are faults with it of course, and there are faults with the Committee's proposals, but what a tremendous job. So I take my hat off for what they have done with that. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)**

I think we also have to be a bit careful what we are comparing with what, and everybody will grab pieces of arguments that make their particular horse look better, or shinier, or cleaner, or can carry more, and when we had people from the UK saying that their comprehensive works really well and it has got a fantastic academic result – if you measure success by academic result, which is one of the models. But then you look at their area and actually there is not a college in sight.

We, here, have a third of our students, as Deputy Trott mentioned, who are already in a college-type A-level situation school, so when you are trying to compare what our comprehensive will look like it is going to be different from a UK one where you do not have a

third of our children going to a college education next door. So be careful what we compare with what.

The other point I would like to just mention is local management of schools. And again Education is probably silent on it, because it is working towards it, that the two-school alternative is quite strong and it is saying it should be brought in. But of course when you start to unpick it back, a lot of what we are doing in the small community is we are centralising a lot of things, so a lot of the things that you might think that a school would do, we are not going to be handing over – I don't think – the budget for the school: 'Here you are'.

Because isn't the Hub still going to be doing things? Isn't central IT still going to be doing things? Isn't central HR going to be doing some things? Or are you going to be putting then a whole new HR Department into the school? Are you going to be putting in a full bursar?

The other thing I am struggling with a bit is: if you have only got one school, although it is one school on two sites, the whole of Education's offering for 11-16 is going to be one school. So there is only going to be one Committee looking after it. It starts to get a little bit different, in that you are not going to have different local management for each school competing against each other as to who can do best, or whatever. It is one school. So you have almost got the situation where actually the people from the Grange – or they were there – could move into that school and be the local management of the school. Or are you going to get other people in (A Member: No.) (Laughter) because you have only got one group?

The other item that people have grabbed on as well is the Law and its revision for change. Yes, obviously it needs change. But thankfully the Law is fairly permissive in what it does allow. (Interjection) So you can do a lot of things by best practice, without actually having the Law there to actually back it up. But I do understand that those who are looking for the two-school alternative have made a particular play that they want local management of schools – but it is going to be local management of one school.

I think one of the key pieces today that I have heard in the debate – in fact, over the last two days – is something that Deputy Leadbeater said, and I think that was a real key. The majority of our children do leave at 16. The majority of our schoolchildren do leave at 16. So while we are sitting here almost focusing on the A-levels and we have got these two campuses feeding the children into the A-level which is the place where you strive to go, and those children are going to feel nurtured and modelled through to the A-level, bear in mind that the majority of the children in that school are not going to go there: they are going to go to work; they are going to go to the College of FE; they are going to go somewhere else.

So I also want to be inclusive for those children just as much as those who have got the academic ability who want to do the A-levels and the university, do not spend all our time on just that area, think of the majority that are not going to be staying at that school. So we are all very happy that the A-level people who are, in theory, we are saying the brightest and the best, or whatever, are going to somehow be nurtured through. But the ones who really need the help, who really need that support are actually ... 'Oh well, it's okay for you. You can go down the road to the College of FE; find your own way, there is a bus somewhere'.

So, please, just be very careful what we do. We need to look after everybody in that whole envelope. And that slightly touches on something that Deputy Soulsby mentioned, and she was right. We have got to look after the gifted and the talented, stretch them, etc. But also in that same debate and in the same sort of paragraph that she was referring to, was the other side of the coin: those who are disaffected, those who have the behaviour problems, those who are in the classroom that cause the disruption that means that the average child – whatever that looks like – is disturbed. We need to also put as much effort into that, to make sure that the school works well and that the teachers have control of that situation.

And *why* that child is disaffected, not just dealing with the cause that is happening on the day but to deal with why it is happening. That is why things like 'Strengthening Families', which hopefully is going to be starting soon, will try and get to some of these root causes that those in society who have just ... And I think Deputy Le Lièvre used the best term, 'children who have



grown up with a slightly different rulebook' – not through any fault of their own, it is just the way it is, they just had different rules that they have grown up with. And we have got to try and help them through it. There is no point those children turning up at Social Security's door at 16 when we have watched the car crash happening. We have got to be a lot earlier, and a lot brighter, and a lot smarter in how we help those kids and strengthen those families.

I am going to now pick up the bit which Deputy Yerby forced me to come to the table with. I was trying to find a way of ... and we have got to the stage now that we almost know the ingredients, we are almost looking to find how we are going to put the ingredients together, or the optimal model. We all know what we want and we all want the best, but unfortunately when we look in that mirror and we look back, we all see something slightly different. It is just trying to see how we could distil that through.

I had a proposal – and I am going to say it now, there is no amendment for this at the moment – but I was thinking, what we are almost looking for would be something like one school, 11-18, which has a sixth form attached, so you have got a big enough sixth form that does everybody. And that 11-16 part of it is based on catchment, and I would put that at the Mare as a new rebuild. I would have two high schools, also 11-16, one at St Sampson's High, again based on catchment, and one at Beaucamps, also based on catchment. I may, and I can be persuaded, that perhaps the Beaucamps site needs to be expanded a little bit to make the three high schools the same, with the Mare having the sixth form. The old Grammar School site, I would turn over to the College of FE.

Now, as we debate these things with these ingredients, we also want the best for the Island, but unfortunately the estate does come into play, and as Deputy Le Tocq mentioned as well finance also does come into play.

That is my model, it is quite simple: it is three high schools roughly the same size, and the Mare rebuilt, and the sixth form added to the Mare. Now, I am not going to lay that amendment unless 20 of you catch me over the lunch hour (*Laughter*) in which case I will, but that would be my thoughts.

So one of the pieces I struggle with, with the two-school model, is this 'sixth-form nirvana' and you are splitting the sixth form as well so you do not get that *esprit de corps* from it; and the Deputy Leadbeater point is that the majority of our children stay to 16. I want to make sure that they have as big an opportunity and as big a challenge as opportunity.

I have just got two final points, and again both of which Deputy Trott touched on: if a third of our children are being taught in the colleges, I have just managed to work out – I am a bear of small brain size at times – but that also means perhaps a third of our teachers are already teaching in 11-18 schools. So when we are doing the recruitment we are not just narrowly focusing on 11-18 teachers teaching at the grammar school type of situation, we have also got 11-18 teachers in the colleges as well. So Island-wide looking to recruit the best teachers we have got some very good opportunities already there with all our schools, because it is an Island offering. And we still support these estates, the colleges. I mean, we could spend days – and we have done – on what that looks like, but support them we do. They are either on our land or money passes from general revenue to them.

Finally, I think one of the points that Deputy Trott made was again very key. He may well go for the two-school model now but with all the caveats that it is going to come back for reviews and gateway opportunities, and I cannot think of all the different phrases offhand – (**A Member:** Jargon) jargon, yes, thank you. But once we are down this model, and I am going to use a phrase that Deputy Inder uses a lot, you try and unpick that a year's time – and his words are 'good luck with doing that'; because what are we going to do then? Are we really then going to go back to square one? Are we then really going to throw it all out and start all over again because that is almost what you are saying? You are saying we will go for that and we will have a leap of faith, but if it all goes horribly wrong all we have got to do is get a bigger cheque book out. (**A Member:** Yes.)

That is about the size of it, and I do not quite like that.

1370 So, over the lunch hour, you have your chance. Deputy Yerby wanted everything out on the table, everything put up. And there is something else will flag up the mast, a three-school model and a full sixth form. Through you, sir, I can see some of the Members agreeing, but I can also see some dissenting – thank you, Deputy Roffey.

1375 So thank you for that, but just please remember that we are trying to do an inclusive system for everyone and do not just focus on those who are gifted and talented, think also of those who are struggling and need all our support.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Tooley

**Deputy Tooley:** Thank you, sir.

1380 Sir, people make speeches for all sorts of reasons: they do it to explain their position, they do it to talk about the reasoning and the thought processes they have gone through, they do it to persuade those around them to vote their way. I found it really difficult to decide what to say in this speech because I have already had the opportunity to do lots of that. So I could stand here and read 100 pages, but I do not propose to do that (**A Member:** Go on!) because I know (*Interjections*) that I am surrounded – yes, Deputy Fallaize has already largely done that! (*Laughter*)  
1385 But I know that the colleagues around me are dedicated people who will have read this, but those who are listening in on the radio and who have taken an interest in the deliberations that we are going through this week will have least read the headlines and the summaries of both models that are placed before them, so I am not going to do that.

1390 I am going to take a step back and I want to talk about what parents want for their children. If you ask any expectant new mother and father from any part of the spectrum, be that social or geographic, or whatever, what they want for their children, they will tell you much the same thing – they want health, they want happiness, they want them to feel loved and to have the opportunity to love someone who loves them back.

1395 When my children were born and I felt all those newborn ... wanting to protect them, wanting to give them everything around them, and I still do. But at their christenings I played a song which says: 'Above all else I hope you will still feel small when you stand beside the mountains, I hope you will never look at the oceans without a sense of wonder, and I hope you will dance'. And those are the things that people want for their children. But actually if we dig down a bit deeper, parents of course want other things for their children too.

1400 I think I am at risk of being called wishy-washy by certain people if I pretend that those are the only things that parents want for their children, because we all know that parents also have maybe slightly less high-minded aspirations for their children: they want them to have a good job, a good education, life chances. Some go further and would choose particular career paths, wealth or fame for their children.

1405 So what do they want from schools? The educationalist George Couros says that parents wanted to know that:

We are focused on keeping kids safe [and] we will provide every opportunity in the world for them to be successful.

Rachel Gillett and Drake Baer in their report said this:

Any good parent wants their kids to stay out of trouble, do well in school, and go on to do awesome things as adults.

1410 There is no difference from that perspective in any of the proposals that are placed in front of you. It is without doubt the one area that everybody in this room would agree we are driving towards. We are determined that the educational policy we come up with will be one that will keep our children safe, keep them out of trouble, help them to do well in school and assist them to go on to do awesome things as adults. The difficulty is that we need to make a choice between two models, each of which – or potentially other models, Deputy Brouard – is promising that theirs gives the best opportunity for that.

1415 So I want to talk about what we are proposing. We are proposing two 11-18 schools, each  
made up of nine or 10 forms which enter the school each year and are being taught in class sizes  
which are no bigger than those proposed by the Committee; a number of students in each year  
group which allows for proper setting where it is appropriate, and there can be no doubt that the  
largest span of children within an establishment, the larger number of children, allows for more  
1420 precise, dedicated setting so that children can be targeted at the level they need support. If you  
have got 100 children going into groups of 10 you can have 10 groups, or moving those around  
the edges because there might be some who need a closer level of support and others who need  
slightly less. But you can have 10 groups dedicated to making sure that each child is taught at the  
level that they are surrounded by people who are with them and therefore need the same level of  
1425 support and need the same level of push.

If you have only got 20 children you can only have two groups. So the child who is at one end  
of the scale and the child who is at the other might be in separate groups, but in between all  
those others are squashed into one group or another which might not be so appropriate for  
them. We propose a number of students which allows for proper setting where that is  
1430 appropriate.

Each of those schools would be attached to a sixth form of approximately 225 students, a  
number at which it is possible – and we have shown this – to deliver a broad and balanced  
curriculum of A-levels and IB subjects. This is achieved by offering a wide selection of A-levels at  
both schools: A-levels that would allow you to go on to a career as a lawyer or a doctor or  
1435 whatever, available at both schools, and then an additional group of more niche subjects at one  
school, balanced with an IB – International Baccalaureate – offer at the other school.

That would mean that student Fred, who attends school A where there are a range of A-levels  
plus IB and who wants to take a subject which is not in that group of A-levels which is taught at  
his school, has a choice at 16. And at 16 young people, with the support of their parents and their  
1440 educators, are capable of making a choice. He can choose whether to stay at the establishment  
where he is and do A-levels that might not have been quite his first choice; or to stay at the  
establishment where he is and do A-levels that were his first choice, plus an IB Certificate in the  
subject which he would have liked to have done as an A-level; or he could choose to transfer to  
the other school and take on the full range of A-level subjects that he would have wanted to do.

He might also be a student who decides to go on and do vocational qualifications either  
deciding that there is a route directly into work that he wants to follow, or that the vocational and  
technical teaching pathway is one that suits his style better and would therefore better lead him  
on to further study in the career he wants to do – because universities are happy to accept  
1445 students who have shown their worth and their learning ability through vocational and technical  
studies. It is a choice. It is not selection, except by the student who is deciding the pathway they  
want to take.

The staffing model that that creates allows for resilience within those staff who provide our  
children's education. It means that on each site there will be a larger group of staff for each  
subject. Now, that has obvious benefits to staff. Those of us who often work alone understand the  
1455 benefits of being part of a strong and resilient team. I have certainly felt it in recent months,  
working as part of a team to create the alternative model.

But it also has a huge benefit in terms of the protection or insurance that it offers to our  
students. If you are studying A-level music and your teacher is, for whatever reason, unable to  
teach your class for day, or a week, or a term then you will be considerably less disadvantaged by  
1460 there being another music teacher who is able to step in. The same applies to GCSE students, and  
actually to those younger pupils who will probably only ever become GCSE or A-level music  
students if they are educated by a specialist with the knowledge and enthusiasm to open those  
doors for them. And obviously this does not apply only to music.

We are proposing a rebuilt College of Further Education because, as Deputy Brouard points  
out, the majority of our students do not stay on to do A-levels, they choose to go along other  
1465 pathways. The Committee's proposal for those students is something that all providers of their

education have said is unworkable. Why are we even contemplating a model for the *majority* of our students which the deliverers of that model say is not workable?

We begin to create parity of esteem by showing very clearly that we do not think we can simply pass the educators of a huge number of our population what we have left over – buildings, equipment, etc. The message that we send when we do this is that we do not place equal value on vocational and technical studies with academic studies. We do not create parity by putting everyone together and thus removing what is necessary to deliver the technical and vocational curriculum. And I am talking about staff, because they have pointed out that this model would not be attractive to them because they do not think it can work. But I am also talking about facilities, and those facilities would not be viable, many of them – specialist facilities like engineering workshops – in the strange amalgam of the sixth form and technical establishment that is proposed.

You are right: the majority of our students do not do A-levels. So our A-level teaching should be supporting our GCSE teaching and we should be looking to create something *much better* than we have now for our technical and vocational establishment, not looking to do something which will damage it. Not looking to do something which its leaders have said is *not* workable.

I want to say a word about Alderney. Unfortunately our colleagues ... who I hope are listening on the radio link, because they are not in the room at the moment. But the suggestion has been made that the alternative model could be disastrous. This is not the case. Alderney has experienced disastrous staffing and recruitment in the last three years or so and while, as Representative Jean said, things are thankfully much more settled now and St Anne's School is much better equipped to deliver the whole curriculum, the slightly bigger schools of the alternative model with greater staff capacity would allow staff to backfill any shortages in Alderney if required, thus strengthening delivery of quality education in Alderney and supporting Alderney in delivering the best outcomes for young people. Additionally, the use of Google for Education through Google Hangouts and Skype, and feedback online, would allow pupils in Alderney to access courses that they might not otherwise be able to follow in Alderney to GCSE options.

Spreading our resources less thinly by having two schools in Guernsey makes this possible. This would not be to take away from the Alderney curriculum but to add to it, and to ensure that all pupils in the Bailiwick receive equality of opportunity regardless of where they live. Within the larger school model there is capacity for exchange visits much the same as we see to France, but with Alderney, for joint projects utilising ICT; the opportunity for Alderney students to participate in overseas and residential visits which are offered by the two Guernsey schools; the combined project week provision ensuring that St Anne's students have access to bridging courses for both the sixth form and the College of Further Education.

There is capacity for teacher exchange programmes. At present there are many examples of young people successfully transferring from St Anne's to our Sixth Form Centre and College of Further Education. But the smaller environment that our sixth forms would provide within the alternative model, where most students will already be known to the teachers, will allow a welcoming community family approach replicating that which exists in Guernsey at the time when students need it most, having left families for the first time.

We are proposing proper local management of schools. We are *committing* to proper local management of schools. We propose that the Education Law 1970, as amended, must be repealed and replaced with legislation setting out, amongst other things, the education aims and aspirations of a modern democratic society, educational policies and the powers and duties expected of Government in relation to education as it approaches the third decade of the 21st century. This legislation *must* establish proper governance arrangements between all providers of secondary and post-16 education. It *must* establish provision for students with special educational needs.

There has been some criticism that we are not more specific about the model for students with special educational needs. It sounds a convenient excuse, but it is not. Within the timeframes and

the resources that we had it was not possible for us to look at what is an incredibly divided set of opinions around what the best model is to move forward. It seems, in bigger communities than ours, a decision is made about whether we look at special educational needs provision through a medicalised model or through full integration into the mainstream and providing the support there.

Guernsey has, through greatly attempting to do what was right for each individual child, spent a great deal of its resource on trying to work in both directions at the same time. And because the resource has been limited that has meant that children have not necessarily received the best provision at either end of the scale.

Guernsey needs to come to some conclusions about the best way forward for our provision and about the way in which we support our young people, where parents' desire and the feeling of the educational professionals and the young persons themselves is that they should be educated within the mainstream. We need to make sure that the mainstream is resourced to provide those young people with what they need. And I am not talking about things like a ramp to get into the school, I am talking about built environments which allow peaceful places for students who become overwhelmed with stimulus. I am talking about built environments which do not create large echoing spaces but still allow for movement of large numbers of pupils. There are architects we can work with to build these into our models, and these are things that are critical whatever decisions we make about education going forward. Whatever decisions we make need to be made by placing the child in the centre.

There are economies of scale that we can build in by looking at larger schools. But because we are a small community there are economies of scale that we can never benefit from if we want to benefit all our children. And so we need to balance those things. We need to ensure that where it is necessary for us to make individual provision for the individual child whose need is different to the majority of those around him, we are able to do that. But equally, that we are able to make economies of scale where possible and where it will allow us to deliver as good – and I genuinely believe *better* – educational outcomes for our young people.

I have had conversations with *many* parents, many providers of education and many people who support our young people through mental health issues and through the things that our students go through. I was surprised at the first conversation I had with the school nurse who told me that peer pressure and bullying around body image is as prevalent among our boys as it is among our girls. But it is true. I have had conversations with these people some of whom have, as you will be aware, spoken out publicly or to Deputies about their support for our model, but others who have said that they cannot speak for their organisation. They are not in a position to have done that, they have not spoken to them, but I have yet to speak to one of those professionals who has not told me that what they would choose for their own children is the alternative model.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, sir.

At the risk of offending the Rule on tedious repetition, I would like to start with some thanks: to the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, past and present, for all the work that they have put in; to the group of four; to individual Deputies in both groups, who have actually forked out their own money in order to explain and promote their ideas that they feel so passionately about; to the staff in the Department, because I know they have really gone above and beyond; and, of course, to all members of the public, especially those involved in education at the moment, students, parents, teachers, grandparents, etc. who have taken the time and effort to engage in this debate and make it all the better for that.

I was really glad – Deputy Tooley alluded to this – that we all seem to be agreed that there is no moral high ground to be claimed in this debate. This is not about who cares more, and that is

really important. It is about which of the models before us today, for secondary and post-16 education, will work best. The common denominator, even in all the words and actions Deputy Le Tocq alluded to earlier, is the honest and heartfelt desire to get this decision right; whatever people believe that decision to be. So I thank every single person for contributing to a better, informed debate.

To the core issues, and I will start with a spoiler alert: I will be focusing on education, personal and social outcomes and I make no apology for that. To my mind these are the key metrics, and I am sure Deputy Meerveld would attest that I have been going on about them for quite some time.

Having done a fair amount of my own research, and having to shine a rather harsh spotlight on my own intuitive preference for small schools in the process, I accept and endorse the evidence put forward in the alternative model that school size is relatively unimportant in terms of student outcomes, except to the extent that size dictates how efficiently, and therefore usually how well, a school can be resourced. How well a school can be resourced has a very material impact on how well children's needs can be met – educationally, personally and socially.

Resourcing is not a linear dynamic and, notwithstanding Deputy Tooley's remarks of the broader context in which we must look at special educational needs provision, I will use that as an illustration just about this linear dynamic of resourcing.

For the time being I will assume we are talking about this context of special educational needs being provided within a mainstream secondary school setting. At one of our high schools there is currently an SEN team of just two. Two valued members of staff who support a relatively large number of students with a relatively wide range of needs, from autism and Asperger's to dyslexia, to significant physical disabilities, and many more besides. When we had the opportunity to grill Will Morgan last week I was amazed to discover that at his school, which is perhaps around four times larger, the SEN team is not four times bigger, but nine or 10 times bigger, on a lower spend *per capita*, incidentally. That is what I mean by non-linear.

The benefits of economies of scale are clear, not just in numerical terms but also, in fact, in terms of quality. A larger SEN team can be staffed by people who specialise in certain conditions, meaning each student can benefit by having someone who really understands what they need and who knows how to best support them specifically. For anyone that is confused about what an educational outcome is, that is an example of one.

Many of the concerns of our larger schools centre on children who might get lost in the system, and we know there are children and young people in our schools who are more vulnerable in that respect. These students are, in my view, the litmus test of any education system. A school can only consider itself successful if it supports and enables these students to thrive. Again, school size is by no means the most important factor. We know what matters most, we have heard it so many times already in this debate – is strong leadership, great teachers and effective pastoral structures and systems. Now we know this not just because of the numerous studies, not just because Will Morgan explained how his school ensures that there is no attainment gap whatsoever between children from the lowest income families and the rest, for example. We know this most of all because one of our own schools is a shining exemplar. La Mare de Carteret has strong leadership and fantastic teachers and we know, most recently from an email from one of those teachers in fact, that they have put in place the same kind of pastoral systems that Will Morgan was recommending. La Mare's results speak for themselves. It is no coincidence, in fact, that La Mare is per capita better resourced than other secondary schools. That was a very deliberate, conscious and completely justifiable decision, in my view, to change track and actually deliver those outcomes – and my, are they doing a great job! But it is a resourcing issue that is my point; it does come down to a resourcing issue.

