SECONDARY & POST-16 EDUCATION

THE ALTERNATIVE MODEL –

A PROPOSAL FOR OPPORTUNITY & EXCELLENCE

A response to the C*f*ESC policy letter P.2017 / 110 –

Because our students deserve better

Presented by:

Deputy Mark Dorey
Deputy Matt Fallaize
Deputy Richard Graham
Deputy Rhian Tooley

December 2017

Table of contents

1. Purpose of report

1.1 In January 2018 the States will debate a policy letter and propositions entitled *The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick* (P.2017/110), which has been submitted by the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture ("the C*f*ESC").

1.2 This report is a response to the policy letter and propositions. It explores the many weaknesses in the structure proposed by the C*f*ESC and sets out a better Alternative Model to promote excellence and opportunity in secondary and post-16 education.

1.3 At the States' meeting an amendment will be submitted asking the States to delete the propositions put forward by the C*f*ESC and to replace them with propositions which would allow the Alternative Model to be approved instead.

2. Summary of report

2.1 The C*f*ESC Model and the Alternative Model would restructure secondary and post-16 education in totally different ways.

2.2 In the **C*f*ESC Model** the structure would be as follows:

- three separate schools each providing 11 to 16 education only – and the schools would vary in size from the smallest at five forms per year to the largest at eight forms per year;

- a post-16 college offering full-time courses (including A-levels, International Baccalaureate and full-time vocational, applied general and technical courses) predominantly aimed at 16 to 19 year-olds; and

- a training college offering apprenticeships, further and higher education and part-time courses and working in partnership with the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and the Guernsey Training Agency with a view to adopting the title Guernsey University College.

2.3 The C*f*ESC Model proposes three secondary schools which would vary greatly in size. The largest school could have 60% more students than the smallest. It is based on assumptions about optimal school size which are wholly unsupported – and indeed contradicted – by relevant evidence.

2.4 In the C*f*ESC Model the States would withdraw from the 11 to 18 sector, leaving this 'offer' entirely to the grant-maintained colleges. It would be especially self-defeating to do this now, at the same time as introducing comprehensive education. It would also deny teachers the opportunity to teach across all key stages of secondary education.

2.5 The C*f*ESC propositions include no commitment to devolve governance and leadership to schools and colleges even though this concept was endorsed by the States nearly five years ago. Nor do they contain any commitment to replace the archaic 1970 Education Law despite secondary education locally being on the brink of its greatest period of reform in nearly 70 years.

2.6 The C*f*ESC Model would divide sixth form studies from 11 to 16 studies. It would divide vocational and technical education between two separate organisations. The College of Further Education would be partitioned – cut in two. A post-16 college and a separate training college would be created as part of an unorthodox structure for which there is little support among professionals who lead and/or deliver post-16 education locally.

2.7 Dividing vocational and technical education between two separate organisations would deny many lecturers the opportunity to practise across the full range of their subject. It would be in conflict with international best practice. It would also be in conflict with developments which are imminent in the curriculum and structure of technical education nationally. The C*f*ESC Model tries to create divisions where there are none and should be none.

2.8 The C*f*ESC's post-16 proposals have been condemned by the College's 'shadow' governors and former principals and industry. There is nothing to suggest they would lead to better educational outcomes. The likelihood is they would be largely detrimental to students and their teachers and lecturers.

2.9 The Bailiwick needs more, and future generations of students deserve better, than this uninspiring vision proposed by the C*f*ESC.

2.10 In the **Alternative Model** the structure would be as follows:

- One 11 to 18 school operating across two sites – and each site would have between nine and ten forms per year;

- The 11 to 18 School operating on two sites would offer sixth form studies on both sites (A-levels on both sites; IB on one site) with 200 – 225 sixth form students at each site;

- The College of Further Education would continue as a single, integrated organisation offering vocational, professional and technical courses for full-time and part-time students, including apprentices;

- It would be an objective of the College to integrate with the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and the Guernsey Training Agency as soon as possible and an ambition to form a partnership with a UK university to become University College Guernsey.