The key point is that those outcomes are not dependent upon school size. And that is just as well, because none of our schools, even under Education's proposals, will be small schools as we tend to think of them. Under Education's proposals, as we have heard, the new school at the La Mare de Carteret site will accommodate up to 960 students, so if were to be relying on a small

school size to safeguard our more vulnerable students from being lost in the system then we would have a very serious problem on our hands.

1625 Whatever model is introduced it is crucial that we put in place the proper structures to support, especially, those students who need it most, to ensure that they have the opportunities they need to succeed. Ultimately, this falls down to how well we can resource our schools, and short of P&R finding a magic porridge pot of money at the end of the rainbow, the resourcing of our schools will be directly affected by economies of scale.

1630 Resourcing is important in terms of the curriculum offer too and student numbers make a big difference. In her speech yesterday, Deputy Stephens asked a really interesting question. She asked is the economy of running two secondary schools instead of three dissipated by having smaller sixth forms? It is a very good question and one that I would like to take a minute to explore from another angle. My question is this: is the economy of running a large standalone  
1635 sixth form dissipated by having smaller 11-16 schools? For example, as someone who loves languages, I was delighted to learn that under Education's proposals, French, German and Spanish will all be offered at Level 3 in the sixth form, subject to demand – aye, there's the rub – 'subject to demand'. The vast majority of students entering the sixth form will come from one of those three 11-16 schools, and in order to take any of these languages at Level 3, in other words A-Level  
1640 or IB, for example, students need to have taken them at Level 2 first, in other words at GCSE, and this is where the numbers matter.

How likely is it that all three languages will be offered in all three secondary schools? I think that likelihood is low, especially in the smallest of the proposed schools. Now, we could choose to over-resource the schools in order to ensure that the subjects run, regardless of class size, but  
1645 class size matters too. We heard from Bill Watkin that classes of less than about eight can be a pretty turgid experience for all involved, and he is not alone in that view. I remember reading some research a while ago that found that classes smaller than eight are suboptimal from a learning perspective. So realistically, in order to offer all three languages at Level 3 we would probably need to over resource our secondary schools and accept suboptimal class sizes, because  
1650 without doing that we are unlikely to have the students that are even eligible to take those subjects at Level 3.

Larger 11-16 schools might not overcome this problem entirely, but they certainly have a better chance of generating optimal student numbers to make minority subjects such as German and Spanish viable at GCSE, and therefore a better chance at making them viable at A-level or IB  
1655 as well. And this is not just about languages. I have used languages as an example, but it does extend to a whole range of minority subjects. Some that particularly concern me, in fact, are the sciences.

I am not sure if Members can cast their minds as far back as the P&R plan phase 1, but they remember an amendment brought to this Assembly by Deputy Yerby and seconded by myself  
1660 which was actually, (*Interjection*) I think it was unanimously voted in that we need to encourage the provision of STEM subjects equally. So I do worry about the implications of smaller 11-16 schools on the viability of those subjects. And we might call them minority subjects but that does not mean that they are not important, they are really important.

Deputy Stephens is quite right to question whether the economies of scale in the two larger  
1665 schools are dissipated by smaller sixth forms, but because the sixth form offer is dependent upon what we can offer to students at Level 2, logic dictates that the economies of scale at 11-16 are the more important factor. And I am grateful to Deputy Brouard in fact, for reminding us of the point that Deputy Leadbeater raised, because it is important. Actually, that is another reason why we need to make sure that our provision at 11-16 is as strong as possible. If the majority of our  
1670 students leave school at 16 then it is absolutely crucial that we can offer them the broadest and richest curriculum offer in the 11-16 year groups.

It is, however, an issue that extends beyond the critical mass of students in the 11-16 year groups. I really think that the presence or absence of an integrated sixth form also directly impacts how the 11-16 sector can be resourced. One of my chief concerns around Education's proposals is

1675 this issue of one-person departments in their secondary schools. As countless teachers have explained to us, and countless people in this debate so far have already discussed, having just one subject specialist across a range of different subjects makes schools more vulnerable than they should be, but being able to pool resource from sixth-form staff offers much resilience to the inevitable challenges such as staff illness or maternity leave or departures.

1680 To me one of the key advantages of the alternative model is that staff will be able to work in actual departments, which not only guards against disruption for students, it also provides staff themselves with greater opportunities for professional development and support, and this too clearly leads to better educational outcomes.

1685 Like many others, I share the concerns – it is hard to ignore them – of the overwhelming majority of post-16 educationalists that that element of Education’s proposals are untenable as they currently stand. And while I welcome Education’s amendment on post-16 governance, that we approved yesterday, like Deputy Roffey, I do not consider that this even comes close to addressing the nub of the problem. Again, at the risk of tedious repetition, I am not an educationalist, but it is clear that structuring and staffing a training college for part-time students will be deeply inefficient, at best, and this is a particular concern with respect to the phasing in of T levels from 2020. I do not think any amendment to push ahead with 11-16 but rethink post-16 is sensible. The two sectors are just too interdependent.

1690 Speaking personally, I have known many 16-year-olds who have leapt at the chance of going to the College of Further Education and the more independent learning environment has seen them really flourish. I have also known many 16-year-olds who have thrived in a school environment for their A-levels or IB. It is horses for courses, and personally I think it is important that we can accommodate both within the State sector. ESC’s proposals remove that choice, which is a concern, but the alternative model retains and indeed, expands that choice.

1695 One final observation on post-16: while we talk about small sixth forms it is important to bear in mind that the sixth forms in the alternative model do in fact meet and exceed – just – the minimum recommendation for integrated sixth forms, whereas the sixth form college in the ESC proposal does not meet the minimum recommendation for standalone sixth form institutions.

1700 Now, changing tack, I am grateful to Deputy Lester Queripel for raising the issue of transport in his speech yesterday. *(Interjection by Deputy Lester Queripel and laughter)* And as the Assembly’s most enthusiastic transport nerd or possibly the Assembly’s only enthusiastic transport nerd, I will willingly take a brief opportunity to offer a few insights. Deputy Lester Queripel was absolutely right; we do need to take a much more holistic look at school transport, regardless of which model succeeds today.

1705 Part of the process of developing these models has been to commission traffic impact assessments. I am not in any way criticising the traffic impact assessments in their own right, but what I am saying is that we ask the wrong question of the wrong people. The assumption at the heart of the traffic impact assessments is that, in essence, we will carry on doing things in the way that we have always done them, and regardless of which model is chosen. If we do that we are going to not just retain but, indeed, entrench and exacerbate all the problems we have always had. Existing problems around school transport affect the wider community, both directly and indirectly and I do not think anybody wants to make them worse.

1710 Deputy Queripel and his colleagues on the DPA know that I regularly make this complaint of our planning application process. We ask the question, how can we ensure we do not make the traffic problems too much worse? Instead of the more relevant question, what can we do to make the system work better for everyone? We do need to take a more holistic approach. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** And this more holistic approach *(Laughter)* is increasingly the norm, even in the UK, and it is not often I use the UK as a shining exemplar of the best practice in terms of transport planning. We have got to stop looking at this as a question of how we move vehicles around and start looking at it as how we enable people to move from A to B to C to D efficiently, conveniently  
1725 and safely.



We have to think more creatively around the broader issues that affect how students and staff get to school. I will not go into details now of specific examples, you will be relieved to hear. But from all the research that I have done around school transport, I am confident this more holistic approach is demonstratively more effective. If we stop looking at this as individual problems, such as junction capacity, the required engineering solution, and start looking at it in its broader context we have a good opportunity, not just to not make the situation worse, but actually to make the situation better. This approach is the approach endorsed in the Transport Strategy and actually has positive synergies across a much wider range of States resolutions too. Not least the amendment we approved yesterday, about creating healthy school environments.

I implore the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, whichever model is progressed, to heed Deputy Lester Queripel's wise words and look at this whole issue holistically, and I am sure I am not speaking out of turn when I offer the practical support to do this from the Committee *for* Environment & Infrastructure.

So to finish, I am genuinely grateful for all the work that has been put in, particularly by the Committee and to the group of four, and I commend them all for their dedication to the task in hand.

But we are, as Deputy Yerby so eloquently explained, at the point where we need to decide between the two models. Notwithstanding Deputy Green's pragmatic concerns, I believe we owe the public, especially all those involved with the education system, that degree of certainty.

In my judgement, which I have endeavoured to keep as objective as humanly possible, the alternative model is the stronger and the most workable of the two models that we are being asked to decide between. And, in my view, it is the model that is most likely to deliver the educational excellence that I know everyone in the Assembly strives for.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak?

**A Member:** In three minutes.

**The Bailiff:** In three minutes.

Well, it looks as if perhaps we are going to rise for lunch. Can I just pause for a moment? We have now had 24 speeches, I sense that there are quite a few speeches still to come, some of which I suspect may be longer than the average. If we rise now, would Members be in favour of coming back at 2 p.m.? So I am going to put to you the Proposition that we come back at 2 p.m. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** We will be back at two o'clock. We will rise now. *(Laughter)*

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.24 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2 p.m.*

### **The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick – Debate continued**

**The Bailiff:** Well, no one wanted to speak before lunch. Does anybody want to speak after lunch? No? Tempting! *(Laughter)*

Deputy Graham.

**Deputy Graham:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I mean, more by accident than intention do I find myself speaking this early!

Members of the States, we face a binary choice today between two models. Before I address their relative merits I want to set the context, or my context, if I may. It is far from straightforward in a way, and there are certain points I wanted to make. One of them, if I had spoken earlier yesterday, would have been for a plea for more light than heat in the debate, and to be honest, I do not think it is necessary to say that anymore because I think the example we have been given so far has been pretty much on the button.

Second, and I am partly addressing Deputy Laurie Queripel here, can we please get away from the notion that any one of us can claim to be speaking for the people of Guernsey – I am not suggesting he did make that claim – and especially for the generations most effected, the young and their parents. I think anybody claiming that is deluding themselves really. The fact is that the community outside this Assembly is as divided as we are inside it. And neither outside nor inside is there a division of two parts. There are those who support the Committee's proposals in their entirety, there are those who support those same proposals insofar as they close the Grammar School and rebuild La Mare de Carteret High School, but they worry about the huge disparity in the size of the resultant schools. Or others support the Committee's proposals but oppose the post-16 element of those proposals. Then there are those who cling still to the hope that things will stay as they are, that the Grammar School and the three small high schools can still be retained. Then there are those who support the 11-18 concept, but even they are split between those who favour the alternative model as proposed, and those who have reservations about the one school two colleges concept for the executive governance.

I have to say, and it is no secret, I think, that within the four of us shades of opinion did vary on that precise point. Now, I make that at least six distinct views expressed outside this Assembly, and I bet that there will be States' Members who can identify with each one of those.

Now, Deputy Laurie Queripel – and this is where he comes in, through you, sir – argued for more consultation. I have a feeling that if we went out to three months', six months' consultation, I have got a feeling six different views would come back, and ultimately I agree with Deputy Peter Roffey from his speech yesterday, that there comes a time when as a politician you have a conviction, you test that conviction against evidence, and you go for it. You take a lead. I think that is what I am certainly doing, and I think my colleagues, or the gang of four, are doing the same.

With all those strands in mind today we face the task of really deciding between just two models distilled from all those diverse elements of opinion.

The third point I wanted to make was it is unfortunate that each model has attracted its own shorthand title, three-school and two-school. And I think it has already been mentioned that the Bailiwick has seven schools in the secondary sector, Les Voies, Le Murier, St Anne's in Alderney, the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre, and the three high schools, and it has a College of Further Education too. Let me be clear, each of them deserves due consideration whatever our preference for this model or that.

Fourth point, each of us has been on a personal education journey since we last debated education, just over a year ago. I advocated retention of selection and I offered three separate examples or alternatives to the 11-plus exam, and I drew those examples from three of the world's leading countries in the field of secondary education. My selection would have led to four small schools – yes, four small schools – each providing its own special pathway to reflect the diversity of student aptitude. I lost the argument, and I have moved on.

In that debate I and others asked those advocating comprehensive secondary education to spell out what it would look like on the ground, answers came there none. Well that is not quite true because Deputy Charles Parkinson, when he made his pitch to be President of Education, Sport & Culture, he spelled out something not too dissimilar from what I had in mind, except he thought it could be done without selection and I did not. Deputy Carl Meerveld went to the

trouble of publishing quite a voluminous piece really putting his vision forward. I give him credit for that, I have to say I personally did not get past page 3, but never mind, he made the effort.

I make these points because any Deputy quoting States' Resolutions of that time who insist that the States then made a conscious decision that comprehensive secondary and post-16 education in Guernsey must adhere rigidly to a predetermined model was at a different debate to the one I attended. All that mattered was selection or non-selection, with an assumption that the Committee would go away and come back with a comprehensive model which offered the best possible educational pathways for all our children.

In a way, the debate and Proposition in front of us, and the amendments to it, had the deep flaw that they were not holistic in their approach. I personally think we run the risk when we look even at post-11 education in isolation from what happens before, but that has to be for another day. But it is inherently dangerous to be talking about post-11 education without the holistic big picture, and that does not just include the obvious post-16 element of the College of Further Education. It does include the other educational institutions. It ought also to include the grant-aided colleges.

I had a sixth point of context and that is to say that although we were not promised anything precisely, we were explicitly promised that our comprehensive model would reflect the very best of the UK comprehensive system, and not the second or third best. Some – the Committee President and then Vice-President – went even further and said our schools would be world leaders. Now, Members of the States comparisons with the UK are inherently dangerous, not least because these fiercely independent Islands of ours do not take kindly to being lectured by outsiders, but since we recruit many of our teachers from the UK schools, since we make use of UK qualifications, and since we send many young students to study in the UK, it is inevitable that we have to consider our education within the UK context.

Now we need to be clear that standards at state secondary and post-16 education in the UK are only modest when compared internationally. So the pledge that our comprehensive schools will reflect the very best UK comprehensives and not merely aim to beat the average is of huge importance.

Now, I have not forgotten that explicit pledge that was made, and indeed it has been my lodestar ever since, and I really think it ought to be our collective lodestar. So can we all agree, Members of the States, that we are not just seeking a model that works elsewhere? We want a model that demonstrably works at the peak of excellence elsewhere.

The moment the States decided to end selection at 11, two things became inevitable. The first inevitability is that every single secondary and post-16 educational institute would never again be the same school or college. For example, the Grammar School was effectively placed on death row, and it is a pretty drawn out sentence, and I have to say I hope Members of the States will join me in paying tribute to the students there, the teachers and the parents for the way that they have kept morale going, and I presume it has been with the support of the Committee.

La Mare de Carteret High School when rebuilt on current proposals would not be the same small community of just 400 students, but it would more than double in size and receive not 21% but 42% of the Island's 11-16 students, and its demographics would change too.

Le Murier and Les Voies would remain in role, but their relationships with other schools would change, not only as those other schools themselves change, but also because traditional concepts of SEN provision are being re-evaluated.

Second inevitable outcome – and that is this, and we have been talking about it for the last day – that whatever the model chosen, chosen for comprehensive secondary education, transition from selective to non-selective would be far from simple. It would take time, it would involve upheaval, would cause parents and children anxiety, and it would demand much patience and calm from all stakeholders. There could be no simple flick of the comprehensive switch.

I now come to the merits, as I see them, of the alternative model, and as I present them to you I have three watch words, and they ought to really be watch words that we all share, students, outcomes – now outcomes have suddenly become some sort of a dirty word and I think it is

because they mean different things to different people, I will revert to that later – and evidence. Now, we are all, without exception, evidence-based politicians, or that is the claim we make. So those three watch words, ‘students’, ‘outcomes’ and ‘evidence’, really ought to be watch words that everybody is comfortable with.

It was shortly after the debate on selection that I first came upon the letter to Deputy Le Pelley which was signed by the Bailiwick’s five secondary school head teachers and the College of Further Education’s principal. It was dated 19th January 2017 – a year ago tomorrow – and it soon assumed the status of an open letter, and I quote from it:

We recognise the benefits of 11-18 secondary schools and the five head teachers are keen to explore a federated sixth form model.

Now, to be fair, the head teachers considered that large schools and school closures would be politically unacceptable in Guernsey, but at least here was clear evidence that the head teachers of our five secondary schools were attracted by the concept of 11-18 schools in principle. Encouraged by that, I next engaged personally with one of the head teachers and with a second head teacher together with her senior leadership team, and from them all I received, in confidence and at first hand, further evidence that these experienced head teachers, who were delivering secondary education on the ground, saw 11-18 as the best way ahead. It was oral evidence.

I was encouraged to delve further and deeper, and I began searching and examining the various tables, which are published in the United Kingdom, showing *inter alia* the educational outcomes of state comprehensive schools at GCSE level. Now, I had no idea what I would find but a pattern soon emerged, and it is a pattern ... I think Deputy Fallaize was quoting from a different list to the one that I did, but the pattern is very familiar. One list after another demonstrated that year-on-year the top performing state comprehensives were predominantly 11-18 schools. Now one list was typical of others and some States’ Members may have seen it, it showed the top 100 state comprehensive schools when measured by the GCSE results in 2016. Now, the top 30, that is about 1%, were all 11-18 schools. As indeed were 97 of the top 100 – 3%. The size of the schools varied enormously from 550 to 2,500, the average being around 1,250. The size of their sixth forms also varied widely, ranging from 90 – can you believe 90? – to 700. The schools were a mixture of co-educational, single sex, single sex with co-ed sixth forms, they covered all regions of England and Wales. Here was more evidence. Now, it was not evidence that 11-18 cannot have poor outcomes, nor was it evidence that 11-16 schools cannot have excellent outcomes at GCSE, but at the very least, I suggest, Members of the States, it was clear evidence that if we are to aim to match the very best UK comprehensive schools, and remember our lodestar, we should not ignore that the very best are predominantly 11-18.

Now, Mr Bill Watkin, who is Chief Executive of the Sixth Form Colleges Association, who spoke to some of us on Monday, asserted that 11-18 schools do not outperform 11-16 for GCSE results, now he did not offer evidence for that claim, and to be fair, he was not invited to. Now, the sixth form colleges are of course in fierce competition with 11-18 schools, and it is Mr Watkin’s job to preach the virtues of the Colleges which he represents. Now, I am not for one moment suggesting that he would be anything less than professional, but it would be clearly unreasonable to expect him to go out of his way to preach the outstanding virtues of the 11-18 school.

Of course in the same breath I need to issue the same caveat for the contrary evidence, and it should be made assessing the contribution to the debate by Mr Will Morgan; he was the principal of the Cotswold School and some Deputies will have met him or listened to him. Incidentally, his school was at position 47 on the list to which I referred. As principal he might be expected to highlight his school’s achievements at all levels, and we must let him off for that. But – and I wish I had made this clearer to his audience – he also brought to the table his wide experience as an Ofsted inspector, in which capacity he is accustomed to making objective assessments of a wide range of secondary schools. Now, he was quite clear, his experience as an Ofsted inspector had convinced him that 11-18 schools outperform 11-16 schools at GCSE. I rate that as pretty fair evidence.

Of course educational outcomes are more than a matter of exam results. A factor which prompted the next stage of my research. I looked at the Ofsted reports for the top 50 schools on my list. They were outstanding, not only for academic results but also for the value they added to individual students from arrival to departure, and also for those soft elements such as student discipline, encouragement of the well-rounded young adult and the important pastoral care provided, particularly for the more vulnerable students. Now here was further hard evidence. This was one of the very strong themes of Mr Will Morgan's pride in his school.

Now, I have heard Members of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, on a number of occasions, state the obvious as if it was obvious only to them and not to others who are not in the inner circle. The obvious thing is namely that excellent schools are not all about exam results. Sometimes these remarks have been made in a tone that seems to imply that the academic excellence of schools, such as Mr Morgan's, has been attained at the expense of the vulnerable and the least academic students, and that exam success is somehow incompatible with providing care for the least advantaged child, and with allowing students to develop as rounded young adults. It has certainly been claimed that the G4 members are obsessed with exam results. Well, let me be clear, Members of the States, nobody has a monopoly in appreciating the variety of elements which make an excellent school, or in placing an appropriate value on them. Nobody has an exclusive covenant with the vulnerable and the less able students in our schools. These values are at the core of the alternative model.

The final stage of my research into UK comprehensive schools was to select from the top 50, four – four which were of similar demographic and size to those which the alternative model would produce in Guernsey. I corresponded with the head teachers of these schools. Now the Cotswold School was one such, and Will Morgan was the first to respond, and hence his offer to come and contribute his experience and knowledge to our debate. It was never his intention, nor mine, to suggest that the Cotswold School could or should be uprooted from Gloucestershire and transplanted in Guernsey. Rather it was to provide an example of what we could achieve here if we adopted the 11-18 model in whatever form best suited to Guernsey.

Now, whilst he was here Mr Morgan made it clear that in his judgement as an experienced teacher and head teacher of an 11-18 school, and as an Ofsted inspector of all types of secondary school, he thought 11-18 schools are best placed to achieve the optimum outcomes in the following areas.

First of all, teacher recruitment and retention. Now the evidence here is inevitably soft rather than hard. On the one hand, Mr Watkin in his presentation challenged the assertion that the recruitment and retention of good teachers is any easier in 11-18 schools than in 11-16 schools. Clearly the Committee have briefed him that Guernsey has no difficulty at all in recruiting good teachers for all its 11-16 schools. Deputy Le Pelley himself has repeated that claim on a number of occasions. On the other hand, at least two of Guernsey's four secondary school head teachers strongly dispute that claim from their Guernsey experience. Interestingly, the five secondary head teachers, in their letter to Deputy le Pelley last year, wrote as follows, and I am just reminding you, as indeed Deputy Fallaize did yesterday. This is what they said:

There are currently teachers who work within the high schools and contribute to teaching in the sixth form. Further development of this work will undoubtedly support continued recruitment and retention of high quality staff.

Now, of course, the Committee model explicitly rules out such flexibility and is clear there will be separate cohorts of teachers, one teaching only in 11-16 schools, the other only in the post-16 college. The five head teachers are joined in their view by Mr Morgan, who is in no doubt on the issue as it applies in the UK. It was his view, and from his knowledge of UK teachers, that if the grant-aided colleges here are the only offer which Guernsey can make to the best teachers who are contemplating a move here and wishing to teach across the 11-18 range then at the very best Guernsey will be limiting the highly competitive pool from which to recruit the best teachers to the state schools.

Now, clearly nobody is suggesting that there are not great teachers in our 11-16 schools; we cannot say that too often. Rather it is a case that some great teachers will be put off from coming here if they cannot teach across the 11-18 range. Some great teachers currently teaching 11-18 may leave or migrate to the grant maintained colleges if Guernsey opts out of 11-18 provision in the States' sector.

Mr Morgan also claimed that progression from GCSE to A-level studies is demonstrably better in 11-18 schools, and this is really germane to the strength or the size of our future sixth forms on the two sites. At the Cotswold School between 65% and 70% of students remain in the school after their GCSE exams and go on to do A-levels. Mr Morgan indicated that this was typical of the best 11-18 comprehensive schools in the UK.

Guernsey's conversion rate, I thought, was nearer 50% but I have heard just before lunch that it is below that. I cannot challenge that, but I do know that the dropout rate from the Sixth Form Centre in Year 13 is too high. Now, of course from the point of view of Guernsey's economy, the optimum balance between those following academic and technical vocational pathways after 16 is a moot point, but if Guernsey wants more students to stay and study A-levels and International Baccalaureate then 11-18 offers an effective model.

Mr Morgan also commented on the record of 11-18 schools for pastoral care, which of course is especially important in the larger schools. There are two elements to this.

First, because they are self-governing and independent of local authority administration, the larger schools are able to invest more resources into appropriate SEN provision, and into managing those who present behavioural difficulties. Teacher leaderships of groups, years and houses is very effective and deep at all levels.

Secondly, the role played by 17-19-year-old sixth formers in partnership with teachers is immensely valuable. That is not to say that 15- and 16-year-olds do not also contribute in 11-16 schools, and some even in the 11-18 schools, but the contribution by sixth formers as role models and as mentors is an important and extra dimension.

Mr Morgan also commented on A-level results and he confirmed what is generally accepted as consistent evidence in the United Kingdom. The best UK sixth form colleges undoubtedly achieve excellent results at A-level. The very best demand high entry standards and they recruit not only from 11-16 state schools, but also from the public schools. The very best of these colleges tend to be larger than 1,000, and some have 2,000 or even 3,000 students. Again, the very best of them concentrate on level three academic studies and are heavily orientated toward preparing students for university; 11-18 schools with sixth forms come closely behind them and the very best compare with the very best sixth form colleges. The worst results are achieved by mix and match colleges which mix levels one, two and three and academic with technical and vocational courses.

I now want to move on to technical, vocational and professional studies. The alternative model proposes to bring the College of Further Education to Les Ozouets in the form of a purpose built multi-faculty college. Two of these discrete faculties would be the Institute for Health & Social Care Studies and the GTA University Centre. The inclusion of these two faculties and crucially the preservation of the current full-time and part-time provision at the College of Further Education are seen as crucial to the ambition to achieve university college status; and I have been so advised by Professor Richard Conder, former Deputy, and a former Member of the Education Committee last term.

We are determined that academic, technical and vocational courses and their students are recorded equal status and esteem. There is a cultural difficulty in this regard, and it is not helped by the current dispersal of the College of Further Education on three separate and substandard sites. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

Now, there has been a view, Members of the States, that equal esteem can only be achieved by grouping academic, technical and vocational students together in one institution. But not only has that been shown to be incorrect elsewhere in the developed world, it has also led to a drop in both academic and vocational courses, and their outcomes, in the United Kingdom. But, Members of the States, the tide is now turning. As we heard from Mr David Corke, the Director of Education

and Skills Policy at the Association of Colleges, those who were fortunate enough to listen to him, the UK has recognised, perhaps belatedly, that it is lagging behind the best in the world when it comes to technical and vocational training, and it is changing course. BTechs and a myriad of vocational qualifications will disappear to be replaced by the new T-levels, which are a highly structured and focussed model, based on the proven success of world leaders in the field, such as the Nordic countries, Switzerland and Singapore. Now, these full-time level three courses, and their associated apprenticeships and work placements, will be delivered in dedicated colleges of further education, and most definitely not alongside academic disciplines in tertiary colleges. Evidence from the world leaders is that this separation far from diminishing equal status and esteem enhances it whilst producing better results at the same time.

Now, Mr Watkin confirmed this analysis when he spoke on Monday. Mr Corke took care to be bi-partisan in his talk, but he was quite clear in conversation afterwards that to him it would be truly bizarre if Guernsey set itself on a course towards the past at a time when the UK is set to travel towards the future. The alternative model will be ideal to enable Guernsey to embrace this inevitable change and the transition and we will reap full advantage in doing so.

Members of the States, bear with me, devolved governance, I think we may almost have had enough of that, but I have got one or two additional points to make. It is very much at the heart of the alternative model, and it is directly linked to educational outcomes and costs. Our aim is to devolve governance away from politicians and civil servants to head teachers and their school governing bodies. Now, if that requires a law change then so be it, and let's get on it.

The G4 members have not always agreed on how best to express the concept when it comes to the two 11-18 schools. I think we drifted into talking of one school on two sites, but I personally always thought of it in terms of two schools each with its own personality and identity but placed under one executive leadership team, purely in order to maximise co-ordination of resources and to be as cost effective as possible.

Devolved governance is of course second nature in the best UK comprehensives and has been for 20 years or more. In fact when I asked the finance manager of the Cotswold School about LMS (local management of schools), she did not understand what I meant, it was so ingrained in the culture already.

Now, the success of devolved governance in the UK only serves to highlight the anachronistic nature of Guernsey's highly centralised, dirigiste management of schools. Now, this is not the fault of this Committee or its officers; it is a cultural thing to them. It is traditional and cultural here, and we still cling to it like limpets, our head teachers and their senior leadership teams deserve to be assured of our confidence that they, the doers on the ground, can be entrusted to manage their own school. For one thing, it is the key to keeping costs under control. For years Guernsey has delivered good education but in a highly inefficient over bureaucratic and costly way. The Cotswold School is fully self-governing and self-administering; the principal indicated that if he speaks to the local authority at all it is less frequently than once a month. Now, these figures are interesting: he employs around 80 teaching staff and a similar number of support non-teaching staff, he is given an annual budget of £7 million to educate 1,350 students. Now he does so to a very high standard, at a per-pupil per-annum cost of £5,200. Here in Guernsey we spend just over £10,000 per annum on each 11-16 student. In 2016 the cost of educating 843 students at the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre here was £2 million more than the cost of educating 1,350 students at the Cotswold School. Now, something is going on there, and I suspect it is more than the 30% Guernsey factor to which Deputy Lyndon Trott alluded.

The alternative model will deliver devolved governance in Guernsey at last, not only to the schools but to the College of Further Education whose shadow board have waited impatiently, it has to be said, in a state of limbo, to assume their intended role for the past three to four years.

I want to talk very briefly, and we are coming towards the end, Members of the States, about the timescale for all of this. Now, we Members of G4 would be wise to acknowledge that a relative presentational weakness of our case – and it has been identified – is that we are not yet able to give a precise timetable for the implementation of our model. In my view, a strongly motivated

2070 Committee could aim to establish which of the two preferred sites at the conclusion of around three months' work, others say it could take a month or two longer, but the subsequent development of plans, achieving absolute clarity over capital costs, and detailed transition for students would inevitably take longer, and the G4 Members would rather lose votes now than make pledges which they could not in all conscience deliver.

2075 That said, Members of the States, is there really a need for haste over quality of decision. Under the Committee's own plan the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret High School is key to everything, and the Committee's latest amendment, if successful, will push its readiness back to September 2022, even if it goes smoothly. In other words, nearly five years from now.

2080 Now, under both models the first all-ability entrance to Year 7 at the four high schools will go ahead in September 2019, subject to any amendments that might come in, and under the Committee's model Year 7 pupils will still be starting high school in the current neglected La Mare De Carteret High School as late as September 2021.

2085 Now as for uncertainty, none of us of course would welcome that, the parents of current Year 6 pupils who took the 11-plus exam this week will not know until around April whether or not their children have passed the exam and therefore to which schools they will be going in September this very same year. Now, that has been an inherent feature of the selective system in the past few generations.

2090 Now, with that in mind, it would be unnecessarily rash to rush to make crucial decisions. If the ultimate provision of the very best educational model depends on a few months, not years, of focussed professional analysis to establish clarity and detail then so be it. That approach may well cost the alternative model crucial votes, but we would not be able to live with ourselves if we found ourselves getting over the line here in the Assembly only by making optimistic forecasts over the timescale.

2095 A few words about the Committee's model. I intend to say very little about this, certainly about the policy letter. In truth, I am trying to be as charitable as I can. If I apply the criteria of students, outcomes and evidence to it I find it difficult to say much in its favour. I recall my lodestar, which is shared by the Committee Members themselves, Guernsey's comprehensive secondary and post-16 educational system will reflect the very best of elsewhere. Now Committee Members have themselves often recited with almost Pavlovian responsiveness the mantra of a world beating system. Deputy Meerveld went even further on 13th November last year when he claimed the Committee has proposed an educational model not only for this century but also into the next. So only 82 years to go.

2100 My problem with all of this is that the evidence is singularly lacking for it. What is it about the Committee's model which will produce these outstanding outcomes? Is it that the 11-16 model of three widely asymmetric schools is itself a proven model elsewhere for producing, for example, the best GCSE results? If so, where is the evidence? Give us an example. Is the secret ingredient the excellence of our teachers? Well, we have excellent teachers, but if they are excellent they will make any model work very well. It cannot be that simple. That is not specific to the model. It is the same with the new curriculum. I personally have reservations about the new curriculum, but leaving that aside, if it is an outstanding curriculum it will be an outstanding curriculum 11-16 or 2110 11-18. Then we have to ask where is the evidence that the Committee's eccentric version of a tertiary college, or whatever they care to call it, with its mix of level one, two and three courses, and its blending of the academic with the technical and vocational, all at Les Varendes, is the route to excellence, when all the evidence seems to be to the contrary. Namely, such colleges where they do exist, and they hardly ever exist elsewhere, they produce the worst results for all the disciplines.

2115 I return to the letter written last year to Deputy Le Pelley by our five secondary school head teachers, they said:

The five head teachers have significant reservations about a tertiary model. They believe that evidence demonstrates it is the least successful model for academic progression and outcomes and that it affords real challenge for a breadth of curriculum offer staffing and recruitment. We also question the value for money.



That was our five secondary school head teachers a year ago.

2120 Then, Members of the States, where is the evidence that at the very time when the UK has recognised the errors of its ways in the provision of technical and vocational training, when BTEchs and their like are to be replaced by T-levels, when the stream elsewhere is flowing towards separate dedicated colleges for academic studies, on the one hand, and technical vocational and professional training on the other? Where is the evidence that Guernsey is headed for excellence  
2125 by simply turning its kayak around and paddling upstream in the opposite direction?

Where is the evidence that if the Committee drops a truncated part-time rump of the College of Further Education at Les Ozouets and then allies it with the Institute for Health & Social Care Studies and the GTA University Centre, that the university world will be so impressed as to grant it the status of a university college?

2130 Now, for me the potential tragedy of all this was summed up when Mr Watkin on Monday delivered the very clear message, T-levels are coming, they will replace BTEchs and all those countless old vocational qualifications. They will have to be taught separate from sixth form colleges as we know them, at a dedicated College of Further Education. Get on with it, he implied. Now this was bad news for the Committee. The response from them was two-fold, Deputy  
2135 Dudley-Owen suggested that Guernsey could adopt its own reduced version of T-levels which would be accepted as currency outside these Islands. Mr Watkin replied very politely that they would not. Not to be outdone, Deputy Meerveld then offered what, in his words, was a curved ball: *(Laughter)* Guernsey would not deliver T-levels it would look abroad and adopt an international qualification, I suppose with courses written in the English language. I think I then  
2140 detected the hint of a smile and a sigh from Mr Watkin. If equal esteem between academic and vocational is the aim of the Committee, where is the evidence that the Committee's plan to delay the move of the College of Further Education on to one site until 2023, almost six years from now? Where is the evidence that that will make vocational students and their lecturers feel that they are valued equally?

2145 Members of the States, that is the end of the script, but bear with me for another five minutes or so because although it is not my responsibility to respond to the debate it would be unfair to leave every single point to Deputy Fallaize when he responds.

The colleges, the grant-aided colleges, I believe the P&R Committee's letter of comment mentioned – I do not know whether it was critically or not – that we did not seem to have  
2150 mentioned the colleges too much. I would make two points about them really. I think the colleges should be part of a holistic approach to education in the Island; I think they are always going to exist there, whatever the funding arrangement might or might not be. The future I see as part of an holistic system is that there should be a relationship between the States and the colleges in the nature of service level agreements as and when sensible use can be made of all facilities.

2155 Deputy Jane Stephens was quite demanding. *(Laughter)* She strikes a hard bargain. 'What about flexibility in post-16?' she said. Well, there is no easy answer to this. The easiest thing to do is to have the course to the whole business of devolved governance larger schools devolving authority down so that maximum flexibility can be made use of resources. But actually that is the answer. I mean the answer lies within that. Through you, sir, to Deputy Stephens, I think the  
2160 answer can be more specific than that, and it is a good example of how we see devolved governance working on the ground, because it is difficult to decide sometimes where politicians and officers should not stray, but I think having laid policy down we should have the confidence to let those doing the delivery on the ground to come up with management and structural systems that enable maximum flexibility to be delivered. I do not think it is the sort of thing that  
2165 politicians and officers should be sitting on top of day-by-day.

Equality of opportunity. Well, there is bags of equality of opportunity. In fact I defy anybody anywhere to identify a point in the 11-18 model where any group is excluded from another. Certainly up until the age of 16. At age 16 there is a choice, and let's face it, we have given them the vote at 16, they can join the Armed Forces at 16, they can surely make mature decisions about

2170 whether they want to stay in the school environment or go on to a College of Further Education in whatever form that might be.

Deputy Stephens also said, well, what about the detailed transitional arrangements between ... sorry, she asked about the viability, I think, of the sixth forms. Well, we looked into that, and it was one of the early questions on which we were challenged. We got professional modellers of sixth forms in conjunction with the Committee officers and they came back with a formula which at least equates to the provision that is currently managed under the current Sixth Form Centre, and it is worth bearing in mind that the sixth form at Elizabeth College across two years is only 130 and across the Ladies' College is only 100.

2180 'Would it be the Grammar in another name?' was a rhetorical question put by Deputy Stephens. It will not be, but it will in a way retain the very best features of the Grammar School that we know, under 18 with the results that go with it, but having jettisoned the least satisfactory part of it, the selected bit. Also in doing that, it no longer will put at a disadvantage those of our students who have gone through the high schools as far as GCSE, got that far and then found themselves theoretically at a disadvantage because they are moving to a new place and they are meeting staff who, by and large, they have not engaged with before. That will go. But some could construe it as a grammar school in another name. I like to think it could be called an all ability grammar school, if that is the way you want to look at it.

2185 It is here that I have to diverge from Deputy Barry Paint. Now, he and I both have the privilege of being Deputies in the Castel. He lives one side of Le Guet, I live on the other and we agree on so many things, but I am mystified that he who so deeply regrets the loss of the Grammar School cannot see that the 11-18 model does preserve the best of that and jettisons the worst. I only wish I could persuade him, and I cannot.

Deputy Stephens also asked, 'How are we going to manage the change for individual children? For example, moving from Year 6 in the primary schools to Year 7 in these two large schools?' Well, again, I come back to the fact that I think it is for politicians, through officers, to give the objectives to those who are managing on the ground. When I listened to Mr Will Morgan, and it is a pity those who have expressed reservations about some aspects of the 11-18 were not able to engage directly with him, because I think he might not have changed your mind, Deputy Leadbeater, but I think at least you would have understood better exactly how some of these more vulnerable children, and those who are not on such a fast track, can, with the appropriate resources, targeted, focussed and shifted around as necessary, monitor individual children – the evidence was there to see as far as I am concerned.

2195 Deputy Stephens also said, 'What about standards, measures?' Well, I think that is the sort of thing that politicians should sit down with the professionals and come up with benchmarks. Simplistic benchmarks, like let's do as well as the top 3% of comprehensives in the UK, would be a starter. I would be quite happy for that as a starter. But we can set our own standards and measures, and then invite the devolved governorships to perform, and if they do not perform we want to know why they have not performed and if necessary they get moved.

2200 Ah, we danced on the pinhead of should and will. Well, this is a tricky one to respond to because, to be honest, we are just four back benchers, we are not the Committee. I think we probably fell into the language that reflected that really. It has been said we are the shadow committee; I think that is rather unkind both on us and on the existing Committee, but nevertheless we are no more than what we are. I think our language is actually recommending, because we are not in a position really to deliver. We are asking the States to adopt the model which will deliver that.

2215 We were also asked about political commitment. I think Deputy Laurie Queripel may have asked that, and Deputy Rob Prow. We are not in a position ourselves to give any political commitment, other than any Committee that is charged with taking forward the alternative model will have our full energy and support and enthusiasm and just about everything else that we can lend to the movement.

2220

Deputy Rob Prow thought that we should, as a matter of duty, have stood to replace Deputy Meerveld when he stepped down and Deputy de Lisle when they stepped down. I have a great deal of admiration for Deputy Prow, and I sit on the Home Affairs Committee with him, and he is a great researcher and a great innovator and he comes up with some great ideas. I just do not think that was the best one that I have heard from him, because just imagine how could any of us have stepped up on to a Committee that has spent the last six months tearing apart our model, and we had done the same to their model over the last ... how could we reasonably have stepped up and sold a model, or been loyal to the Committee, when we did not really have it in our souls?

A final word on Will Morgan, I have made the point that he is an Ofsted inspector as well as a principal; a suggestion was put around that he was being paid, when in fact we paid his school, because they charge, for him to come and speak our script. I think the fact that he, as some people said, went off message on grammar schools and funding of the colleges just shows that that was far from the truth. Look, what did we expect, he is a Welshman from a part of Wales that does not ever vote Tory. I have lost count of the number of cold evenings I have stood in a rain – filled trench on the Brecon Beacons only about five miles from where he was brought up. I mean they do not think anything other than in a certain, you might say, left wing way.

He was very clear though about what his message was. He did not actually, as a man of principle, object to private education and in fact he lives with it; I mean he is not far from Cheltenham and Gloucester and the place is running with good public schools. The point he was making was that, as a Welshman with his background and leadership of a comprehensive school, he could not understand why we as an Island spend some of our States' funds on a private education scheme, and he could not get his head around the principle of it, and you could hardly blame him in the context, can you? He was very careful what he said. He said, 'Look, my school can live in competition with the private sector in the UK. They are not the problem to me.' He said, 'What would be a problem if I had a thriving grammar school, creaming off the top 30% academically; that would be hard to compete with,' but as it is, and let's think of the UK context here, the nearest grammar school to him is about 12-15 miles away. That is no distance at all in the UK these days, and he does fantastically well with it.

Finally, Members of the States, we have been talking about upheaval, creating uncertainty and delay and so on, and nobody could apologise more sincerely than I do if that has been the outcome of what we four have been doing these last few months. But it was for a purpose; I am not saying it was for a noble purpose, but it was so that this week when we came here we would have more than just a take it or leave it decision to make. Others could have come up with other versions but they have not. We have two models in time, we have a clear decision to make and I hope we get on with it.

Finally, Deputy Roffey yesterday confessed to a sort of spring in his step, even excitement; well at 77 I have to avoid excitement, (*Laughter*) and perhaps the metaphor of Shakespeare's Henry V 'greyhounds in the slips' is probably not becoming to me, but if it is and we strain at the start and instead of crying 'God for Harry, England and St George', let's at least, Members of the States, stiffen the sinews and go ahead with the alternative model for the children of Guernsey.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear. (*Applause*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, those are stirring words from a distinguished former soldier. Now I was always a chocolate youth, then I was a moody middle aged man, and now I am a crusty old man. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) (*Laughter*) I thought I heard Deputy Trott (*Laughter*) but let me commend ... I start and finish or I start where Deputy de Sausmarez started and finished, which is commending everybody whether it is the Education Committee, whether it is the gang of four, if I can call them that, and all the people that have assisted, no doubt both sides in bringing these proposals before the States. They are all done with absolute integrity with complete sincerity and

in the best interests of what they regard the present and the future students of Guernsey, so I commend them, absolutely commend them, and everybody who has spoken to date, it ends here of course, has spoken well and has spoken with feeling.