2.11 In the Alternative Model resources would be pooled in one 11 to 18 school operating across two sites of a very similar size. The number of students at each site would be in line with the average size of the highest-attaining comprehensives nationally, all except one or two of which also have sixth forms. Students would have the widest possible range of curricular and extra-curricular opportunities. Importantly the Alternative Model does not require larger class sizes than the C*f*ESC Model.

2.12 In the Alternative Model teachers would be able to work across all key stages in secondary education, which would maximise the chances of Guernsey developing, recruiting and retaining great teachers.

2.13 The Alternative Model would allow the States to maintain the 11 to 18 'offer'. This is particularly important in the years ahead when the new comprehensive system needs to secure the confidence of parents of children of all abilities.

2.14 The Alternative Model includes a firm and unambiguous commitment genuinely to devolve governance and leadership of both the 11 to 18 School

and the College of Further Education. It also includes a commitment to a new Education Law to capture the educational aims and aspirations of a modern, democratic society and set out the powers and duties expected of a government in relation to education as it approaches the third decade of the 21st century.

2.15 In the post-16 phase the Alternative Model provides a single sixth form operating on two sites which can maintain students' subject choice. The College of Further Education would not be partitioned – all vocational and technical studies would remain part of a single, integrated organisation.

2.16 The Alternative Model allows lecturers in vocational and technical studies to practise across the full range of their subject. It provides for the closest possible integration between college-based and employment-based technical education, which would allow the Bailiwick to take full advantage of developments which are imminent in the curriculum and structure of technical education nationally.

2.17 The Alternative Model foresees a new era of stronger collaboration between the 11 to 18 School and the College of Further Education. It is better able to cater for developments in lifelong learning. It sets out a more coherent approach to integrating with other providers of vocational and professional education, which would provide a stronger platform to work towards university college status.

2.18 The following pages of this report explore all of these issues in detail. They also consider the family of secondary education providers in the Bailiwick, which includes le Murier, les Voies and St. Anne's. This report concludes with sections on the practical implications of the Alternative Model, including sites and costs.

2.19 The removal of selection at 11 means that secondary and post-16 education locally is about to undergo a period of substantial transformation. This transformation should be based not on convenient management of the existing estate, but on educational policy and educational outcomes. Buildings are not unimportant, but the future of the Bailiwick depends most of all on the knowledge and skills of its people.

2.20 The Alternative Model would put the Bailiwick in the best position to realise the twin objectives of comprehensive education: excellence and opportunity.

Note: Throughout this report the post-16 institutions proposed by the C*f*ESC are referred to by their original generic titles – post-16 college and training college – used by the C*f*ESC when first presenting them in July, 2017.

3. Schools in the post-selective era

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 In March 2016 the previous States agreed to replace selection at 11 with all-ability (comprehensive) secondary schools.

3.1.2 In December 2016 the C*f*ESC asked the present States to reverse this decision and to agree to retain selection at 11 instead. The States rejected this proposal, thus confirming their earlier decision to introduce all-ability secondary schools.

3.1.3 Children in the current Year 6 will be the last to sit the 11 plus. Secondary schools will admit their first all-ability year groups in September 2019. Under the C*f*ESC plans not all students will attend all-ability schools until September 2023.

3.1.4 There is also a need to continue redeveloping and reorganising the secondary education estate to ensure that in the future all students have access to the finest facilities the Island can afford and also in response to curriculum changes and the wish of the States to rationalise the number of schools. However, the introduction of all-ability schools and the redevelopment of the estate are separate initiatives. They are proceeding according to different timetables. The first non-selective year group will move into secondary education in a little under two years from now whereas the schools' building programme will continue for several years thereafter irrespective of which model of secondary and post-16 education the States adopt.

3.1.5 The current C*f*ESC policy letter proposes that at the point when the Island starts to move to comprehensive education – in September 2019 – and for a few years thereafter there should be four secondary schools. In practice, in

terms of the experience for students and their parents, the substantial differences between the C*f*ESC Model and the Alternative Model may not be felt for several years.

3.1.6 In the medium to long term, the two Models would restructure secondary education in totally different ways:

- In the **C*f*ESC Model** there would be three separate schools each providing 11 to 16 education only – and the schools would vary in size from the smallest at five forms per year to the largest at eight forms per year;

- In the **Alternative Model** there would be one 11 to 18 school operating across two sites – and each site would have between nine and ten forms per year.

3.2 C*f*ESC Model & Alternative Model – size of schools and year groups

3.2.1 There are around 1,980 students in Guernsey in school Years 7 to 11 (the 11 to 16 phase). The four States' secondary schools have capacity for between 2,340 and 2,580 students, even without adjusting form sizes. This means there are around 350 to 600 surplus (unfilled) places, depending on which of the C*f*ESC's recent figures is used. Taking the mid-range point of surplus places, there are more of them across the estate than there are students at each of les Beaucamps, la Mare de Carteret and the 11 to 16 phase of the Grammar School.

3.2.2 It is projected that in the years ahead the number of students in Years 7 to 11 will first increase and then decrease again. In 25 years' time there are forecast to be only around 100 students more than there are at present. The peak in the number of students is expected to be in the year 2025 when there are forecast to be 2,210 students.

3.2.3 The previous States – when presented with what became known as the 'four-school model' – were faced with proposals to build a secondary education estate for 2,580 students, which would have provided nearly 400 surplus places even at the expected peak. The C*f*ESC is now proposing to build a secondary education estate for 2,280 students by providing 19 forms per year group. The Alternative Model is also based on 19 forms per year group, allowing a like-for-like comparison. In the 11 to 16 phase, class sizes and pupil-teacher ratios are exactly the same in the Alternative Model and the C*f*ESC Model.

3.2.4 In the C*f*ESC Model the three schools would vary greatly in size. St. Sampson's would have six forms per year. The smallest school, les Beaucamps, would have five forms per year. The largest school, la Mare de Carteret, would have eight forms per year.

3.2.5 In the Alternative Model the two sites would be of a very similar size: either nine forms per year on one site and ten forms per year on the other site or nine-and-a-half forms per year on both sites. Each site in the Alternative Model would have at least one but no more than two forms per year more than the new, eight-form-entry school at la Mare de Carteret proposed by the C*f*ESC.

3.2.6 In the C*f*ESC Model there would be significant variation in the number of students at each school. At St. Sampson's six forms would mean approximately 144 students per year and 720 across the 11 to 16 phase. At the smallest school, les Beaucamps, five forms would mean approximately 120 students per year and 600 across the 11 to 16 phase. At the largest school, la Mare de Carteret, eight forms would mean approximately 192 students per year and 960 across the 11 to 16 phase. There could be 60% more students at la Mare de Carteret than at les Beaucamps.

3.2.7 The local representatives of the National Education Union have said publicly: "*…the discrepancy in the proposed sizes of the three secondary schools may lead to inequality of educational provision and opportunity"*.

3.2.8 In the Alternative Model there would be no significant variation in the number of students at each school site. It is possible that both sites would have nine-and-a-half forms per year. If, however, one site had nine forms per year it would have space for 216 students per year and 1,080 across the 11 to 16 phase; and the site with ten forms of entry would have space for 240 students per year and 1,200 across the 11 to 16 phase. This would result in size differences between sites of only a fraction of the size differences inherent in the C*f*ESC Model, which is clearly preferable when admissions to schools are based on catchment areas or feeder primary schools.

3.2.9 In Years 7 to 11 each site in the Alternative Model would have capacity for between 24 and 48 students per year more than the new school at la Mare de Carteret proposed by the C*f*ESC.

3.2.10 Of course in the Alternative Model there would also be sixth forms on the two sites. This would add between 200 and 225 students at each site.

3.2.11 However, it should be noted that the C*f*ESC proposals for la Mare de Carteret also include a new two-form-entry primary school. The primary school would have capacity for 420 students, although as a social priority school it would have lower maximum class sizes and therefore could be expected to accommodate up to 350 students. This means the current C*f*ESC proposal is for the site at la Mare de Carteret to accommodate around 1,300 students aged between four and 16.