Now of course, and I mean this as a compliment, you have the people with the golden larynxes like Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Roffey who leave us mere mortals in their wake when they speak with their eloquence and without notes, etc. The rest of us have just got to manage. But two of the best speeches I have heard were from people who are very able, very good Members of this Assembly, but are not noted necessarily for being the best orators. They are good orators but they are not the best orators, and I mean that in a respectful way. I am talking about Deputy Prow and Deputy Leadbeater. I thought their contributions to this debate were truly excellent. I do not agree with everything they say, but nevertheless what they say, and the contribution just made by Deputy Graham was stirring. I almost got my sword from my scabbard (*Laughter*) with what he said, and of course, isn't it ironic that I sit by him, because my only military experience was in the CCF at Elizabeth College? I managed to get promoted twice to the dizzy rank of Lance Corporal and ended up as a cadet – for insubordination! Why would anybody – ? (*Laughter*)

But in connection with this particular matter, we talk about education. Education inspires, it informs, it civilises, it humanises, it does all of those things, and I am not just talking about the people who get 12 GCSE star grades or four A-level top grades. I am not talking about that, because even if you go to school for your 8 or 10 or 12 years, whatever it may be that you are at school, you will come out, you will have made friends, you will have had connections, you will have been... Even if you were a student who hated every second of it, you will have had some benefit from education. Education is the most important thing, other than happiness and health, that people can have.

Deputy Tooley made that point in her speech about what do we want to give our kids? We want to protect them; we want to help them; we want to give them things; we want to make sure they have all those things. We also want our kids – and because we are Members of this Assembly we want other people's kids, both now and in the future – to have the best start in life whatever that may be.

Now I *hate* – and I apologise for hating it – the word 'comprehensive' in this context. I hate it, because I very much respect, and I will come back to it in due course, Mr Mulkerrin's letter. Mr Mulkerrin is a stunning example of what you can do when you do not have a good start, somebody who came from Greenfields. Look at the contribution he has made both to education in the UK and to here. I am not talking about financial worth – a man of sterling worth. So you start off with that and you say the thing that people like Mr Mulkerrin say, and I will come back to that in due course, but where we have to move forward, I do not want mediocrity.

I am a person of average ability that has had to run very fast – figuratively because certainly not literally – to achieve whatever I could achieve, and the only way I could do it is always having my foot flat out on the accelerator. There have always been people cleverer than me, always been people more able than me. I have had to make the most of it. When I see other people who have had *infinitely* more ability than me waste it, it annoys me. I have always recognised quality, and I want us to have not the bog-standard English comprehensive system, which I know is a world away ... Mr Mulkerrin talked about how awful it was when it was first started and it is a lot better now. It is still not where I would like Guernsey, and I mean the Bailiwick of Guernsey, to be. I do not want us to be in the top 3%. I want us to be better than the top 3%; I want us to be absolutely world class and world leading.

I am not an educationalist. I do not know how we achieve that, but I have got to listen to all the arguments. I am exactly in the Deputy Paint camp: I abhor, I hate, I detest the fact that we have executed the Grammar School. We have. There is no way that anybody in here can tell me what I should have to think, or how I should think it – I abhor it, it is a disastrous decision. But we have got to move on from it. I accept the point that Deputy Graham has made. You cannot look backwards; you have got to look forwards.

Now, both of these systems have their flaws. I sat, at the invitation of Deputy Graham, a week or so ago now, whatever it was, with the head teachers of Beaucamps and the Grammar School and the principal of the College of FE. Now, I would never have got away with describing them as girls, as the genteel Deputy Graham described them – ‘what do the girls think?’ I would never have said that, because if I had said it they would have been a sharp intake of breath, but these people were not there to empire build. They were not there to do anything other than what they believed, in their considerable experience, was for the best of the children of the Bailiwick going forward, and I was very much influenced by them. This governance thing ... because I think it is known, not only in this debate but everywhere, I do not like rules and regulations because with rules and regulations that overprescribe, people dot the i’s, cross the t’s and forget where the reality of things is.

We have got an Education Law that Deputy Soulsby very much highlighted. She is a poor woman, how could she ... between 1967 or whatever it was ...? Whatever the nonsense of the words of that statute is. Now, that is what we do in Guernsey. What I reckon probably happened in 1970, and I was in the early parts of law school in 1970, so I am older than Deputy Soulsby, but in relation to that (*Interjections and laughter*) what we would have done in Guernsey I reckon at the time is copied the equivalent English statute, which would probably have been promulgated about 20 or 25 years before. We do that all the time.

We have got a Court of Appeal Law 1961 because we set up a Court of Appeal – even then, the States moved with due alacrity. The Law was 1961 but the Court of Appeal did not actually open its doors until 1964, and our Court of Appeal Law in relation to how you could appeal a criminal conviction is based on the equivalent English statute at the time, which was 1907! England abolished that statute in 1968 because it was found to be unjust; we still have that Law now.

I challenge anybody – I do not mean anybody in this room necessarily – to tell me when there was a last successful appeal from the Royal Court to the Court of Appeal on a conviction in the Law Court, because our Law is antiquated. It is exactly the same with our 1970 Education Law. We have copy English statute so we do not do anything about them and we let them sit on the statute books forever, and they are wrong and they are outdated.

In connection with the Education Law, Deputy Brouard said it could be permissive in relation to certain parts. So why cannot we challenge? Why cannot we say ... ? Because it would take some time to change that Law, to have the law drafted to have it go through the Privy Council, for us to nod and genuflect and get it through this Assembly. Why cannot we decide today, tomorrow, whenever we take a vote on this, that we are going to inform, allow the Education Committee, or whoever is in charge, to say as from say June-September time, we will allow the present shadow body of governors in relation to the College of FE to do their job? We will allow them to do it, we will delegate those powers to them. Whether we have a three-school model, or a two-school model, or a federated school model, why cannot we say we are going to set up between now and September a board of governors and we will pass over the responsibility to them? Why cannot we do that now?

I asked – I think Deputy Fallaize wants to make yet another speech, so I will sit down temporarily.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you. I thank Deputy Ferbrache.

One could do that. The Education Committee could do that. Of course if they did it in ... I cannot remember which month he was envisaging doing it, was it July or August or September? The issue is that the following month they could take the powers back, because it is only through the Law that it can be set out formally, otherwise it is entirely at the discretion of the Education Committee and the Education Office. That, I think, is the key point.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Well, I – Oh, another interruption, I will sit down again.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** I do apologise. Thank you very much to Deputy Ferbrache for giving way.

The Education Committee are actually in the process of delegating powers down to the shadow board of governors, so it is not correct for Members to have given previously the assumption that that is not being done. We are actually working on this currently.

Thank you.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Well, I am grateful for both of those interjections, but I do not think they add a jot to what I was going to say. *(Laughter)*

I appreciate that if the powers are given in September they could be taken away in October, but we are dealing with honourable people. If Deputy Le Pelley, or Chairman Le Pelley as he was called by Mr Jean, if they say 'We are going to give those powers and we are not going to take them away', they are honourable people, I accept that. I accept that in pure theory they could do so, but I do not think, and I do not believe, that they would do so. So that could happen straight away.

I think it is pretty clear where we are going to go with this debate. I think the alternative model is ... If we just tick the people who have already said they are going to vote for it, it is already past the finishing line. But it has got problems, and I will come to those in a moment.

Today or tomorrow we are going to decide that the Education Law should be repealed and reformed. We are going to decide that. So it then falls into the Law Officers' camp, no disrespect to them, they have then got to draft it and it all takes time.

But let me come to the concerns I have, what I said at that meeting and I think Deputy Graham will probably recollect it, I said to the three head teachers, 'Look, if you folk' – I will call them folk, not ladies or girls. 'If you folk are given the power to run the schools in your own way, are you capable?'

Now in my professional life I have asked very many questions which are offensive, and I have asked very many questions offensively, but here I did mean – but there was a sharp intake of breath when I said that, and it came back quite clearly and they explained why they have got the capability to do it. I was not implying that they did not, I was not for a second suggesting that they did not have the capability because I fully accept that they have.

Now, we come to Mr Morgan, the Welshman. He is not the only one that has never voted Labour, in the time I lived in England I never voted Labour – never voted *Tory*. *(Laughter and interjections)* I always voted Labour. What I meant to say was I could not vote for the present Communist Party that calls itself a Labour Party, but I always voted Labour, because if you come from the background I do, and I do not care – we can forget the toilets from ~~from~~ outside the Charotterie ... but if you come from the background I come from you could never, ever vote Conservative because their class is different to my class. I am sorry if I still think that at 66 years of age, but I do.

In relation to that, where I am disappointed with Mr Morgan, I fully accept his integrity, I fully accept he is a brilliant headmaster, I fully accept that the college or academy or whatever you call it that he runs is a magnificent school., I do not need any convincing further from him. I found that impressive, but he did add the other two riders. I know there was an email exchange between Deputy Graham, Deputy de Sausmarez and I, but much as I respect the integrity of both of those people, neither of them – and they were not seeking to tell me – could tell me what I thought of the impression that was created.

The impression he created was that he not like the grammar schools, he wanted to close down the grammar schools if he could; he did not like the fee-paying schools, he would close those down. I did have a little exchange with him about 'I do not mind you voting Labour' and all that kind of stuff, with him at Les Courtils. I think Deputy Fallaize was there, so he may recollect it. What I was trying to say is that teachers are entitled to their political opinions as much as any other citizen, but what they are not entitled to do is to bring their political opinions into the educational forum, and *vice versa*.

That is the point I am making about devolution of change. We should keep politics out of education as much as we reasonably can. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We should be doing that in abundance, because we all think we know everything and most of us know very little.

Now, we have all had oodles of letters, oodles of emails, which I know, because everybody in here is conscientious, everybody will have read, and I say something one of the previous speakers have said that just because I may come to a different conclusion than a goodly percentage – because I think it is not far 50/50, I have not done the arithmetic – of people and the views they hold does not mean I do not respect them, does not mean I will not give them due weight. But we have to come to a conclusion.

Where I have got concerns ... and it is a point well made by Deputy Trott, and he only think came to the decision he is going to come to by 51/49, by a real smidgen, he made that very clear. I am of the same ilk in relation whether I come to the same conclusion you will have to wait till I vote, but in connection with this we have got to live in the practical world. People are going to expect – the average member of the public is going to expect – us today, tomorrow, whenever this debate is concluded, to have given them a route march for the future; and a route march which is going to take us on a path that will come to a conclusion.

They were published and I very much commend, I really think it is an excellent piece of work, the 100 pages or so that the gang of four came up with. It was published on line on 27th and I read it that day, because I had a meeting with Deputy Graham the following day and before we got the post that day. I read it, and I highlighted three concerns to him at the time, which I have repeated since, and I wanted an undertaking. I appreciate you cannot give an undertaking unless you can comply with it, and I accept the integrity of the four people in question in connection with that, but I am concerned. I am concerned about the timing of the two-school model. Deputy Trott posed his three questions, one and two were tongue-in-cheek but I understood what he meant. Mine are a bit more direct and I do not mean any disrespect to Deputy Trott's questions. Mine were these: firstly in connection with it, which two schools are we talking about? That is very important. I thought that it would come back with an undertaking, and it has been fully explained to me why not by Deputy Graham, and I accept that, within three months. Deputy Graham said he hopes that it could be June but some of his colleagues thought it might be a month or two later that they could come back and say which of the two schools. I struggle with that, because we are in January, why it could be June, July or August before we can say which of those two schools.

The second point is: what is the cost of it? Deputy Trott again talked on that. Deputy Inder gave some figures yesterday, and I think I have got the figures right, he talked about the cheapest option for school two £90 million and the most expensive £135 million. That is a difference of £45 million in itself. The Education Committee's proposals were something like £72 million or £74 million. So you have got a difference: let's take the cheap version £90 million; that is £16 million. Let's take the expensive version: that is another £45 million, £16 million and £45 million, that is £61 million. £61 million difference between the two schemes.

When I used to sit where Deputy Parkinson sat – we swapped seats! – I used to look out there because the States when it made decisions whether there is a money tree here or a money tree there or a money tree there – I have never found any, not at the Guet, not in my garden, not anywhere. So where would we get an extra £60 million, possibly? Where would that come from?

That takes me to point three. Where would we get ... ? Because you must have some idea; they must have some ideas, speaking in the third person. They must have some idea as to when they would expect the new two schools, one school [*inaudible*] to be in place – whether it is two years, three years, and both Deputy Fallaize, skilled orator that he is, and I admire him so much for having that ability, and Deputy Graham in his comments were trying to deflect that, saying, 'Well, it is going to be five years or whatever it is before we have a new system anyway and we are going to through the transition', and Deputy Fallaize said, 'Well, I cannot really give you that information yet', in his very responsive way. Well, I am afraid I would like today, I would like to have some indication. It is not so much what I want; it is what the people of Guernsey, and the

people of Alderney, and the people of this Bailiwick, want to know when we are going to have a new funky scheme.

And it was the point Deputy Brouard made, and I think Deputy Trott also touched upon it, I cannot quite remember, which was what happens ... ? Deputy Inder it was, sorry – very similar, Deputy Trott/Deputy Inder – what happens if the wheels come off? What happens if we cannot afford the £60 million, we cannot do the scheme? What are we going to do in a year or two's time? What can we do then for the people of the Bailiwick of Guernsey. What are we going to tell them then? 'Oh, I am very sorry.'

One of the things that has been talked about, I really would like to belong, and I mean it most respectfully, to the Deputy Roffey School of Economics, it would be fantastic. It is not one... My only qualification in economics is A-level, I took it twice because I wanted to improve the grade and I managed to do so, but Deputy Roffey said despite the fact that we have been told that the revenue costs the extra revenue costs of the two-school model are about £400,000 per annum, and I am not frightened by that. Even if that was right I am not frightened by it because if you are going to get a better system for an extra £400,000 a year you do not throw the baby out with the bathwater, you do not penny-pinch. With the kind of figures we are talking about that is penny-pinching. I think he is probably right, that if you have got two schools rather than four or five schools to service, it should be cheaper in due course, I accept that.

But what he talks about is that Beaucamps we could this and Beaucamps we could do that and we could have a campus at Beaucamps. Well, we have actually got a Human Rights Law; 2000 it came into force, again it shows the latitude that we bring these things in. It came into force in September 2006. It only took six years after the States approved it, but never mind. It is in force now.

One of the things that says is that you protect people's possessions, which we would say that. So if it was Beaucamps, and if you had to buy some land, and if people would not sell it to you, you would have to go through compulsory purchase. Now that is, from my professional experience, a long and uncertain way to operate. It takes a time.

So let's just say Mr de Baugy, I do not know, Mr Dorey, whoever owns the land around there, I have got no idea of whose land is out that way (*Laughter*) – no idea at all! (*Interjection*) Whoever it may be. But it is in the Castel Parish, but whoever it may be owns land around there, they take the stakes down the full 26 miles and 385 yards, the full marathon. What are we going to do, how long does that ... ? Let's just say it is not feasible.

Guernsey people do not like you imposing solutions on Guernsey people. I have dealt over the last 37 years in Guernsey with so many boundary disputes, arguments over about four foot of land. If you say to people, 'This is madness, absolute madness – give him the four feet!' Mind you, you have the same madness in Alderney. Give him the four feet – they have got registered title there, they should argue over it! Give him the four feet, what you are going to pay me is worth, thankfully for me, is a lot more than the value of that land. It does not matter, it is "... land – we are going to fight for it! We are going to fight for it. That brought so much joy to my heart. (*Laughter*)

But anyway, can I say this also, in relation to it, this has been up to date, I am not sure about the debate over the last day or two, It has been a very...

Oh sorry, I apologise I did not –

**Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, I do appreciate your giving way.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

**Deputy Roffey:** I just hope that this passionate opposition to compulsory purchase that has been so eloquently expressed – and by the way, I did not suggest compulsory purchase at Beaucamps – but I hope it will be carried through when we discuss any possible runway extension. (*Laughter*)



**Deputy Ferbrache:** Well, we have got a new President of the Economic Development Committee: he may take a different view. He is entitled to be wrong just as much as everyone else. *(Laughter)*

2535 But, I had a letter written to me, and this is a letter written by a member of the public. I think it was sent to everybody. There was an additional bit at the end which I will read first.

So sorry to see you leave the Economic Development Committee, I thought you were doing a good job there.

Thank you very much. *(Laughter and interjections)* I know I was doing a very good job there with four very able colleagues. But anyway onwards and upwards.

What she writes is this, and I think you all had the same letter except for that bit.

I know little about the States of Guernsey as I believe governments globally are trying to meet with little money enormous challenges like climate change, providing improved public services, growing and ageing populations, to name a few. But in Guernsey we are luckier than many other jurisdiction.

However, I am infuriated at the way the States have handled the educational reform which has resulted in utter confusion.

2540 It then talks about the gang of four. I have absolutely no criticism of them because I think they have done a sterling job. But she talks about bad Guernsey governments and what she says is this, and I am concluding in relation to her points, because she asked that two questions were asked. Now I am just going to ask them. They are her questions, but I think she is entitled to have them answered by either Deputy Le Pelley, Chairman Le Pelley, or Deputy Fallaize, whoever it may be. They are entitled to have answers to those questions. And the questions are these: how have we  
2545 managed to reach a point where we are here to debate the States' Resolution of March 2016 for a three-school model, which was given to ESC to construct and yet we also now have got not a small two school amendment but a virtual full-blown one formed by politicians out of ESC to rival our mandated three-school model. This has caused even more confusion, anxiety and uncertainty amongst parents.

2550 Secondly, what is the point of having individual Committees when we allow other non-Committee politicians to break with procedure and intrude and take over almost another Committee's job? Now, I do not have a problem with that actually, but it is fair for those questions to be posed. It is fair for those questions to be posed because this is the most important topic that we are likely to be voting on in the lifetime of this Assembly.

2555 But I do say this: in March 2016 an amendment proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Le Lièvre, passed by 36 votes to 8, with one abstention and two absentees, so an overwhelming vote, the actual wording – and it is referred in the appendix which Deputy Le Pelley and his team have appended to the thing – was that we have the three-school option. That was what was proposed, and we debated to death in November 2016 the 11-plus again, when  
2560 Deputy Fallaize made a comment which I thought was true. I think he meant it slightly triumphantly, but he mentioned something where the Education Committee had managed to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. I can remember him saying it, in relation to the 11-Plus.

2565 What we did – not me, not Deputy Kuttelwascher, not another 17 of us – what the States did was to take down an education system, to take it down without having a blinking idea of what it was going to do to replace it. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)** What it should have done, it should have had ...

2570 When I say the two-school model, I hope everyone ... or the three-school model or something to say, 'If it goes, we are the people that do not want selection any more; this is what we are putting forward.' Instead we have had this chaos and uncertainty from November 2016 until January 2018, so 14 months. We can live with that because in our lives as politicians and citizens 14 months is not very long. If you are a parent who is wondering which school your kids are going to go to, what their future is, it is a real worry. So what Deputy Le Pelley and his Committee have done with the three-school model is exactly what they were told to do by the States in March 2016. There can be no criticism of it.

2575 Where I think they have got it hopelessly wrong, and I do not mean that disrespectfully – I know Deputy Soulsby sometimes says when I say that I do mean it disrespectfully, but I do not, not in this case (*Laughter*) – is the post-16, because the post-16 is wrong. Ninety-odd per cent of people in that sector say that the Education Committee have got it wrong, and they have got it wrong badly, in my particular view. That is why I seconded an amendment from Deputy Meerveld which is to look at it again – you have got the exact words. Now, I appreciate if this amendment is passed, that is dead in the water. Whether it is tabled or not, I do not think it will be tabled, but that is for the Bailiff to decide. In my book, it will really give us the decision ...

2580 What I would like us to do is this: I would like us to cast aside the word ‘comprehensive’. I would like us to strive for true excellence. I would like us to come up with a system, including a college of further education, and to investment the millions and millions that we are going to need to invest in, but to do so on a constructive basis, both that the money is well spent and that the system is the best they can.

2590 I would like us to keep out of things that we know very little about; we have got very little expertise in. I would like us to leave to the professionals and the other people who would run these schools and academies or whatever we call them, I would like us to do that. I would like life to be as simple as that.

2595 So you will find out how I vote when I say so, when the vote is called, but I would like Deputy Fallaize – or Deputy Dorey has not spoken yet – I would like one of those gentlemen, when they speak, or if Deputy Dorey speaks – no doubt he has got some statistics to tell us about, I look forward to that (*Laughter*) – but I would like somebody to tell me, give me the best answers they can to the questions I have posed.

2600 Those are the three questions I asked of Deputy Graham when I met on 28th December. I have been consistent with those. There is a fourth question which I did not raise with him, but it is just how long, what is the gang of four’s best estimate to change the education? What is their best estimate, assuming – which I think is the overwhelming view of the States – that there should be governance taken away etc? How long do they think in their best estimate that could take?

2605 I thank everybody for their contributions, and there are more people yet to speak, and I say that genuinely, and this is such a topic. I was walking down The Grange the day before yesterday and there was a friend of one of my daughters drove up The Grange and she stopped. She is a mum and she also fosters children, so the two in the back and they were looking at this grey haired old man out of the window ... Anyway they were looking and this lady said to me, I thought she was going to say, ‘How are you? I haven’t seen you for a long time.’ She said to me, ‘You and your colleagues have today got a very important decision to make.’ She said, ‘Please make the right decision.’ I said I am not mentioning her Christian name, I said ‘What decision do you think we should make?’ She said, ‘That is for you to decide.’