3.2.12 In the Alternative Model, at the point where the projected number of students in Years 7 to 13 is at its *highest*, a ten-form-entry site (i.e. the larger site) could be expected to have 1,160 students in the 11 to 16 phase and 200-225 students

in the sixth form (1,360 to 1,385 students overall). At the point where the projected number of students is at its *lowest*, a nine-form-entry site (i.e. the smaller site) could be expected to have 980 students in the 11 to 16 phase and 200-225 students in the sixth form (1,180 to 1,205 students overall).

3.2.13 In other words, assuming an even distribution of surplus places, the number of students at each of the two sites in the Alternative Model over the next 25 years would be between 1,180 and 1,385. Projections indicate that over the years 2018 to 2042 there will be an average of 2,571 students in school Years 7 to 13, which would require an average of 1,286 students at each site in the Alternative Model if they both operated with nine-and-a-half forms of entry.

3.2.14 The C*f*ESC Policy letter implies that schools outside the upper range of their '600 to 1,000' policy lack *"the family feel where our young people are treated as individuals"*, but Guernsey knows this is not the case. For several years until as recently as 2009 the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre accommodated more than 1,000 students who were *"treated as individuals"* – and there is broad consensus that larger year groups can be more beneficial to comprehensive schools than selective schools because of their wider range of ability.

3.2.15 The C*f*ESC proposal for the States to adopt a policy which would in effect endorse secondary schools of 600 students, and indeed for a school of exactly that size to operate in the new comprehensive system, is also not easy to reconcile with the shape of much of the primary school sector in Guernsey.

3.2.16 Around 40% of primary schoolchildren in the States' sector attend schools with between 497 and 560 students. These schools are attended by more 1,500 children between the ages of four and 11. If, from the age of four, so many hundreds of children can happily attend schools with around 500 to 560 students, it is difficult to see why the C*f*ESC considers that schools catering

mainly for teenagers are of *"optimal size"* once they have 600 students. Under the policy proposed by the C*f*ESC, secondary schools would reach *"optimal size"* once they accommodated only 40 students more than the largest of the Island's popular and successful primary schools.

3.2.17 Slightly larger schools may need to pay particular attention to the need to allocate students to smaller 'units' for pastoral and other reasons. However it would be a mistake to believe that this is a challenge faced only in the Alternative Model. The year groups at the sites in the Alternative Model are likely to be only around 25% larger than the year groups at the new school at la Mare de Carteret proposed by the C*f*ESC.

3.2.18 Each phase within the schools/sites could operate a 'schools within schools' model in which students would be arranged into smaller groups each with a 'home' base. Each student would be supported by a tutor who would assume responsibility for his or her academic progress, social development and well-being, including providing guidance at key times, such as at arrival in Year 7, choosing subjects for key stage four, preparation for exams and transition to the post-16 phase (College of Further Education, sixth form or work). The tutor would be the primary point of contact between parents and school. A tutorial session would be a key part of each day. Use may be made of vertical tutor groups consisting of students in different year groups. No doubt there would be a 'house' system, not only for sport: students could be arranged into, say, five 'houses', each of approximately 250 students. One does not need to look hard to find countless OFSTED reports on larger comprehensive schools – often much larger than what is proposed in the Alternative Model – where pastoral care and student support is rated as 'outstanding'.

3.2.19 At present 11 to 16 schools are organised on the basis of a pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) of 13:1. The C*f*ESC proposals assume an increase to a PTR of 15:1. For

comparative purposes the Alternative Model has used the same PTR as the C*f*ESC Model.

3.2.20 Larger schools are sometimes wrongly confused with larger class sizes when in fact the two issues are unrelated. The Alternative Model does not require larger class sizes than the CfESC Model. If anything the larger size of year groups in the Alternative Model would provide greater flexibility for subject leaders to establish smaller classes where they were felt to be in the interests of some students.

3.3 Evidence about school size

3.3.1 As well as proposing three 11 to 16 secondary schools with a wide variation in the number of students at each school – approximately 600 at les Beaucamps, 720 at St. Sampson's and 960 at la Mare de Carteret – the C*f*ESC is also asking the States to establish a policy that every secondary school student should be educated at a school where there is a minimum of 600 students and a maximum of 1,000 students. Indeed this policy underpins the whole of the secondary education structure proposed by the C*f*ESC.

3.3.2 As a result of other proposals submitted by the C*f*ESC, this proposed policy on optimal school size could not be realised before September 2023, after the last 'selective' cohort of students have taken their GCSEs. If the C*f*ESC is so committed to such a policy on optimal school size, six years seems rather a long time to keep some students in schools which would fall outside the policy.

3.3.3 Moreover the C*f*ESC's proposed '600 to 1,000' policy is not supported by relevant evidence. It relies on three pages of a report which the C*f*ESC has referred to as *"independent research"* but which was in fact commissioned by the C*f*ESC's predecessor when it was proposing four schools. At that time undue weight was placed on the report – an error which would only be

compounded by adopting '600 to 1,000' as a formal policy today. A wider review of evidence favours the size of year groups and sites proposed in the Alternative Model.

3.3.4 Bradley and Taylor (1998) investigated the relationship between school size and exam performance in secondary schools in the UK. After controlling for factors such as type of school and students' social background they found that in schools serving Years 7 to 11 (11 to 16 students) performance peaked in schools with between 900 and 1,500 students (and ideally 1,200) and in schools serving Years 7 to 13 (11 to 18 students) performance peaked in schools with between 1,200 and 1,800 students (and ideally 1,500).

3.3.5 Barnett, et al. (2002) examined the relationship between school size and achievement in Northern Ireland and found that schools with more than 1,000 students performed better when taking into account both grades and cost effectiveness. Sawkins (2002), studying Scottish secondary schools, found that as school size increased student performance first declined and then improved and the turning point for improvement was around the 1,200-student mark.

3.3.6 Newman, et al. (2006) published research from 31 studies on the effects of secondary school size in OECD countries and concluded that student attainment and attendance were better in larger schools up to an optimal size but that estimates of that optimal size were so imprecise as not to be useful, although the authors provided the following conclusion:

"The findings of this review would seem to refute some of the more prevalent myths regarding the advantages and disadvantages of smaller and larger schools. For example the view that student attainment is universally higher in smaller schools and student behaviour is universally worse in larger schools is inconsistent with the current evidence."

3.3.7 Several Dutch studies (e.g. Dijkgraaf and Van der Geest, 2008, and Dijkgraaf and de Jong, 2009) found no statistically significant relationship between school size and student attainment.

3.3.8 Drawing on these and many other studies, an extensive review presented by Luyten, et al. (2014) concluded that *"international comparative assessment studies do not show school size as a strong correlate of educational achievement".* Hattie (2011) developed a way of ranking various influences on student achievement and after studying nearly 1,200 meta-analyses concluded that school size was only the 78th most important factor, just behind the quality of students' outdoor adventure programmes.

3.3.9 Nevertheless, despite a wealth of evidence to the contrary, the C*f*ESC continues to claim that *"evidence strongly suggests that secondary school size has an optimal level of between 600 and 1,000 learners"* and that in larger schools *"educational outcomes would be lower"*. This is conjecture dressed up as fact.

3.3.10 The claims are largely based on a paper by two Canadian researchers (Leithwood and Jantzi, 2007). There are two important points about their paper which appear to have been misunderstood or disregarded by the C*f*ESC. The first is that the paper draws on only three secondary school studies from the UK and ironically all of them show a *positive* relationship between school size and student attainment, i.e. students achieved better results in larger schools (1,000+ students). The second is that the other secondary school studies used in the paper – of which there were 15 – all related to US high schools, in which typically there are only four year groups as distinct from the five year groups in 11 to 16 schools. A US high school of 1,000 students would fall within the optimal range indicated in the study, but it would have 250 students per year group, slightly more than the number of students per year

group proposed for the sites in the Alternative Model. A US high school with 600 students would fall at the smallest end of the optimal range indicated in the study, but it would have 150 students per year group, more than two of the three secondary schools proposed in the C*f*ESC Model.