2610 It is for us to decide. Let’s make it a good one.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

2615 **Deputy Gollop:** You may as well continue this trend of speaking in a line, but, yes, well, Deputy Graham made a good case as to why he did not particularly want to join the Education, Sport & Culture Committee late in the day. But I was perhaps in a position where I did fill the vacancy and so that has been a challenging experience in itself.

2620 I would like to point out a few issues that have come up. We discussed the curriculum in broadest terms, but it is very much felt by professionals that have looked at the material that across the A-level spectrum French, Spanish, further maths, French, history and other subject art subjects too, and some of the sciences, might not be viable in a two-school framework. It would be harder to recruit expertise of those teachers and lecturers, and I think that is a fundamental point we need to bear in mind.

2625 I am wearing today, for the fun of it really, an old Elizabeth College tie, not the house I belonged to but it is a new house in the Castel, funnily enough. It is resonant of an era. But when I

was doing A-levels, although I did a lot of A-level subsequently, mostly at the Guernsey College of Further Education, the ones I did at the College were limited by not the expertise of the teachers, or even the classroom structure, but by the constraints of the curriculum. I wanted to do theology, religious studies, for two reasons. One is I wanted to be like Rev. Jonathon Le Tocq and Deputy Le Tocq and be kind of up with the theological insights, the other reason was it was an easy A-level that you could often get an A or a B in, rather than struggle, and that matters with the UCCA codes and all the rest of it.

Now, as I recall our curriculum was somewhat limited, we only did integrated science until 16 rather than physics and chemistry at the time, it was a fad that has now gone out. But in the sixth form I do not believe anyone in my year did chemistry, and of course chemistry is extremely useful if you are going on to become a nuclear scientist, or an engineer, or especially a doctor, and we did not do ancient history, we did not do politics either, we did not do a Law A-level, there are all kinds of subject we did not do. I do not believe anyone did a German A-level.

The point I am making is in the future if we really believe in a multi-faceted variety of qualifications ranging from child care, child psychology to hopefully to support our finance and other industries, maybe advanced levels or equivalent in Mandarin or Japanese, I know Deputy Dudley-Owen has a degree in Japanese, but there are not many people who are experts. We do actually need the widest possible curriculum.

That is really the strength of the sixth form argument. One of the points is why could we have a world-class system simply because the sixth form college would be the best possible way of achieving that objective? Now, I know some people might say, 'They would say that, wouldn't they?' but the Sixth Form Colleges Association, who we met, Mr Watkin last week, have actually published, which was also reported in *The Guardian*, a report in June 2014 from London Economics. Now, London Economics appears to be a reputable consultancy with offices in all kinds of places, even more than Guernsey Finance. They have got offices in London, Brussels, Dublin, Cardiff, which would please Deputy Tindall, Budapest, Paris and Valetta. The authors of it were apparently a Dr Conlon and a Ms Halterbeck, an economic analyst. The point of this report really was to summarise its strengths was to say that actually from their perspective sixth form colleges, of which there are 93 in England and Wales are amongst, if not the most cost-effective way of delivering a good sixth-form curriculum, and very strong on value added, and they compared them against the general FE colleges, the school sixth forms and the academy sixth forms.

Now one point Mr Watkin made, and I think it is an important point, is fortunately in Guernsey, we complain about our political system and all the rest of it, but we do not have to worry about a UKIP Party, or a Conservative Party, or even a Communist Party, as Deputy Ferbrache hinted at. We are relatively independent, because of that we do not necessarily have the political vagaries in the UK and there are many different varieties on a theme, both with the way counties and boroughs organise matters and the way governments organise things. Now Mr Watkin's point, it is a point that confused the audience a little bit, but that is because he was speaking from his perspective which we always have to bear in mind when we have experts that come and give us talks on any point or perspective. His view was that actually for some reason, which could be political, or could be administrative, schools at 11-18, as Deputy Fallaize and other Members have said, are extremely good have more funding per pupil than sixth-form colleges. Sixth-form colleges have to work very hard to add value within their budgets, and that is why sixth-form colleges have to be rather large to cope. Guernsey has a completely different funding system, and as Deputy Graham perhaps has pointed out a relatively extravagant system in some respects, and therefore we can disregard some of those arguments. We have to look at them purely on intrinsic merits.

I also would like to point out if the President and Vice-President does not, and they will probably build on this. If the States does move towards a degree of support for the alternative model, we will need Deputy St Pier and/or other representatives of Policy & Resources to confirm that Education, Sport & Culture, regardless of who sits on the Committee, will be given the

necessary additional funding to pay for all these further feasibility studies, architects' plans, traffic studies, land purchases, review of law, possibly compulsory purchase issues, governance, review of SEN, and all the special needs issues, and everything else that has been suggested, and all this work will need to be done quickly, if that is the mood of the States, and I hope it is, and within the current cycle of capital prioritisation. That is to say well before the next general election. If we collectively do not have the commitment to this funding, then moving forward swiftly will be nigh on impossible, which is an issue which is not really covered in the amendments or the speeches. As obviously whatever happens massive change will be coming at the same time, and administrative change too, just the research of views and plans will cost many millions before we can even implement any of the changes. We have spent nearly £3 million on just the plans for La Mare de Carteret to date, and I could add to that, that updating a 1970 law will also be a significant endeavour.

Now, going to slightly broader themes at this point. We see before us today, and yesterday, and possibly tomorrow, two models with strengths and weaknesses. Given a free hand as an individual I personally tend to believe in diversity, and a bit of competition, and opportunity to balance strict equality and uniformity. I possibly would have welcomed, with enough time and effort, a Parkinsonian or maybe Deputy Yerby sequel with a four-school model of academy specialist schools and so on. Or a three-school model with one having a sixth form perhaps, situated at La Mare de Carteret campus would be an excellent place, and/or a tertiary model like Deputy Roffey and Deputy Le Tocq and others have referred to. Although maybe like Deputy Kuttelwascher I would not have called the product a tertiary due to some of the baggage and public relations issues.

I have met educationalists and professionals who would support a variety a plethora of these different models. The point is made that some highly respected leaders in secondary and further education back alternative models, as we have heard from Deputy Ferbrache and others. But others, possibly the majority, back Education, Sport & Culture, particularly at the level of primary school head teachers.

We have all used the jargon 'parity of esteem', but that concept does not necessarily apply to the binary choice today. One model, the Education, Sport & Culture model may have certain strengths and a few weaknesses, but it has been, and will be, robustly developed by both senior officers and politicians over at least a year. It is largely costed, with a sensible site strategy, definition, and a much-communicated transitional model which several thousand people have either attended or read or been part of. The other model suggested by the group of four, whilst being clever and visionary has no detail whatsoever. As Deputy Trott and others have observed it is light on detailed site plans, legal arrangements and costings and capital expenditure and revenue. It is not in that sense robust, and moreover might have unforeseen issues regarding planning for example. You could argue I am conflicted by talking about plans that have not even appeared, and traffic planning, bus provision, all that side of it.

There are two model scenarios but we are not really comparing like with like, apples and pears maybe. We have got a proper scheme programme in the Billet d'État scenario launched, admittedly not universally popular, but within our current budget and land rules, and the other model is a nice dream, even if maybe a world class nice dream. A vote for the alternative model will close schools, it will create uncertainty for all, and it will cause delay, including a downside for the construction centre at least in the short to medium term. I suppose a slight silver lining would be extra planning fees for the DPA.

Policy & Resources acknowledge that Education, Sport & Culture has broadly discharged the Resolutions in their letter of comment. But we, and my predecessors, have done more than that, an unparalleled number of media releases, frequently asked questions, videos and public meetings were arranged in Guernsey and Alderney. I went to all of them. Even the ones I was not invited to, and those which did not take place because I was the only member of the public present. Where were all of the Deputies – admittedly Deputy Dorey was at a number – researchers academics and supporters of the alternative model then during that long hot July summer? The

States' Resolutions clearly gave a steer that the probable inferred direction of travel, given the three previous debates, was a three school equality of opportunity comprehensive type model with a tertiary college maybe. As it turned out the Board supported by highly trained and knowledgeable professionals in the department as indeed Deputy Dorey said in the Environment & Infrastructure debate in the autumn trust the experts when it comes to walls. Support of the sixth-form approach that was the collective view. With a highly detailed scenario logistical testing of curriculum formats. Who am I to disagree and second guess these modules, do I really know better?

I think the putative university college idea integrating the best of my favourite College of Further Education, the Training Agency, the University and Institute of Health is a visionary development, and I would hope and trust that part-time apprenticeship vocational elements of that body would evolve into an alternative choice for non-conforming teenagers that Deputy de Sausmarez, for example, spoke about.

Others meanwhile in the chunky and robust Sixth Form Centre could mix and match theory and practice in vocational T-levels with academic rigour. That would be particularly useful for arts and drama. The sixth-form model may lack prefects but, do you know what, I was never made a prefect despite staying on for the sixth form. I presume I was not considered a role model, despite my tie – I wonder why, there I was overlooked for promotion again. But then again, the Sixth Form Centre strength is that it contains equality of scale, economic and breadth. Many UK courses and colleges are dropping subjects. Deputy de Sausmarez, as I pointed out, wants French, German, maybe Mandarin and also sciences to be prioritised. The sixth-form enhancer on one site is the choice, the best choice.

Actually, the Sixth Form College has been a real post-2001 Guernsey success story. We often think maybe the 2001 debate left a rather awkward outcome, but there were successes such as the Performing Arts Theatre and the Sixth Form Centre. In a way the Grammar School is no longer, in my view, a conventional 11-18 school, as half the sixth-form are successful high flyers from the emerging secondary schools. Nostalgic people who say sometimes we only have excellence from the grammars, secondaries, do not really know what they are talking about as the landscape has changed. I could name many highly successful people who received a good secondary modern education.

The Sixth Form Centre to me is more of an enhancement of what we already have plus extra pupils who might have gone to the independent colleges. We have to bear in mind that there could well be 52 extra pupils per year in theory in future, and the vocational students will all be mixing together in an equal type of way.

In contrast the two 11-18 schools are likely to lose the less academically inclined pupils who will leave at 16 and maybe quit education. The argument that more children stay on post-16 is probably true, but the converse can also be true of a sixth form. A sixth-form college is freer than a school, horses for courses.

I have personally always supported the updating of the 1970 Law. I remember when I was Chairman of Legislation, and Deputy Stephens was a Member, we discussed the point, but Education, Sport & Culture need the resources and not just the political will but the resources of officer, policy and legal to complete it, not cuts, and delegation issues saw – I was reading our press release – saw the very well respected head master, Mr Mulkerrin, depart as a board member in 2014, but then as I say to some of my newer colleagues, four years is nothing in States' time. One has to be more patient than in the private sector.

How a new or existing Committee can move forward though, or how a new or existing Committee can move forward on delivering the Law, the new Law and delegated governance on these two, in a way red herrings, at the same time, as well as developing the school, is a huge ask. Especially as, to go beyond my brief a bit, we will have a new Director of Education in one way or another and a new Principal Secretary. I do not know, especially with the budget restraints, how all this work can be prioritised.

Unhappily some of the complicated and nuanced tensions that one can detect between different professionals, unions, experts, different organisations, and the centre versus the periphery, have influenced this debate and I think there have been undercurrents. Clearly there is a demand from many people for more delegation, as Deputy Graham and others have very ably pointed out, but that is not really the issue we are talking about today. We actually adopted by Resolution the principle of delegation some time ago, if for one reason or another the States or the Committee has not delivered, I think that is a different issue from the actual arrangement of sites.

The understandable demand for greater freedom from the somewhat controlling centre has perhaps led to a kneejerk reaction, perhaps throwing out the proverbial baby with the bathwater. Consider the very real loss a careless governance delegation could give. Because although I have always supported the principle of delegation and the reduction of the centre. I am aware that, especially having attended a significant conference last week, we run the risk of losing the expertise and services without careful adjustment of attendance officers, psychologists, special needs, transformation and other central resources from musical excellence to quality. So uniquely – well, not uniquely because Jersey is the same – we are both Whitehall, a UK government in London, and a county or local authority and there might not be the critical mass to deliver those services with just one school in two parts, for example.

With respect, I find next to nothing about the eastern side of the Cotswolds to really compare with us. They are agrarian, rural, slightly upper class arguably, amongst the Midsummer Badminton set. Their private schools in the area are very expensive and they still have grammar schools. The school has grown phenomenally not only because of its inspired leadership but because it is clearly attracted pupils, frankly from other schools with a more flexible admissions policy. How else could they have grown from 400 to 1,300? I do not really think that reflects greenbelt construction or family population growth.

**Deputy Graham:** Point of correction.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Graham. Can you put your microphone on, Deputy Graham?

**Deputy Graham:** Just to clarify, the Cotswold School actually recruits from one of the largest 'States' housing' estates, or whatever the equivalent is, in that region, and it has close to it at least two or three other similar 11-18 schools. I forget the name, one is Balcarras, again right up there in the top 100. But that fact that it is the Cotswolds does not mean that they do not have the same social housing structure around these schools. They most definitely do.

**Deputy Gollop:** Thank you.

Point of correction, I do accept that there is real poverty in Gloucestershire, even J K Rowling wrote a book on the subject and, just as and aside, although Wales traditionally supports the left politically, it is intriguing that both Monmouth and Brecon and Radnor in the Brecon Beacons have elected Conservatives in the last two elections.

So you do perhaps have a demographic and social change in the area, my wider argument though is not that the school does not cater for a wider number of needs, although I looked again at the report today and saw that in fact they have a lower than average number of socially disadvantaged children or special needs children, but my point is that the school numbers have grown dramatically, and we sometimes see that with a popular private school, or an area that is in a period of population growth, but I am not entirely as sure why it has grown. I think it has grown because people are attracted to what is a great school, but that of course perhaps suggests a different sort of catchment and flexible admissions policy.

It also, as was pointed out today, can afford more special needs support, because the centre is weak and costs are probably lower there. Again a lot of Guernsey's special needs are delivered

either through the Education Centre or Health, and maybe that is a model to change, but we cannot just blunder into it.

2835 Another expert on the Sixth Form College, Mr Watkin made the subtle but telling point that any system can work, and I paraphrase here, 'if you chuck enough money at it.' He hinted with reservations – and this is not meant to be speaking against Education, Sport & Culture – but he hinted that the Education, Sport & Culture model was probably kinder to the taxpayer and more fiscally robust, value for money, but to evolve the alternative model that Deputy Fallaize and his  
2840 colleagues have put forward would probably produce slightly superior outcomes (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) but implicitly at a greater cost. What cost was not quantified, or the time that it would take to do so. Of course, his perspective too was one perhaps of relative elitism in terms of he clearly wanted higher standards, I will come on to that in a minute.

Alderney needs more resources both on-Isle and off-Isle and we need to enhance both  
2845 integration of pupils with disabilities, special needs, and importantly support for autism and high flyers too. We can deliver on better educational outcomes by age, budgets, teacher training, leadership opportunities, and IT learning, latest ideas from everywhere from TEDx onwards, in classroom empowerment. I believe that can be delivered, whichever model wins.

If we want to have improved educational outcomes we need actually maybe to consider  
2850 spending more money and lower class sizes in certain situations, especially those as Deputy Parkinson said, the 20% who felt disadvantaged, and we have heard from the experts, but I think we knew this anyway, that add-ons like drama, music, arts and sport, build leadership and strength.

Mr Watkin also questioned the egalitarian wisdom of mixing Levels 1 and 2 with Level 3 and  
2855 above. He was probably right for the home counties, but Guernsey is different, we cannot afford to be divisive and to have lots of small institutions around.

Deputy Fallaize as always is eloquent, diligent and persuasive. I actually was an early fan of exploring a two school academy model, and you could hear that back on the radio and all the rest of it. However, like, I think it was Deputy Prow, I saw it as a partial return to a grammarian dream  
2860 with a touch of the federation, in a sense, before striking back. But he was a little rude to the Committee, perhaps, when he said our views were nonsensical and ignorant in some areas. Deputy Roffey continued the trend. He is right, we do need to evolve, we do need to have vision, but I could add that the reason why England has had much more devolution of schools than Guernsey is not just a cultural point: it is because England started to go that way during the  
2865 Thatcherite, if I can call it that, Conservative era and at the time the left of centre parties were very much in favour of the local authorities.

Deputy Roffey though was very honest when he said that perhaps Beaucamps was the best site to expand, which hinted that the La Mare de Carteret might close and not be rebuilt. But what a bitter disappointment for both communities especially La Mare. Received wisdom used to tell us  
2870 that Les Beaucamps was a constrained site too with restrictions in terms of size.

I would undertake personally as a States' Member, currently a Committee Member, and I thank very much Deputy Le Pelley and everyone else for the work that we have done together. That I would try to make either model work, or a variety in between. I think both would naturally evolve, and remember Deputy Fallaize's points about the sixth forms reflects our priority to have the best  
2875 possible system.

But in terms of weighting and risk assessment and executive policy evaluations one new vision might be stimulating, nice and very tempting but it is no more than a sketch, a proposed blueprint, a bit like HS2. The other model, the Education, Sport & Culture model, is ready to go, it is robust, it is costed, and it is supported by the senior leadership of Education, Sport & Culture,  
2880 after many months, if not years, of consideration. You know when you are going to go somewhere, do not drop the plan despite the criticism, or drop the pilot.

I am calling for the States to be insistent, consistent and loyal, and support your elected team that was given a vote of confidence, in a sense, a year ago and deliver the long published model before you; therefore to vote against amendment 2.

2885       **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

          I think Deputy Gollop just mentioned about the proposals are supported by the senior leadership. Well, it certainly, if he has been reading his inbox, is not supported by the senior  
2890 leadership in our schools, because I think there has been a significant number of emails from senior leadership members of our schools which have not supported the Committee's proposals.

          There have been many excellent speeches and I will try not to repeat points that have been previously made, although I am sure I will.

          But firstly I would just like to clarify the position regarding my support for two 11-18 schools being the best alternative to selection. Since May 2015 I have supported two 11-18 schools. I  
2895 spoke in May 2015 in the debate on the redevelopment of La Mare post the Dr Nicholls review. The purpose of the amendment that I seconded, Dr Elis Bebb proposed it, in that debate was to review the future of secondary education before any decision is made on La Mare development, noting that the Education Department's 2013 vision document had previously said that a review  
2900 should be brought to the Assembly in 2014. I was very clear in my speech in that 2015 debate that if selection should end the best alternative system is two 11-18 schools, and I explained the advantages, and most of the points have been made already in this debate and in the alternative model report.

          I refer to my support for two 11-18 schools as the best alternative also in the 2016 debate, but  
2905 I just referred to it, I did not repeat the detail from the previous debate. Also at that time I did not speak about the College of FE, as I never envisaged that there would be such an unorthodox proposal to split it in half as we currently have in front of us.

          There are been reasons to support the amendment which have been referred to in other speeches, but I would like to speak about the logic for one reason to support the two 11-18  
2910 schools, based on where A-levels should be taught. Deputy Parkinson has already spoken about this, and I will try to add to his points. A-levels require teachers who are subject specialists, who have normally studied a subject to degree level and who want the challenge of teaching six formers. In order to have the resilience to cope with illness and teachers leaving you need to have cover of at least two teachers per A-level subject. In the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre  
2915 they make sure they have at least two teachers teaching at A-level syllabus so they have sufficient cover. Of course, they can do this, because they have an 11-16 school attached to the Sixth Form Centre.

          The proposed Sixth Form College will be a stand-alone Sixth Form Centre with full time students from the College of FE and their lecturers in the same building. Just because they are in  
2920 the same building does not suddenly mean that A-level teachers are qualified to teach the College of FE students and *vice versa*. In that stand alone Sixth Form Centre, as it has been called, there would be at least eight subjects that would need less than one full time teacher, and another four A-level subjects that require less than two full time teachers.

          It is not as simple a matter as some might say of saying that if a teacher leaves you can bring  
2925 one in from the 11-16 school, because they have not been involved in the A-level syllabus and have not been teaching A-levels. So I simply say that the proposed Sixth Form College is not viable, and could have a serious detrimental effect on the educational outcomes of the A-level students.

          In order to have sufficient teachers the logic tells us that A-levels need to be taught in two 11-  
2930 18 schools or you could have in one 11-18 school as we now have and two 11-16 schools, and Deputy Brouard referred to that this morning. But it would not be equal in opportunity as the 11-18 school would be seen as the better school. If you split the sixth form over three schools the six form would be just too small to be viable. In my view the only logical conclusion is that if we are going to be successful in teaching A-levels and have equality of opportunity then the only model  
2935 is two 11-18 schools.



But this is not just my own conclusion. I will read the conclusion from a local very senior teacher, which I am sure we have all seen in an email. This is his point. Deputy Gollop actually said in his speech 'trust the experts', so I think we should trust the experts, because this is an expert:

I conclude therefore that the Committee proposal for sixth form education will expose future generations of students to a level of risk that is so significant that it is certain to damage the chances of a significant number of students in terms of their access to their chosen university or employment. It will certainly have a significant negative impact on educational outcomes. I believe that to design and implement a structure for secondary and post-16 education that exposes student to such a risk is both reckless and unnecessary.

2940 Strong words, but I believe that Members should note them very carefully before they consider how they vote on this issue.

2945 My next point is about splitting the College of FE in half and creating two unorthodox teaching centres. The Director of Education and Skills Policy for the Association of Colleges said in his recent presentation, that there is no English state comparator in size or shape to the Further and Higher Education Institute. Again strong words, trust the experts Deputy Gollop told us, another expert. It is difficult to envisage how we are going to attract lecturers to come and teach in such a unique institution.

We know also from the presentations that T-levels will replace BTechs. The Chief Executive of the Sixth Form Colleges Association said that T-levels would not be taught in a Sixth Form College, they would be taught in a College of Further Education.

2950 There is also the point about that if you mix Level 1 and Level 2 to more than 15% of a Sixth Form College it loses its focus, and he gave specific examples, in one case where this happened. This, in my view, highlights how unorthodox and experimental the Committee's proposed structure is.

2955 I understand the concerns that some will have about the size of the two 11-18 schools, but as has been outlined by others the two schools will enable each site to have dedicated professional staff to cope with the individual needs of particular pupils in a way that is not possible in a smaller school, and that has been outlined to us.

2960 I would just like to pick up some of the points made in the debate in addition. It is interesting looking back through my emails, from March 2012 which was just after the Mulkerrin Report came out and the action of the Education Department and their report of implementing the Mulkerrin recommendations. One of the points was changing the Education Law and they set out a timetable which started in Q4 2012 publication of a consultation paper etc. Q1 2013 end of consultation period, Q2 2013 submission of a States' report by the board for consideration and approval, Q3 2013 States' debate.

2965 So Deputy Ferbrache asked what is the best estimate? Well, there sets out a timetable, but of course that involves commitment to that and drive to achieve it. Without that commitment and drive and may I add a States' Resolution it will not happen, and that is an example of an Education Department which committed to achieving a programme but did not achieve it.

2970 Also interestingly reading through that report, again this is from March 2013, in relation to LMS it said we will establish a LMS advisory group to make recommendations to the board on the appropriate form of LMS, Local Management of Schools for Guernsey. Rather similar to the Proposition we have had in front of us today. But it just illustrates that if you do not have a States' Resolution which can be held to account for, you do not have the drive, you do not have the commitment, what happens? Nothing.

2975 Deputy Stephens spoke about larger schools and the advantages in setting, and I completely agree with her, sir. But if we then go to the three schools proposed by the Committee, in fact we increase the ability range within those schools because they are not changing in size as the proposals are. So in fact the setting... you would have the same number of sets in a particular year but you would have a bigger ability range, so you have a bigger ability range in those sets, so that  
2980 it why I completely agree with her. Because we increasing the ability range in our schools by

ending selection, we need to increase the size of those schools in order to ensure that we have as small an ability range as possible in our sets.

It is interesting one of the teachers that emailed us said how stressful it is, the bigger ability range you have, in particular in science and maths subjects.

2985 Deputy Trott spoke about not being an open cheque book. Well, I totally agree, it cannot be an open cheque book. But this is, effectively. It is not a policy letter; it is a policy amendment. It is not a detailed report with a capital budget, and nobody can interpret it as that, there are not any Propositions along those lines.

2990 The procedures of the States will ensure that all projects be tested at the various gateways, and I think we have made massive advances in the processes that we go through to ensure that we do get value for money, some say we have gone a step too far, but there is no question that we have not got enough steps in. Of course it will have to come back to the Assembly. So I cannot make any commitment, but it is not an open cheque book.

2995 Deputy Ferbrache spoke about politics. In March 2016 I was in the Assembly and there were some proposals about the federated four-school models and ending selection. Well, there was a group of four of us again who were involved, and we tried to separate out the Propositions, so firstly we had a debate about selection or no selection, which was done, and then there were separate once that decision had been made about whether it is a four-school model. My views, as I said, have not changed from the two-school model but as ever politics is the art of the achievable. I knew that a four-school model was wrong, I would have preferred the four school model, but those who were opposed to it had to find a coalition around an alternative to it and we did, and we opposed it and the three-school model was supported by the Assembly.

3000 Continuing in 2016 if I remember correctly, I am sure Deputy Le Pelley made a commitment to look at alternatives in relation to whether the three school model or not. That is precisely what they did, they invited us all into a workshop in January 2017 where we looked at the various alternatives. Obviously from that we did not know what model they were going to propose until they came back and, as Deputy Gollop said, I travelled round to most of the consultations as I could, some of them I turned up late, I had other commitments, and found that they were leaving the consultation because nobody had turned up. Then obviously a number of us having seen the proposals agreed to form the gang of four, as it is so called, and take this forward. So I think there is a process that we have gone through which has resulted in these proposals.

3010 Timing and the cost, I am not going to stand here and make a commitment, and I am sure that Deputy Fallaize will not either, I mean he covered these points in his opening speech, the timing is according to what priority what resources are given to this project. It is impossible at this point to know how much resources will be and therefore what the time period will be, and of course it is who is in office, which is making the decisions about the priorities, but I would hope that if we make a decision today to go to two schools that it is a major priority and it is driven forward as quickly as possible. We know there has been some work done so far looking at traffic, looking at services and looking at these high level feasibility studies, and we know from those high level feasibility studies two sites can be built on. We know from a more in-depth study that was done on one of the other schools that it is possible to convert one of the other schools to a 1,300-student school and we also know that it is possible if you acquire land at another site to do it. So effectively I cannot say which will be the two sites because that work would have to be done.

3015 The cost will come from the Capital Reserve as always in terms of capital projects. But what we do know we have got some quantity surveyors which have given estimated costs, but subsequent to the specification that was given to the quantity surveyors we asked further questions with the team at Education and we found out that the initial specification that they gave to the architects was overstated in terms of the size and the number of classrooms that were needed. So but still they were only estimated costs from a quantity surveyor based on a pure square foot, and as ever each site will have its own problems or simplicity in terms of building which will save or add to the costs.

3030

I want to conclude by repeating part of the quote that I said earlier in my speech on the Committee's proposals:

It will certainly have a significant negative impact on educational outcomes.

3035 I would say that the alternative model is a proven, successful structure for secondary and post-16 education, that is appropriate for the size of Guernsey and Alderney and I urge Members to support the amendment.

Thank you.

3040 **The Bailiff:** Anyone else? Oh, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

**Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Thank you, sir.

3045 First of all I just wanted to clarify a couple of things about the idea of parity of esteem. Like Deputy Roffey I also was attracted to the idea of a tertiary college because of that mix of vocational and academic, which suits me coming from my background quite well, but it does not necessarily mean that I cannot be moved from that position.

3050 I cannot agree with Deputy Gollop in his speech laying out the benefits of a Sixth Form College, because what was being proposed is not a Sixth Form College. Bill Watkin said that a general further education institute was the closest parallel, and all of those great statistics about sixth form colleges were about sixth form colleges, the breadth of curriculum that you could get with 1,000 plus pupils. I am not going to go again into all of those, but one of the things we do end up, and it is a problem that the UK are going to have to deal with, with the route that they are choosing, is the parity of esteem.

3055 If we are separating the academic and the vocational at this level we have to look at how not only the T-levels and raising up the standard and how you are delivering the course and having clear pathways and neatening it up, getting rid of the plethora of BTechs, if they are doing that and we have the A-levels and we have the T-levels and these clear vocational academic courses, the decision to go down one of those routes at 16 does not just start at 16. It needs to start way back in Years 7 and 8, where the way that we are designing the curriculum now, the Big Guernsey curriculum, is fantastic and there is no reason why it would not be in the alternative model as well as the Education, Sport & Culture model.

3060 One of the things about creating that parity of esteem, it needs to start earlier and students must have access to that rich balanced curriculum, again that Guernsey curriculum, prior to making the decision at 16. That creative and technical elements need to be in that part of the school curriculum and delivered around a solid academic core, along with the flexibility to change their minds, and that is something that Deputy Stephens spoke about, the flexibility, and you can understand how Education, Sport & Culture came to this idea, that flexibility would happen in the Sixth Form Centre, but if we are unable to do the best A-levels and the best technical in that one area what does it matter how much flexibility and how easy it is to change courses. If we are not doing the foundation work and actually looking at the children from Years 7 and 8, saying to them what is best for you from that point, then actually giving them the foundation to go forward, what does it matter if they are able to say, 'Oh, I do not like A-levels', or 'I do like BTech' and switch and change as much as they want if we have not done the foundation work from the beginning? That is something whichever model would be key to getting right, and I do not think that one element is enough to make me decide to go with the Education, Sport & Culture model.

3075 Like I said, it is a general further institute not a sixth-form college. There are concerns over being able to staff both the A-levels and we are told it cannot deliver T-levels in the institute. If we did choose to ignore T-levels and try some approach that blends vocational and academic there remains serious concerns over how to deliver the different pathways to the highest degree.

3080 We already have a proven track record of delivering A-levels in an 11-18 school, we know how to do it. We also have a proven track record of delivering vocational in the College of FE.

Now Deputy Tooley mentioned earlier about the different workshops, particularly Performing Arts, we have a purpose built Performing Arts Centre that is not on the Les Varendes site, again in the opening speech Deputy Le Pelley did say that no children would need to change sites, so what are we going to do? Are we going to rebuild a theatre and performing arts centre at the Les Varendes site so that we can give the creative performing arts students the same opportunity that they ... ? Too many questions, engineering workshops, health and beauty – again if we are creating that parity of esteem, one of the key things, again Deputy Tooley did mention it briefly in her speech, is if the College of Further Education has the GTA and the Health Institute on the same campus and that organisation has aspirations to move up to a University College – and this is something when I was looking at tertiary models there is research that the 16-19 students benefit from having adults in that environment because (a) they have something to look up, to aspire towards, you can aspire to Level 5, Level 6, you can see the professionals, but (b) you also have and it is the same argument that is used for the 11-18 the A-level teachers teaching GCSEs they have got a higher level of expertise, the lecturers that will be lecturing the university level courses have high expertise and that is delivered to those students.

We have an example of that: the College of FE has introduced a Higher National Diploma in Creative and Digital Arts at the College and it shows that we are already moving in that direction, the College are already moving there. Where would that fit in in the Education Sport & Colleges ... Education, Sport & I forgot Culture, their model (*Laughter*) where would that moving of ... would that Higher National Diploma be delivered in the general further education institute, or would it be delivered in the part-time training college? It does not make sense.

Now, the other major part of my concern, and it was a very real concern, was the special educational needs provision within three educational model. The alternative paper report does outline on page 36 that:

the Alliance is of the opinion that co-location 'may be (inadvertently) set up in such a manner that achievement of the goals of the UN Convention, particularly those of challenging segregation and stereotyping, may never be achievable'.

That is one of the reason why they looked to, rather than say, 'Well, we know the answer, there are so many different opinions about this, they say we have to look at this and not ...' I do understand the Committee's not reticence but concern over creating uncertainty within the special educational needs sector by saying wholesale we are going to go down this road, and even a review to some degree does cause that uncertainty. But it does not acknowledge that there actually is a need for change.

One of the points that was raised again in Deputy Le Pelley's opening speech was this idea that we will listen more to the parents' needs, that already happens and we already fail far too many children because we are trying to do two different systems. We need to have a step back and actually listen to the people who are affected, not only the people in the system but ask people and find out from the Committee what makes them decide to go in a certain route. 'Why am I asking for my child to be helped in this way, is it because I fear that they will be bullied in mainstream education or is it because it genuinely is the best place for them?' Those in the system at the moment and also those after. Are we giving them the best opportunity to go on with further life if we separate out a certain section of our children and then plonk them into the market at the end? Deputy Leadbeater quite rightly raised that point that there is not an element of transition, or it is not looked at properly the transition from school into the job sector, but it is an even rougher transition if you have already separated your children away from their peers. What are we saying, how are we going to have an inclusive society if we kind of take people out put people back in?

Sorry, I give way to Deputy Leadbeater.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Sir, I thank Deputy Hansmann Rouxel for giving way.

I fully appreciate her opinion. Deputy Brehaut and myself had a quick word about this at lunchtime. The thing with special educational needs provision is every single child with special educational needs is completely different to every other, and every parent's experience is completely different. I thank Deputy Hansmann Rouxel for discussing this and raising this because this is a piece of work that we need to get through. I do not necessarily think it is tied in with this debate now, but I thank her for raising this and I hope that the rest of the Members will help keep this on their radar.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

**Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** I take my cue to move on swiftly, Deputy Leadbeater.

Those issues – and we also need to acknowledge those who have dropped out of the system. Those who are home schooling their children because they do not have access into the system. Well, yes, they have the means to actually home-school their children but why are they not able to access education for their children on Island? All of those areas.

The one overwhelming concern that people have expressed, specifically from the special educational and additional needs community, has been concern over the size of schools. I took a long time to look into the example of the Cotswolds and looked at their special educational needs policy. What was really interesting is that along with the independence and the governance they actually had two governors who were specifically on hand to govern the special educational needs within the committee, and we can argue over 'Oh well, they had the resources, they do not have as many special educational needs people,' but if it is a model that works why can we not emulate that model? It does not necessarily mean one thing about the size and the economies of scale and Deputy de Sausmarez did mention it, and I think it is really important.

In the March 2016 Election we had disability inclusion hustings, where we walked around. Overwhelmingly people were saying that in various sectors that the continuity of care was what was important and was what was lacking because of the retention of staff, the turnover of staff. If we do go to two schools we have the ability to have a more robust special educational needs in each school where potentially you could have one individual following and creating that pathway right throughout that child's school career because you would have that continuity within the system. At the moment we have those resources but they are spread over, so you have a resource and they will then be deployed to the school and there will be there for a day then move to the next school, but if it is in one school they will know those pupils, they will be able to build that pathway for the pupils and crucially I do think that we can provide that continuity of care, again it is not up to us as politicians to decide that, but for the head teachers to explain how they have successfully delivered those kind of provisions within the successful schools that they have taught in the UK. Why can we not learn from them and build those into the system?

I will just leave you with this – one last thing it is about the buildings, and it really frustrates me because yes the capital cost of the buildings is absolutely vital, but there is this idea that we do not need to do anything to the other schools is wrong. Those schools were built as secondary moderns, and they were not built with the idea of modern teaching. So looking at the educational estate, and looking at those buildings, and looking at the areas that we create where we can have different kinds of support and provision, as well as the acoustics and the environment of the buildings and what can be done to actually make them accessible, because right now there are some children with sensory issues that are not actually able to access the school. It is not about the curriculum or the academics; it is about the actual building being too loud.

And the last thing, a quote:

Disabling educational environments affect all children not just those who are identified with having impairments.

That is one of the reasons why inclusivity and allowing a slightly bigger environment we will have much more scope to give individual care.

That is why I will be voting for the two-school model. Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Oliver.

**Deputy Oliver:** Thank you, sir.

3185 Firstly I would just like to declare an interest. I have a little three-year-old daughter who is currently at lower pre-school, and not too far in the distant future she will be entering school. She does not have her name down for any of the colleges, not that that should make any difference.

3190 Normally with a strategy or a plan, or whatever you want to call it, you prefer one more than the other. I am not an educationalist and I have no plans to become a teacher. However, on this occasion I do believe Guernsey was not quite ready for an all-ability system that we need to be truly great. That is why I wanted to retain selection, but that ship has sailed.

3195 However, I think Deputy Soulsby actually described how I felt about this debate, the forthcoming debate, quite well: pulling wisdom teeth and this debate have something in common. I have never set out wanting to close any schools, but this has happened when we lost the debate for selection, and all the schools, like Deputy Le Tocq actually said, are no longer what they are, they are always going to be something different. It is not all-ability or selection which is hurting the Island; it is what many people have said in this room, the uncertainty. I am a strong believer that a decision does need to be made. Whether we like it or not, a decision has to be made.

3200 So on researching this, after looking and reading both reports, having masses of other literature sent to me and people's correspondence which they have been so kind to send to me, I thought let's start at the beginning. What makes a good school? I am sure some of us will say this is not what makes a good school, but this is what I found. First of all, it is what many of us in this room have actually implied, quality of leadership. In other words, students perform better where heads provide strong leadership.

3205 The second is having high expectations of students as well as teachers. High expectations of students have repeatedly been shown that has a positive impact on students' performance. This is not saying that everybody should achieve an A\* but a high expectation for some children means achieving a grade in something.

3210 Thirdly, ongoing assessment of student performance and development. Schools should use assessment to compare their students with others, not just from the UK but we should be looking to Europe as well, effective use of assessment allows schools to identify problematic areas of learning at the classroom in school levels so that solutions can be generated as how best to address the problems.

3215 Fourth, having goals and a direction – basically we know where we want to go. This cannot be said at the moment. Our schools are just in limbo and this is why I urge us to make a decision today.

Finally, the school should be secure and organised, for maximum learning to occur students need to feel safe and secure. Respect is also a quality that is promoted and is a fundamental aspect of a safe school.

3220 I think these in many respects can be applied to either model. However, as so many of us have said changing the Law and devolution of power to the schools in most cases will help the schools achieve this, and I do not understand why it cannot be done sooner than later, as Deputy Ferbrache pointed out.

3225 I know the Education Committee has been ... this one and previous ones have been looking at this for the last eight years. We do not appear to be any further ahead. At least the two-school models have put a date on it to work to, although they might come up against the same problems as the previous Committees. I get that, but surely if the States have a will to make something happen we can. We can just get on and do it.

3230 I then when on to look and think, and I do not normally bring personal experiences into debate, although I have on this one because I looked at what I want for my daughter, and what I want her to actually achieve in her educational years. I came up with three aspirations, and they are aspirations, they might never happen, but this is what I hope. I want teachers to understand her and bring the best out of her educationally, emotionally and sportingly. In other words I want

her to be rounded and grounded. I want her to be confident inside and outside the classroom. I think this is so important, a lot of people can become very educational and academic but have very little common sense and know how to live in the real world. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) So this is what teachers need to provide to be able to live outside the classroom.

I will not go over all the pros and cons of both models. All I can say is that it was actually Deputy Soulsby that made me think, do we want an educational system which is all value for money or do we want the best educational system? I know Deputies in the room at the time when this was said, different views came out, and I thought about it really very long and hard, and I think it has to be a mixture of both, if I am truly honest. If we can have value for money then we can put in the things that I think most people would like to. We would like to put in more sports or at least different sports in schools, we would like to put in more afterschool activities, not only to help the children of those schools but also the parents. It is so difficult for a parent to have a full time job and pick up their child at 3.30 p.m. or 4.30 p.m. These are all things that if you have value for money you can then achieve.

The final point I think that changed my mind and sort of actually made me think which model do I want was something Deputy Meerveld said. He called me up to ask if I would support an amendment to say would I support basically the option 2 of the schools, which is two 11-16 and one 11-18, and I thought about it and my immediate reaction was parents will perceive the 11-18 to be better, and we spoke a bit more about it and he said, well yes, that is what the Committee came up with and that is why it was option 2. I just thought, what is it about 11-18 that makes people perceive it is better? It might not be, there are some great 11-16 schools out there and there are also some fantastic 11-18. I cannot answer that. I honestly cannot, and I have tried, but I know in my heart of hearts, my daughter might not even go on to do A-levels, she might choose at 16 to say 'No, I have had enough of school, I do not want to do it', or she might choose to go to the college. That does not bother me in the slightest, but it goes back to my five 'what makes a good school', and it is the high expectations. I think the higher you have the level – you might never reach it, it does not matter – but it is having them in the first place, and that comes back to what makes a good school.

My final point, and this is almost a bit of a negative, because my worries about voting for the two school, it is a bit like, through you, sir, Deputy Trott – it is by the slimmest margins. There are huge negatives with the two-school model: there are no proper costings, there is no final end date when it will be fixed, there are so many problems with it, you have got HR, you do not know how much it is going to cost to change teachers' contracts. But overall, there is just something in that that makes me want to vote for it.

So that is why I will be voting for the two-school model.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

**Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, first of all I would like to declare an interest, I am a Vale Representative on the La Mare de Carteret High School Management Committee, of which I am President; I am a member of the La Mare de Carteret Primary School; and I am President of the Hautes Capelles School Management Committee. All three schools I was voted on by the Vale electorate. Also, sir, our daughter carries out supply work as a Learning Support Assistant, and I have grandchildren in the States' schools and at the private colleges.

Both La Mare de Carteret Primary and High Schools desperately need rebuilding. The list of problems with both the buildings goes on, and we know, or jolly well should know, these two schools have been delayed now for years, and the alternative model are not even pushing for La Mare de Carteret High School to be built.

I am astonished at the lack of Members asking, 'What about the primary schools?' I have heard loads about 11-18 or post-16, virtually zilch about the primary school children, who are a big part

3285 of this debate, or jolly well should be. Nothing in the alternative model of where the primary school children will attend school under their proposals. This brings more worry to the parents and teaching staff who many believed once the Education, Sport & Culture report was published at least they had certainty. If the alternative model succeeds today, the worry, unrest cannot be underestimated for those parents and teaching staff.

3290 I have heard colleagues state that a new school does not improve education, a new school will only improve the building. That is certainly true to a certain extent, but if only Members had taken the trouble to visit La Mare de Carteret Schools (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) when in operation and see how students have the books under the table, as four are sharing a table and does not allow enough room for their reference books or files, hence all on the floor. Having a decent sized  
3295 classroom will address this. Having a building with air conditioning will make a huge difference to those at La Mare de Carteret, as many of these students are far too hot in the summer, whereas some work with their coats on in the winter as the nine huts are really cold. Those nine damp cold huts were temporary – no, they have not been temporary; they have been permanent classrooms for far too many years. The States should hold their heads in shame. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

3300 So saying a building does not make a difference, it is down to the teaching staff, is not entirely true, although they along with the head teacher are brilliant and do an excellent job. But both the High School and Primary School buildings are not fit for purpose, with far too many small classrooms or huts. The States have failed the pupils and staff at La Mare de Carteret for far too long, and now the two schoolers want to pull the rug on the new build.