3.3.11 In view of the C*f*ESC having largely based its proposed '600 to 1,000' policy on the Leithwood and Jantzi paper, the authors of the Alternative Model contacted Professor Leithwood at the University of Toronto. When presented with the size of schools/sites in the C*f*ESC Model and the Alternative Model, Professor Leithwood advised that there was insufficient evidence for school size to be considered a major factor in the decision. He had earlier advised: *"It is important, in my view, to appreciate that among all the factors that contribute to student success, school size falls at the weaker end of the continuum."*

3.3.12 It is clear that *the* essential policy which underpins the C*f*ESC proposal – that secondary schools must have between 600 and 1,000 students – is wholly unsupported by relevant evidence. There is simply no evidential justification whatsoever for adopting such a policy. In fact British studies of the effect of school size on student attainment appear to be more favourable to the Alternative Model than to the C*f*ESC Model.

3.3.13 When the States voted to remove selection at 11 there was much talk about the need to adopt the best features of the comprehensive system. With this in mind, it is instructive to consider the size of the 100 leading state comprehensives in England and Wales when measured by GCSE attainment. Nine out of every ten of these schools have more than 800 students. 80% of them have more than 1,000 students and would therefore fall outside the C*f*ESC's proposed optimal school size policy. Most of these schools have between 1,000 and 1,400 students and nearly one in four has more than 1,400 students. On average these schools have around 1,200 students. Almost

without exception these 100 leading schools also have sixth forms and one-third of them have sixth forms with 250 students or fewer.

3.3.14 There are some smaller schools with equally outstanding rates of attainment, but they are independent or private schools which charge very high fees and therefore cannot credibly be compared with all-ability state comprehensives.

3.3.15 During the debates about selection at 11 there was also considerable focus on the issue of how to group students in comprehensive schools. Setting needs to be distinguished from streaming. Streaming is where students are assessed for general academic ability and accordingly put into classes which remain together for all subjects. Selection at 11 is a form of streaming: some students are selected for the 'grammar stream' and some are selected for the 'secondary modern stream'. Setting, on the other hand, is where students are grouped by ability for particular subjects – it is possible to be in a higher set for, say, English and a lower set for, say, Maths.

3.3.16 Little enthusiasm was expressed for streaming in comprehensive schools, but much enthusiasm was expressed for setting – indeed so much that the need to *"set students by ability as appropriate"* was adopted as a policy by States' Resolution. Ultimately these are matters which should definitely be left to school leaders – especially if more responsibility is to be devolved to schools, as it should be – but it is worth noting that slightly larger schools lend themselves more easily to setting students by ability. For example, in theory, at the smallest school proposed by the C*f*ESC there could be only half the number of sets as there could be at the sites in the Alternative Model.

3.4 Teachers – 11 to 18 opportunities

3.4.1 There is a quote which has become popular in the world of education: *the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers*. In other

words, recruiting and retaining good teachers is a prerequisite for good schools. Or as Denis Mulkerrin CBE put it when he reviewed education in Guernsey some years ago: the most important person in any school is the pupil and the most important asset is the teacher.

3.4.2 It is sometimes suggested that 11 to 18 schools attract better teachers. Putting it that way is unfair to the many excellent teachers working in Guernsey's high schools. It is true, however, that some good teachers wish to teach across the curriculum phases: key stages three (11-14), four (14-16) and five (16 to 18).

3.4.3 Successive Education Committees and their senior advisors have recognised that maintaining an 11 to 18 'offer' in the States' sector can assist with the recruitment and retention of good teachers. In 2016 the then Education Department promoted the notion of federating schools and of teachers working "*…across all key stages in secondary education, including post-16, thus enhancing their career opportunities and progression"*.