3305 Both Education, Sport & Culture and the alternative model have put on presentations with their own UK expert, which as we all know is good to hear how it is done elsewhere, but living on a small Island must be taken into consideration. It became apparent when the alternative model group met with teaching staff locally, and they were not necessarily aware of La Mare de Carteret High School work.

3310 Currently on Island, to a very good excellent education, both primary and secondary school, here are great examples backed by an independent body of Education Scotland. I just feel, fine to do the research but do not dismiss the good practice that is already in our schools. The independent inspection validation that took place at La Mare de Carteret High School set out the following:

Learners' experience – very good; teaching for effective learning – very good; meeting learning needs – very good; improvement through self-evaluation – very good; leadership of improvement and change – very good; improvements in performance – good.

3315 Now that might not mean a lot to Members, but on the definition of 'very good', let me read to you what it actually says:

Very good = major strengths.

An evaluation of 'very good' applies to provision characterised by major strengths. There are very few areas for improvement and any that do exist do not significantly diminish pupils' experiences. Whilst an evaluation of very good represents a high standard of provision it is a standard that should be achievable by all. It implies that it is fully appropriate to continue to make provision without significant adjustment. However, there is an expectation that the school will take opportunities to improve and strive to raise performance to excellent.

That is the definition of 'very good'.

3320 Let me just carry on and read what was in the independent evaluation. This is by Terry Carr, who is a HM Inspector, when he spoke about leadership of improvement and change he wrote the following:

The head teacher demonstrates outstanding leadership skills. She has successfully developed the school's vision to attend, aspire and achieve through consultation with staff and other stakeholders, and communicated it well across the school community. The head teacher has established sound working relationships across the school community and beyond and has gained the respect of staff, young people, parents and partners. She has very high expectations for all students and staff. Her robust, rigorous and persistent approach to securing improvements is evident in the high



quality learning and teaching observed across the school and in the improvements in attendance, attainment and achievement.

Also when the alternative group met with teaching staff, it was said by one of the political Members who attended that actually it is very difficult to have extra curricula when sited in a small school. Well, La Mare de Carteret runs 52 clubs weekly, and 92% of students participating. That is pretty impressive.

3325 It was argued that points that La Mare de Carteret cannot manage attendance effectively in a small school due to lack of staff. In six years La Mare de Carteret have improved by 10% and currently operates above national average, it has gone from 84% to 95.2%, and that as somebody mentioned this morning is about the resources they have put in. Right and proper the attendance records have gone up, because they are working with parents and they are working with the  
3330 pupils, and that is the joy of having a very large estate right alongside the school. If La Mare de Carteret is not operated and it is not rebuilt, I hope that will not diminish, but I do suspect that that will be more difficult.

I also have concerns over the viability of La Mare de Carteret Primary. The alternative model proposes that the plans allow for it to be built, but there is no guarantee this will happen.

3335 We also heard how well an 11-18 school was doing in the Cotswolds, and I agree it is doing very well, but of course, the Cotswolds is not an island. There remains choice for parents of schools, they also have grammar schools, they have other schools, other colleges in England and we do not.

3340 As the years go by in all walks of life things change, progress must be welcomed. Just reflect on the last 15 years, and think of some good news on new health treatments available, how the finance industry has changed over the last 15 years, education systems have also changed quite considerable in the last 15 years. The world does not stop still. Progress should be welcomed, we cannot hold back on rebuilding a school just in case. There will always be a just in case. Changes in progression happen all the time and we need to move on now and get certainty by supporting,  
3345 I believe, the Education, Sport & Culture proposals.

With the special places at the colleges gone, this States has managed to remove choice and the opportunity for inclusion to the colleges. They have made the colleges so elite, unless in highly paid employment, ordinary families will struggle to have a choice of education for their children (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) a wonderful own goal by the States are producing a 'them and  
3350 us' education system, so much for equality and inclusion.

Money being tight, the States will still have to find savings, yet by supporting the alternative model a leap of faith in the dark exists. No costings, no timelines, no identification of which schools will close and no information for parents of the feeder schools. In my opinion a dangerous route.

3355 This has not even been part of a consultation process, what a cracking failure of good governance voting blind, no expenditure identified, no plans, no evidence, no timeline. I am sure if any of you wanted to come forward with a plan for our head of law enforcement to open a new police station, he would welcome this new approach that we are taking here in this States.

3360 Yes, we must listen to the professionals, but we must also listen to the parents and others who have a right to speak out, and not though, I suggest, in a way that the Chamber of Commerce did by supporting the one school two-site model before it had even been published and before they even asked their members.

3365 A parent stopped me the other day and he said I would not say this in my speech, so I am proving him wrong, because he was pretty angry, and what he said to me was, 'I do not want to hear from UK specialists presenting on two different schemes, I do not want to hear from States' Members who are paying for their children to have private education that has now been denied to my children as a special place holder. I want the States to support the ordinary working class parents whose children by a large majority attend the States' schools. Ask us what we want, you have not done so.' He concluded, 'Add that in your speech, but I bet you won't, because nobody  
3370 listens to us as the ordinary people of Guernsey.' (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

3375 The 69-page alternative model report, and I am sorry, Deputy Fallaize, I have got it 69 because I took out all your double spacing; it saved on my printer. *(Laughter)* It is a good report, it is a good report but it is certainly not 105 pages. I would have liked to have also taken out the attacks against Education, Sport & Culture, because I wanted to read what you had to offer not necessarily having a go at Education, Sport & Culture. But it is very much a vision document, and of course we have seen vision documents in this States, the last States, the States before, the States before and the States before. Visions documents have been helpful but also they can set out expectations that are not necessarily fulfilled.

3380 But after all these years Deputy Fallaize saying he would like a two-school model, I am grateful, although it is this last minute proposal that has been produced, if only this had happened last term by him, or even last year, complete with the data, but at least now we have something before us Deputy Fallaize, and I am grateful.

3385 Listening to Deputy Soulsby in 2013 she did not want schools to close, breaking up the community, tearing out the heart of the community. Well, it is going to happen again, but this time it is two more schools. Earlier today Deputy Soulsby says she does not care where the schools are, what a difference time makes.

A lot of this is about trust.

3390 **Deputy Soulsby:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** I was talking about primary schools, not secondary schools at the time.

3395 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

**Deputy Lowe:** Still closing schools, Deputy Soulsby. It does not matter whether it is primary in my opinion or high schools or indeed the College of FE or indeed the Grammar School. We are here facing closing two schools today.

3400 **Deputy Yerby:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

3405 **Deputy Yerby:** Four schools have already been closed by the effect of the decision to remove the 11-plus. We are debating whether to create two new schools or three.

3410 **Deputy Lowe:** No, we have not closed schools, the schools are still operating. What is being looked at here is to see whether they can be amalgamated into a different educational system where there are more people together. That is what we have got before us. The buildings are still there, we have not closed the schools. The community schools are still there.

3415 I think a lot of this is about trust. Listening to some of the speeches Members just do not trust the Education, Sport & Culture. The Education, Sport & Culture won a vote of no-confidence, and they proved many of the doubters in here wrong when it was said Education, Sport & Culture would not return to the States with a three-school model in time, and it would have some form of selection available. Today they have proved otherwise. There is, I believe, yet again part of this debate about trust.

3420 I then turn to the letter that we had and I am grateful that P&R produced a letter for us to have a look at, although I have to say I was a little disappointed with the content, because it does not tell us anything. Yet the day before in the paper we were hearing about leadership and how the States is failing, but this does not actually come up with a leadership answer for me, which

that is fine, but at least we have got something here telling us what P&R think. I am grateful that P&R acknowledge

that the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture has broadly discharged the extant States' resolution

in their letter. Also:

the Policy & Resources Committee does not find any single overwhelming argument in favour of either set of proposals.

3425

They go on to say that we need:

to choose the option which provides the greatest flexibility for future developments.

But we can only vote on what we have got before us, because none of us have a crystal ball and as I said before the last 15 years how education has changed considerable none of us really know what is going to actually happen. But I agree with what has actually been written in here, it says:

3430

The Committee is strongly of the view that it is imperative that the States make a clear and firm decision regarding the future structure of secondary and post-16 education. The current uncertainty is proving unsettling for parents, teachers, children and the wider community. This uncertainty will increase if a firm decision is not made.

They go on to say:

The States owe it to the community it represents to remove that uncertainty as soon as possible.

I agree, but I still do not see where the alternative model gives certainty, because we still do not know which schools will close, the parents will still not know where their children are going, we still do not know the timeline, and yet here we are looking for certainty. It goes on to say as well that:

3435

we must have confidence in our policy decisions and most importantly in the leadership of that change and implementation process.

When Deputy Gavin St Pier speaks, I would appreciate if he could expand on that, does he mean the leadership in the schools, or does he mean at the Education, Sport & Culture?

It goes on to say:

It is difficult, if not impossible, for the Policy & Resources Committee to comment on the value for money of either proposal or make any comparisons between them.

Well, that is a given because one is priced and gives a timeline and the other does not. It goes on to say:

3440

With its wider mandate, the Policy & Resources Committee is also mindful of the impact to the Island's construction sector associated with the longer timeframes with the Alternative Model ...

We all know that the Island's construction are looking for a decision today, and are hopeful that they will be able to get a spade in the ground and get employment back into the building industry more than we have currently got. It goes on to say:

3445

Having considered both reports at length the following are the matters that have been the subject of greatest interest and debate, both politically and in the wider community.

I agree. Issues the section under issues says:

Clarity for parents, teachers, learners and the wider community.

3450 And it states:

The Committee for Education, Sport & Culture's policy letter contains sufficient detail to give clarity regarding the future, whereas, understandably, there is ...

And it says 'less detail' but I have put in brackets there is no detail:

and hence less clarity – in the Alternative Model report.

I was grateful that they put a section as well under recruitment and retention of teachers, because that is key, because we have heard too often by some who are saying there has been a problem recruiting, and that is not necessarily the case. So I am grateful for the explanation that they have got there that Human Resources which comes under P&R have made it clear there are:

currently no discernible issues with recruitment or retention,

and I think we need to remember that. It goes on to say:

Impact on the wider education system

Neither report considers the potential impact of their proposals on the grant-aided colleges.

And Deputy Trott covered part of that this morning, but of course by removing the decision to allow places to be going to the colleges, and if we go down to a single 11-18 school I do believe the colleges will prosper, and I do believe there will be ramifications and an impact on the States' system. Only two weeks ago Blanchelande started with now a two form entry and had 22 new pupils attend in Years 5 and 6. I am also aware as a Member on Hautes Capelles that children have left Hautes Capelles including Year 3 at half term in case they could not get a place in Years 5 and 6. That is what is actually happening out there.

We go on here to say the traffic issues:

have been carried out which indicate that there are no insurmountable traffic issues associated with either model.

I will come back to the traffic issues a bit further on in my speech, but again I am not quite sure or confident about the traffic around St Sampson's School.

It goes on to say about the:

Impact on Committee resources

Should the Alternative Model prove to be the favoured option in its entirety, a review of the Education Law will be carried out.

And it goes on to say that this will come back to the States to see where it will fit in the prioritisation because it has not been in the prioritisation for education and that it would need to come in nearer the top for drafting to take place. Well, I am sure nearly every Member in this Assembly will be fully aware top of the legislation list for drafting is Brexit. We have a huge amount of work for Brexit. We know, certainly from Committees – well, Home Affairs and indeed I have heard from other Committees as well – that we have legislation stacking up that will affect our community, and benefit our community, but Brexit is the priority, and as has been said by Deputy Brouard, and indeed by Deputy Ferbrache, some things can happen already under this Education Law without it, and it will not happen, it will not jump over Brexit, it cannot afford to do so. But I think that has been a little bit exaggerated on that one.

So the final bit I am going to read out of the letter from Deputy St Pier is he says:

The Committee would urge States Members to ensure that a clear decision is made.

Well, as I said, I cannot see much clearer than the Education, Sport & Culture report, because they show the feeder schools, they show the high schools, they show the timelines and they show the costs.

So there is also a presumption by some of the speakers that the Education, Sport & Culture Members would go if they lose the vote for three schools, and the two-schoolers have already stated, if not publicly but privately, who would take over, that is if the States approve their nominations. So will there be another vote of no confidence if they decide to carry on and now bring forward a two-school model? I say that because this Committee have brought before you today a three-school model, even though every Member of that Committee supported selection, and every Member wanted to keep that going, and there was criticism that they would not be able to bring it back in time, as I stated before. So there is not any reason, in my opinion, why they could not bring forward a two-school model; they brought forward the three, but I will leave that to Members to decide how they are going to handle it, and indeed to the Members of Education, Sport & Culture how they are going to handle it, and if other Members feel that a vote of no-confidence would be on the radar if the two-school model goes through, or one school two sites.

Deputy Roffey mentioned Beaucamps could be extended but compulsory purchase would be necessary and Deputy Ferbrache covered that earlier. That does not happen overnight –

**Deputy Roffey:** Point of correction.

I mentioned nothing about compulsory purchase.

**Deputy Lowe:** No. Sorry, through you, sir, no, you mentioned about Beaucamps and it has been mentioned about compulsory purchase – yes, that is fine.

It was said that St Sampson's would be the easiest option, one of the two schools, I think you set out the different schools that you felt may be appropriate, or acceptable. We do not know if that would mean extending Beaucamps upwards or outwards or how they would do it, but doubling the size from 700 to 1,400 pupils, or extending outwards or taking away much of the outside sports facilities only time will tell. But you cannot extend a school outwards and expect there still to be space for the youngsters to be able to go outside, not when you are doubling the school in size.

I do agree with him about the famous flood defence. I do not know why it is in there, I mean the water actually comes off the land, not off the sea, so it just needs a good drainage system to be put in there to be honest, but there we go, that flood defence I think has been a pain to several of us over the years, and something like a £9 million pain.

It was also said as well that the La Mare de Carteret would be the same size as the Grammar School, that may be right but the Grammar School does not have a primary school on site which children from four years upwards, and with even younger siblings on the school site picking up their brother or sister.

So if the amendment is successful and the Education, Sport & Culture return with a report for two schools, which includes St Sampson's School, will we see again Deputy St Pier, Deputy Trott, Deputy Merrett, Deputy Stephens, Deputy Le Pelley and Deputy Meerveld marching through the streets opposing doubling the school size from 700 pupils to 1,400 resulting in extra traffic? Bearing in mind only a matter of a few months ago this issue was raised by them for a planning application very close to St Sampson's School, hence the public objection campaign with the St Sampson's Deputies leading the walk. Will they be consistent and protest about the amount of traffic bringing 700 extra pupils to and from St Sampson's School? Who knows?

For years there has unfortunately been too much class, it is almost snobbery, against the College of FE. The College of FE is superb. They have not got the best facilities, but there is no doubt that some, not all, but some that attend the Grammar School turn their nose up at the youngsters that go to the College of FE – wrongly so, it is shocking. I have even heard it by some who have actually said it to me. So I welcome the college of FE being developed in the future years, and that is what I liked about the element of the Education, Sport & Culture: it would get rid of that stigma. There is a stigma, there is no doubt about it of youngsters that feel if they go to the Grammar School some feel they are better than those that go to the College of FE, and yet those that attend the College of FE come out with some cracking high results for A-levels, and we

should be promoting that more often and boosting that, because it is just unfair to those youngsters that go to the College of FE.

I now move on to the assurance sought by Deputy Stephens of Deputy Fallaize, that she seeks to assist her decision. I am rather grateful that later on this afternoon, Deputy Graham stood up and answered that, because he cannot give any assurances, he is not a Member of the Education, Sport & Culture, so unless it is the actual leading Committee, they are the ones that can give assurance for how they will look to this, but a lay person cannot give any assurance whatsoever because they have not got the mandate. These are individual Members that have brought an amendment, no more, no less, so although you are looking for assurances, Deputy Stephens and others, it just cannot happen, because they cannot do anything about it, unless, of course, it was part of a States' Resolution. If what you are seeking was part of a States' Resolution that is different, but it is not, and also even if it was, we have seen in the past as well where a President could come back with a statement apologising as they have not been able to fulfil the assurances given. That is not new; that has been happening for three years.

So, sir, I am nearing the end of my speech, but I want to say I am disappointed as well, it was said not by the Member, but it was what a Member heard one of the speakers from the UK say about creaming off the children at the top. They are not cakes, they are not icing, they are not delicious cream – these are our children in education. There is nothing about creaming off children, they are all equal. It does not matter whether one person goes to one school or another, everybody is different, and I would appreciate, and I am glad that it has not been said by a Member. It has been said by a Member from somebody outside of this Chamber that has actually said it, but it is an awful expression, and I have heard it in the past.

So I would also just like to ... There have been a few misleading, I would have to say, and probably inaccurate at times, comments that have been said to me, which I would like to address and put on record, because there have been rumours going around, and some of those rumours I ended up taking forward to find out the truth. I heard rumours about Blanchelande, so I contacted Blanchelande, both the head and indeed the head of the trusts, and I put the rumours that I had heard being told. They were absolutely inaccurate, Blanchelande is a thriving school, it is doing extremely well, there has never been, and there still is not, any pressures on families to attend church services. It is simply absurd – their words, not mine.

Regarding the leases which were renewed a couple of years ago on exactly the same terms and conditions, and Blanchelande have made it very clear, as have the other schools, and indeed the high schools as well, and the primary schools, and the heads that I have spoken to, they do not wish to get into a political ball game. They wish to be able to carry on in the schools offering the best education system that they can without getting embroiled in what is best building-wise, political-wise, two-school, three-school. They want to get on with the job, and they do a good job all of them.

So finally, sir, I struggle to comprehend how Members supporting the alternative model believe it is okay to close two schools and to vote for an open cheque book on an amendment that does not contain details. Where is the money coming from? Bearing in mind we have all been asked to make savings. It has been acknowledged the alternative model will be more expensive. That was said yesterday by Deputy Fallaize. Deputy Yerby said, well if we do not like it when it comes back, we can change it – but what is Plan B? There is no cap on how much they can spend. You have not got any figures in front of you whatsoever. There is nothing, absolutely nothing. By supporting this amendment you have not got a Plan B, none of us have got a Plan B in front of us, because there is nothing in that report.

So when a report comes back by Education, Sport & Culture and the eye-watering figures come before you, where are we going to be then? How are you going to face the public then, all of you? It is blind. A decision – the first time I think ever in my time in the States I have been asked to vote on a serious matter like education, on capital expenditure, on children's education, on closing schools, no timeline, no costs – not for me, thank you. This is not the way the States

3585 should be carrying on (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and I ask Members to reject this amendment. (*Applause*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen

3590 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, this amendment asks Members to set aside the Committee's mandated proposals. The Resolutions for which are clearly set out in Appendix 1 of our policy letter. Members are being asked to discard the costed and careful planning for the transformation of our secondary and post-16 education which has been laid by the Committee, for a model which has no plan, and is  
3595 noted as having little substance. There is no detail, no capital or revenue cost, no timeline, no preferred delivery sites, no consultation with the public. The delivery of this report at the last minute has led to great uncertainty and confusion in the community.

The Committee for Education, Sport & Culture have been mandated by the States to bring back a model for the delivery of secondary and post-16 education, and we have done this. The  
3600 Committee were asked to deliver a plan for 11-16 education in three schools, we have done this.

Now, sir, I received an email this week from a constituent which entirely sums up my thoughts on the Alternative Model report, so having received his permission I will read this to you now:

A lot of their paper dismisses your plan but does not give thorough proposals of their own, with lots of conjecture presented as fact. I do not understand some of the two school arguments. They spend a long time arguing why their school size is better than your proposals, then in point 3.3.11 get expert advice stating that there is insufficient evidence for school size to be considered as a major factor. In any case surely it is teacher quality that matters.

He goes on to say:

I understand and agree with their comments on the benefits of devolution of governance, but that could apply irrespective of the number of schools, and it is maybe that you have not covered that or are updating the Education Law on purpose as it is not what you are currently meant to be debating. However, if it is the case and you would be happy in implementing such changes then you had better make this clear so the debate is about the models, not unduly influenced by superfluous issues.

I thank my constituent as I could not have said it better myself, and as I, as the Committee,  
3605 agree with his comments, and the alternative model's comments, about devolved governance and the Education Law I will clear this up now, as this debate is about the models and has been unduly influenced by these superfluous issues.

The Committee has been looking into governance, or LMS, for Guernsey since it took office in May 2016. I can confirm that the Committee is supportive of devolved governance as proved by  
3610 our amended Proposition 8. The officers have been working with the College of Further Education on the trial that was begun in the last term. The Committee has stated on numerous occasions its intent to move down this path.

Some Members have asked today why it is not already up and running, the College of Further Education. It has admittedly been a very long process with a lot of support being given to the  
3615 College and the shadow board of governors to set up an accounting system in order to produce financial accounts and a business plan. Any board needs a clear view of the liability that they will individually hold as they take on the roles of directors of the limited by guarantee company which will sit above the College.

Things have taken far too long and this Committee have tried to move this project ahead by offering, amongst other things, to incorporate a company on two separate occasions, only to be  
3620 set back when financials are not completed, and awaiting advice from Law Officers. The reality that without a focused, uninterrupted effort we will continue to fail to get the governing board in place. It will not happen. That is why our Proposition 8 was amended to ensure that we get the focus and momentum required to push this on for this new post-16 structure.

3625 Members of P&R will remember that the Committee has recognised the requirement to rewrite the Education Law, as this was included in the Committee's initial drafts of its priority plan last

June. This item ended up being dropped from the top five priorities because P&R had stated that only items which could be deliverable within current resourcing could be included. Reviewing the competing priorities, such as delivering the post-16 and secondary transformation, the Law was then regrettably omitted from the P&R Plan.

Informally, however, the Committee discussed that as soon as we possibly could we would get together a sub-group using expertise, perhaps from this very Chamber, current educationalists, legal advisers, officers and our own Committee Members to progress this important item. It was planned to formalise a decision for July 2017. I am afraid that it just has not happened yet, but that we have every intention of beginning the rewrite of the Law within this term, which could take up to two years or more to complete given the processes involved, after all, sir, how long has the disability legislation taken.

A question that I have, related to this, for Deputy Fallaize, is what comes first in his ideas – the Education Law or the move to the new school structure? Is Deputy Fallaize planning on changing the Law first to enable the new school governing body to be established prior to implementing the move to one school on two sites, or will the transformation of secondary and post-16 education begin sooner than this with the devolved governance following? If the former then the timescale for moving to two 11-18 schools under the alternative model could be extended even further than the time required for planning, transition and assessments.

I am pleased that Deputy Graham has cautioned Members against asking him for an undertaking, and his fellow officers, for the delivery of a detailed plan for the alternative model in a specified timeframe. It is very clear that deeper thinking by the authors into many essential considerations just has not been done. In fact as none of the authors are currently sitting Members, as Deputy Lowe has just told us, of the Committee and therefore do not constitute or represent the Committee, it would be impossible, I think, for them in fact to give any undertaking about the delivery of a plan at this stage. I do not believe that they will be able to in fact deliver a credible and feasible plan ever.

Sir, one of our most excellent head teachers has commented that there seems to be a fundamental lack of understanding in the report by the authors of what we are actually doing in schools today. One area where this is abundantly apparent is in the constantly evolving digital environment, for which I am the political lead. All schools and colleges across the Bailiwick of Guernsey have been engaged in a bespoke 21st century learning programme provided by Aspire 2Be in partnership with the States of Guernsey. This is a two-year cultural change and empowerment programme, and has been designed around central objectives of developing sector leading educational digital practice and community cohesion, raising aspirations and standards in teaching and learning with technology. There has been a recognition of the importance of digital skills in Guernsey and alongside this a need to evaluate where schools stood in their practice, and implement schemes to promote and enhance digital pathways for young people for future economic growth.

In relation to the broadband provision for schools, I can confirm that internet bandwidth supplied to the schools will be increased from 500mb to 750mb within the next few weeks. So the authors do not appear to me to be quite up to date with the latest developments. In fact maybe rather outdated perhaps – the use of the term in the report ‘teleconferencing’ in respect of St Anne’s in Alderney when in fact they are using that very modern technological innovation Skype to interact in real time with schools around the globe was almost embarrassing. They are referring to very outdated technology in methods of communication.

Our education is a constantly evolving field and we are training our young people for future changes, and that is a clear picture of what tech in education looks like in practice. School children speaking to each other in very different places around the world during their school day without huge complications expense or resourcing – that is what we are doing now.

A key point that I would like to make where the alternative model is completely silent is about how the success of our education system is intrinsically linked to the success of our economy. Healthy economies are linked to health education systems around the world.



Sir, I have been in contact recently with the former Chief Inspector of Education Scotland, and this is relevant because our schools are inspected by Education Scotland, so benchmarking our schools for what we do in future against Ofsted inspected schools is not really a fair or realistic comparison. The ex-Chief Inspector, Ken Muir, is now the Head of the Scottish General Council of Teachers, and given his work in ... Guernsey, I took the opportunity of our introduction to provide him with both the Committee paper and the alternative report, and also in order to try and not give him a bias I gave him the bare minimum of background information, and only because he was aware that education changes have been on the table here for such a long time.

He made constructive and positive comments about our Committee proposal, which I was obviously pleased about, but I am afraid he was rather less positive about the alternative model. He has told me that other leading education systems have been grappling with similar curricula issues, for example Finland, Wales, Scotland, Ontario, to those we are battling with in Guernsey. All are going down the route which has the essential following features and which we are proposing in Guernsey: a greater student-centred and bespoke approach to curriculum design; increased skills focus, but based on a strong foundation of knowledge and understanding; recognition that learning takes place in a variety of places; planning a curriculum that is as future-proofed yet flexible as possible. On reading the alternative model paper he said, 'I smiled at the suggestion that the Committee model was an unorthodox experiment; the route we are following in common with other jurisdictions would suggest otherwise.'

Mr Muir made further comments about the alternative model: great emphasis is being given to the alternative model being a better one in which leadership and governance can be devolved to the school level. He said, 'I cannot see why this should not be the case with the ESC model.' He said, he notes that there has been some financial projections prepared for the alternative model, but that the authors admit in paragraph 6.19 that more detailed analysis of operating costs is needed.

Just on my reading of the papers, I think that the alternative model would be more expensive. Indeed, later in the paper the authors note that prioritising economical use of the existing estate inevitably incurs less capital expenditure in the Committee model. Later he says in their paper they note that further work is needed on the costings. This matter we have explored a lot in detail today.

To my mind, he says, 'one of the major criticisms levelled at the ESC model in the alternative model paper is based on the size of the schools. This ignores that what is most important is the quality of the teacher/student interaction, irrespective of the school size.'

He then finishes by saying the criticism of mix-and-match programmes of study in the ESC model is to misunderstand – to *misunderstand* – the need for opening up a greater number of pathways and opportunities for students.

This last statement from Mr Muir confirms to me that the alternative model is a retrograde step and is an attempt to create a Malory Towers style idyll, not a progressive forward looking and flexible system which is fit to take our children and young people into adulthood, and what will be a more complicated work life than we have ever known.

The question that we should be asking ourselves, sir, that I think every Member should ask themselves, is what do we want from our society, and how do we want our children to ultimately contribute to our society? Our plans from the Committee are about achieving this goal; we want children to be creative; we want them to be resilient and confident; we want them to have digital skills and the ability to apply practical skills. Guernsey has been successful and made its wealth from practice, not theory. This is really about employability and giving children the opportunity to be productive, happy, contributing members of our society. The report is silent on this matter.

So I hope that I have made it clear that the only two substantive items within the alternative model idea are already on the to-do list of the Committee. Their report is ideological; it is not real; it is not pragmatic; it does not set itself in context with Guernsey; it is not carefully considered; it has not exploited to the full the extra P&R funded research in its formulation.

3730 I had been inclined towards an outward generosity towards the Alternative Model report because clearly there has been a lot of work that has been put into it, but I would not therefore be being entirely honest in continuing this way, as I do not share the same views as some Members who are clearly very excited about this and have praised the report highly. I really would not want anyone who has not read it to come away post-debate with an unbalanced view, thinking that the  
3735 the four Deputies have produced something of great quality, something worthy of such praise, or something which, in my view, is really credible in terms of planning the educational future of our children.

The report carries a price tag of £72,000 – £72,000 of taxpayers' money, not counting the staff hours. And for the cost of the data produced, the content of the report is wholly inadequate – on  
3740 the basis of which Deputies should be expected to take an informed judgement. It is clear to me that there are some who have taken political lines on this. Deputy Roffey's speech was a thinly veiled confirmation of this. I for one certainly never expected him to endorse anything that the Committee presented, and fully understood his pledge to support us in bringing the plans back to the States to mean that he would only cease sniping at us for a while to let us get on with the  
3745 work.

No, sir, this debate is not a straight forward one, there are no answers behind it, and I am beginning to see more clearly that this is because some Members do not want, at any cost, the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret. I am using *Hansard* here to illustrate my point, and make no apology for that. In the March 2016 debate on reducing four schools to three, Deputy St Pier  
3750 stated:

Sir, I am sorry to say, but the only logical solution, the only obvious solution and the only sensible solution is to close La Mare. I have said very little actually about the financial case for three schools ...

He has also said:

I am afraid that the La Mare rebuild is a story of the *Emperor's New Clothes*, like the little boy in the crowd someone has to say so, and today it falls to me to do just that. I know that will be deeply unpopular with many people, but it makes no sense to rebuild La Mare and then close another school.

Deputy St Pier made it very clear in this speech how he felt about La Mare de Carteret rebuild, although this speech refers going from four schools to three, it could equally apply in today's circumstance. Has he really changed his mind, sir, and is Deputy St Pier's deep conviction over the  
3755 course of the last two years has it changed?

For some this debate is on the premise of educational outcomes, but the reality is that it is not only about the best educational outcomes for our children, it must also have consideration about the financial cost and the Education estate, which lies at the heart of P&R, and no doubt specifically the President.

3760 Deputy Lowe is the only Deputy who has commented on this, and it appears that some Deputies might prefer this observation has less focus until after the debate. By not rebuilding La Mare some of the least affluent children in our Island will be negatively affected. I believe that we should rebuild a school at that site – a site that sits on the edge of one of our biggest social housing estates, which provides the support that is so needed there by many families.

3765 So for one reason or another it is now abundantly clear why some of P&R, knowing the President's stance on La Mare and his desires to rationalise the estate, have teamed up and funded the G4, or the group of four, in their alternative investigation into two schools and its financial aspects. Herein lay the opportunity maybe not to rebuild La Mare for those Deputies who did not want it rebuilt.

3770 The Education Committee know that the peripheral costs associated with increasing the size of St Sampson's, Les Beaucamps and a purpose built new build for the College of Further Education could far outweigh the Committee proposals. Our proposals make good use of the existing estate. These points have not been addressed at all by the Deputies behind the alternative model, and are of vital importance.

3775 No reference either has been made to Les Varendes as yet in speeches, Deputies need to understand the extent of growth in the Sixth Form Centre and they need to use classrooms in the main school, and it makes sense, as per our model, to utilise these rooms for other full time study courses if the 11-16 years olds move elsewhere. For several years the established Sixth Form Centre whilst part of the Grammar campus is also regarded as separate and has the aspiration of  
3780 certainty on the next step in the world of education for many of our children.

Sir, Members might be interested to know at this point that enrolments for the 2017 cohort at the Grammar School were as follows: from the grant-aided colleges 51 pupils; St Sampson's High 35; Beaucamps 29; Grammar 94; La Mare 19; St Anne's 6; and from others 6. It is truly a sixth form that takes all children from all schools.

3785 Sir, Deputies need to be making decisions based on all facts, and this includes as far as possible all financial information. In reading the details from March 2016, the debate in March 2016, we are reminded that in that instance, as now, what is so wrong about the alternative model, and indeed from the whole manner in which it has come about, is that the principles of good governance are completely missing. Here I will quote directly from former Deputy Sillars made at the time:  
3790

Good governance means performing effectively in clearly defined functions and roles.

Well, sir, that has certainly not been apparent in the lead up to this debate with effectively a shadow committee facilitated and supported by funding from P&R.

Deputy Sillars continued:

Good governance means promoting good values for the whole organisation and demonstrating the values of good governance through behaviour. Good governance means taking informed, transparent decisions and managing risk. How can we make a decision on four or three schools without any financial information and awareness of those risks?

(A Member: Hear, hear.) Indeed how, sir, can we make a decision today on four schools to two  
3795 without any financial information and awareness of risk?

A final comment for ex-Deputy Sillars:

We fail this basic principle of good corporate governance and we should not be having this debate without the knowledge of the facts. Good governance means developing the capacity and capability of governing bodies to be effective. Good governance means engaging stakeholders and making accountability real.

Sir, the public are still oblivious, as are we, as to which school this Assembly intends to close if the Fallaize amendment is approved. There has been no engagement, no consultation and this is unacceptable.

3800 At this point I will address a query from Deputy Green and assure him, through you, sir, that the Committee absolutely agrees that we should look at the performance of excellent and high performing schools wherever they are and implement some of what makes these schools so good into our education system here. But we must remember that schools in other jurisdictions are operating in a very different context.

3805 Many of the excellent schools on the Fallaize list will have very different admissions policies. Some will select based on different criteria, many will be oversubscribed leaving those unsuccessful children to travel to another school that very likely will not be so high performing. We have no evidence from the Fallaize list of the performance of other schools in the vicinity of these high performing ones.

3810 I would remind Members, sir, through you, that our children in Guernsey do not have the opportunity to go to another school down the road. Our schools must provide excellent outcomes for all.

These schools in England are successful because they are competitive. Is that something we want in Guernsey? Two 11-18 schools competing for the best students. These high performing  
3815 schools in England also have a very different demographic, many will not have a high proportion of disadvantaged pupils, those on free school meals.

I will also remind Members that not all students will have the opportunity to stay in their school until the age of 18. They will need to achieve certain grades to access the sixth form, or they will have to leave. Where is the equality of opportunity for all? Earlier Deputy Leadbeater articulated this very well. They will also have to move sites if their catchment 11-18 school is not the one offering IB and that is the route they want to take. They will have to move if their catchment 11-18 school does not offer the A-level they want to take, and quite how they will be able to access the vocational and applied general publications which are offered by many of these high performing 11-18 schools in England remains to be seen.

We agree that leadership and quality of teaching is what sets good schools apart from mediocre ones. We can evidence this with our own schools, regardless of whether they are 11-16 or 11-18. So yes, absolutely, let's look at excellence elsewhere. Let's really try to understand what it is that makes those schools so good, and let's implement it here. But I have heard very little evidence that it is purely because these schools are 11-18 and not 11-16 that puts them on the Fallaize list.

Deputy Yerby seeks to assure us that there will be a chance of real scrutiny and good governance if any plans for the alternative model come back to the Assembly, well why does that not apply now? Where is our chance to scrutinise effectively and apply principles of good governance now to this plan? To let the Committee plan fail in respect of any shortcomings without using the process which we have here in the Assembly today would be more than regretful.

Sir, is Deputy Yerby so optimistic or perhaps naïve – that maybe a little bit unfair – to think that the two-school model will be without a flaw – (*Interjections*) I will repeat that – to even think that the two-school model will be without a flaw, let alone feasible? Listening to Deputy Yerby today one might believe that the Committee has not considered any other options and that this as Members know is absolutely not the case. Members might believe that we may not have researched what works well elsewhere, they might believe that a considerable amount of time has not been spent looking, examining, modelling, reviewing all the complexities that changing our school system and structures involved. Please do not be misled by Deputy Yerby's comments into believing that the Committee and their staff have not put anything other than a considerable amount of time and effort into pulling together a well-researched and detailed plan.

In response to other comments made by Deputy Yerby, the alternative model started by modelling an identical curriculum offer in two sixth forms, but this proved unviable and costly. The Deputy Head of the sixth form and education officers agree that it offered significantly reduced flexibility in the options presented to students. Deputy Yerby was simply incorrect by saying that the teacher who did the timetabling said that the sixth form timetabling would work in the alternative model but not in the three school proposal.

Work was then progressed to reduce the curriculum in both sixth forms. To quote the Deputy Head Teacher who completed the curriculum model for the two sixth forms he says, the obvious disadvantages of this model would be that some students would move institution at age 16, also that the two sixth forms will not be offering the same curriculum and may be perceived as inequitable.

Operating a catchment-based system where there is inequality in sixth-form provision presents difficulties as this builds in a systemic limitation on student choice or preference of one sixth form above the other. Approximately half of 16-year-olds will not remain within their school at age 16 and will not have the full 11-18 school experience. This is hardly equitable.

As my colleague Deputy Gollop has explained, but I want to repeat, in the alternative model there will be limited choice of subject combination for students in both institutions. These subjects are planned to be offered in only one sixth form: Further Maths, French, History, Music, Psychology, Design, Spanish, Film Studies. Therefore if you want to do an A-level in these subjects you simply have to move schools.

To quote the Deputy Head's paper, this is problematic –

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, point of correction.

3870

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize, point of correction.

**Deputy Fallaize:** That is not a limitation, because almost all of the subjects Deputy Dudley Owen just read out are not offered *now* at A-level. They would be offered at A-level on one site in our model, currently they are not being offered at all.

3875

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** But the benefit of our model is that they will be offered to all Islanders at 16. The modelling undertaken assumes that the number of students will be split between the two sites equally. This will not be the case. The numbers between the two schools' sixth form are likely to be unequal.

3880

The revenue costings for the alternative model are unlikely to cover the cost of the full curriculum offer that has been modelled by the Deputy Head for the two-school sixth forms. Its delivery and maintaining student choice has not been evidenced.

There are serious concerns at the timetabling across both 11-18 schools will need to be aligned with the College of Further Education, otherwise this will not allow students to mix and match curriculum choices across academic and vocational courses. How can this be achieved effectively with two governing bodies with different strategic drivers?

3885

I have a question for Deputy Graham, which maybe Deputy Fallaize can answer on his behalf, actually I have a few. What is it about the alternative model that makes it so outstanding? Where is the evidence that their two sixth forms over two sites is a route to excellence when all the evidence that I have just read out seems to be to the contrary? How will the alternative model pick up the recommendations made in the PWC report? No mention has made about this at all. In all areas where functions of Government are devolved we are looking at better alignment, sharing resources, and efficiencies of merging administrations where there is clear duplication. The report is silent on this.

3890

3895

There are so many problems with the alternative model I have not managed to capture them all here, and I know that my President, Deputy Le Pelley, will offer a robust rebuttal to much of the misinformation and many of the spurious claims made in debate so far.

What is most important is that this model just will not work. I have said this many times, and I will say it again, the idea quite frankly is about as sensible as building a bridge to Jersey on the basis that we need better inter Island links. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) (*Laughter*) Popular but unfeasible, complete pie-in-the-sky in practice.

3900

I find it utterly bizarre that some Members of P&R are driving a coach and horses through their own fiscal rules and putting ideology before responsible Government and the use of public money. The same Committee who refused funding to underwrite a trial inter-Island ferry last year on the basis that the business case had not been sufficient made. I would therefore have expected such prudent Members of P&R to speak against the amendment, especially given that the Committee are mandated to develop and promote States' policy objectives (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and lead the policy planning process, and to advise on the implications of other Committee proposals, and in particular whether they accord with States' objectives. Can we therefore assume that Members who vote in favour of the amendment are not complying with their very own mandate? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

3905

3910

Staggering then that today Members of P&R are supporting, perhaps by majority, the alternative model and by Deputy Trott's own admission are effectively happy to hand over a blank cheque. (*Interjections*) No mention –

3915

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, on a point of correction.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

3920

**Deputy Trott:** This has been a very good speech but I said precisely the opposite.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** I do apologise, Deputy Trott. Thank you for that correction.

3925 No mention either from P&R yet of a pledge of extra resources and funding which are required at the Education Office to go back to the beginning and start all over to create an extremely challenging set of plans as required by the alternative model.

3930 Before I close, sir, I would like to remind Members that they have the opportunity not only to vote for our proposals but also against those they do not like. Given the complexity of the debate and the proposals that we have put forward, we circulated before Christmas an organogram of voting choices, that is right, all laid out and 'Janet and John', like Deputy Inder likes, simple pictures. I ask Members therefore who have discounted our proposals on the basis that the post-16 element requires more work, not to vote for this amendment instead.

3935 It is also naïve to think that any plan is ever perfect and even the best laid of those will need rethinking to a degree in order to implement. Members need to be realistic, the report is inadequate and can in no way be taken in comparison with the detailed costed thoughtful Propositions that the Committee has laid before the States today.

There has been ample time to act in the intervening years by any Deputy wanting the Committee to change direction and spend its scant but precious resources constructively and collaboratively with them.

3940 Sir, this is the right time though to let Members know that as the Committee feel so strongly that the alternative model will be ruinous for Guernsey in so many ways, and that the consequences will be felt for many years, that we are considering to lay overnight an amendment along the lines that Deputy Brouard described just before lunch. *(Interjections)* This would be for a three-school model, including one school with a sixth form. *(Interjections)* This is what was termed option two in our paper. We understand that there is considerable support in this Assembly for this model of two 11-16 schools and one 11-18 school. This brings together the two main arguments which we have seen play out over this debate. One is a split sixth form in the two-school model, and the other is the merger of the full time provision of the sixth form and the College of Further Education.

3950 Sir, through you. I ask Members to vote against this Fallaize amendment, which prolongs the uncertainty for our Island, which really does outweigh the near aspirational ideas, and most importantly I believe is completely undeliverable. *(Applause)*

**A Member:** Hear, Hear.

3955 **The Bailiff:** I have been asked whether it might be possible to sit to conclude this this evening.

Can I just have an indication of how many people are yet to speak, because I suspect we are perhaps looking at another two hours of debate, and of course there will be a reply. As I have been asked I will put it to you, but as I say I suspect it will still be quite a long time to go.

3960 Deputy Le Pelley, you have a lengthy speech, I understand.

As I have been asked to I will put it to you. I put to you the Proposition that we continue to sit to a conclusion. Those in favour; *(Laughter)* those against.

*Members voted Contre.*

3965 **The Bailiff:** I thought that might be the conclusion, but it does mean ... Members, do you realise this does mean that this debate is unlikely to finish tomorrow, and it will therefore be ... My guess is that the overall debate on this Article will not finish tomorrow. It is likely that the debate on this amendment is going to continue for most of tomorrow morning. We then already have been warned... well, three amendments have been circulated, there may be another amendment, and then there will still be general debate.

3970 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, it goes against the grain, but do you think we should start at nine o'clock tomorrow morning?

**The Bailiff:** I will put that to you that we start at 9 a.m. tomorrow. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Contre.*

3975 **The Bailiff:** There is your answer Deputy Gollop – 9.30 a.m. it will be.

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.45 p.m.*