3.4.4 This was also recognised by the head teachers of the Bailiwick's secondary schools in a letter they wrote to the President of the C*f*ESC on the 19th of January 2017, in which they stated:

"*We recognise the benefits of 11 to 18 secondary schools and the five head teachers are keen to explore a federated model… [t]here 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."*

3.4.5 The C*f*ESC Model denies teachers the opportunity to teach across all key stages of secondary education. This has been confirmed repeatedly by members of the C*f*ESC and the Education Office, who advise that the post-16

college would be staffed independently of other schools/colleges. The Alternative Model, however, provides for teachers to teach 11 to 18 or 11 to 16 only or, in some cases, post-16 only. Therefore, in the medium to long term, the Alternative Model, once established, would be more likely to maximise the chances of Guernsey developing, recruiting and retaining great teachers.

3.5 **One school on two sites – governance, leadership and organisation**

3.5.1 The governance of schools was addressed in the aforementioned report on education services written by Denis Mulkerrin CBE some six years ago. Mr Mulkerrin advised:

"Power is held by the Director of Education and, on paper, the Education [Committee]…The Director of Education informed me that, as well as formulating policy, the Education [Committee] is also the governing body of the schools. This may well be under the 1970 Education Law. However to imply that the [Committee] can be an effective governing body to the 27 schools in the Bailiwick is nonsense. It is simply not possible.

"A better and proven model would be that of a governing body. The role of the governing body – every state school in England has one – is to provide strategic management and to act as a critical friend in supporting the work of the head teacher and other staff. In conjunction with the head teacher, governors set the school budget and decide on priorities. They have a role in monitoring the school's progress and in setting annual targets for the school's performance. They also take responsibility for the annual appraisal of the head teacher… [t]here is no reason why schools in Guernsey should not have properly constituted governing bodies and every reason why they should… [t]he governing body model…would support schools far more than the present system whilst, at the same time, increasing accountability.

"A major advantage of establishing governing bodies is that they would create a better balance in the way power is distributed in the Guernsey education service.

"The degree to which education is controlled at the centre…is a major weakness…. [it] reduces autonomy at the school end, prevents head teachers from being pro-active in the running of their schools and causes untold frustration. The Education [Committee/Office] should be empowering schools – in practice it does the very opposite… [t]he Guernsey model of central control used to be the normal structure in the UK. By the 1980s it was increasingly found to be ineffective – as it certainly continues to be in Guernsey."

3.5.2 In July 2014 the then Education Department announced: *"We are going to deliver a Guernsey version of 'Local Management of Schools' within this political term and work is ongoing to develop this…"* In the end other work took priority, such as universal access to pre-school education and removal of selection at 11, and no changes were made to the governance of schools.

3.5.3 In October 2017 the current C*f*ESC advised deputies that *"the Committee is still pursuing a system of providing greater autonomy to our school leaders through a system of local management of schools and independent governance"*. In answer to a follow-up question, the then Vice-President of the C*f*ESC said that devolution of governance and leadership *"should be possible within the next 10 to 12 years"*, i.e. by the year 2029, nearly 20 years after the recommendation was made and essentially accepted and 40 years after legislation introduced such reforms successfully in England. Strikingly the C*f*ESC policy letter is virtually silent on the need for devolution from the centre to schools.

3.5.4 The Alternative Model includes a firm and unambiguous commitment genuinely to devolve governance and leadership of both the 11 to 18 School and the College of Further Education. It is an imperative in order to realise the full benefits of the Alternative Model. It would undoubtedly require the

preparation of a new Education Law, which in itself is years if not decades overdue, and this is referred to further in a later section of this report.

3.5.5 Devolution of governance and leadership would allow more decisions to be made by schools, i.e. closer to the student for whose benefit the education system is meant to exist. It places more decision-making where the expertise is most likely to be.

3.5.6 School leaders at secondary level – perhaps especially those who have relocated to the Island – generally want and expect devolution. Many of them become immensely frustrated by the current highly centralised regime. Good leaders have been lost because of this frustration.

3.5.7 The *Cf*ESC (supported by the Education Office) should focus on 'central government' functions – for example education law, strategy and substantial policy, curriculum, funding arrangements, the accountability of schools' performance and standards. In a small jurisdiction it may be pragmatic also to retain some services centrally, e.g. admissions, significant capital expenditure, oversight of works, and some HR advice if required for complex cases.

3.5.8 The devolution of governance, leadership and responsibility would inevitably lead to a material reduction in the size of the Education Office – some resources would be reallocated to schools and colleges and some would be saved altogether.

3.5.9 In the Alternative Model the 11 to 18 School, operating on two sites, would be one organisation with a single board of governors and a single executive leadership team, but each site would develop its own identity and make day-to-day decisions. Each site would have a principal (and its own deputy and assistant heads) who would report to a single executive head teacher who would be the senior-most executive of the organisation. This is close to the leadership model envisaged by the then Education Department as recently as

March 2016 when it identified research outlining the positive effects on teaching and students of establishing single governance and leadership arrangements across multiple sites.

3.5.10 In other ways the Alternative Model differs markedly from what was proposed then. Importantly the Alternative Model emphatically excludes the notion of students at key stage four (14-16) moving to, or travelling between, sites in order to pick up their preferred subjects. On two sites rather than four there would simply be no need: both sites would provide the opportunity of a full curriculum and the full range of extra-curricular activities.

3.5.11 The creation of one school on two sites must be a collaborative endeavour between the four existing secondary schools. It must not be seen as a takeover by one or two schools of other schools, but rather a merger of four equally-valued schools. This work could start immediately – indeed starting it before a final decision is made about which two sites to use is likely to promote an approach which is collaborative and not territorial. Momentum must be built by harnessing the enthusiasm of stakeholders and through collegiate decision-making by school leaders and others.

3.5.12 The ambition is clear: to pool best practice and resources to create a single organisation – one school on two sites – which would put Guernsey in the best position to realise the twin objectives of comprehensive education: excellence and opportunity.

3.5.13 The School should be founded on a culture which is at once both aspirational and supportive and which values students' attainment and progress and well-being. It should create an environment for learning where students of all abilities are respected and able to fulfil their potential. A broad, rigorous and engaging curriculum should develop both knowledge and skills.

3.5.14 The larger number of students at each site should allow for the widest possible range of extra-curricular activities and student enrichment to promote a healthy and active lifestyle and prepare youngsters for adulthood. Close links should be developed with industry, the College of Further Education, the voluntary sector and the wider community. Close links should also be developed between school and home. All of these objectives rely on continuing to retain and recruit high-quality teachers and school leaders.

3.5.15 These are the hallmarks of the best comprehensive schools. They are not created simply by 'flicking a switch' and turning off selection at 11. That is how much went wrong in the early days of comprehensives in England. And yet this approach runs through the C*f*ESC Model like the lettering in a stick of rock. No school can be comprehensive without an all-ability intake; but an all-ability intake is no guarantee of a *great* comprehensive school. What is required is genuine transformation and that is what lies at the heart of the Alternative Model.

3.6 **School partnerships**

3.6.1 The section of this report on post-16 education includes the following: *"The Alternative Model proposes a new era of collaboration between the 11 to 18 School and the College of Further Education. The terms of collaboration should be set out in a partnership agreement. The benefits of collaboration are so important to the School, the College and their students that the need for a partnership agreement should be included in a new and long-overdue Education Law… [t]he partnership agreement need not be restricted to the 16 to 19 phase of education. It should, where appropriate, cover Years 10 and 11…"*

3.6.2 Students in Years 10 and 11 are able to benefit from 'Links' courses run by the College of Further Education. They provide an introduction to various areas of

work, including health and social care, public services, hair and beauty, carpentry, plumbing and catering.

3.6.3 The School's partnership with the College of Further Education in relation to teacher training could develop into obtaining training school status. The partnership should also encourage staff in the School to pursue relevant higher level qualifications.

3.6.4 There are existing links which must be maintained with higher education providers nationally and internationally, e.g. Winchester and Brock University. Other partnerships could be established in Europe and further afield to provide international opportunities for students and staff in language development, work-related learning and art, culture and sport. The School could seek to become active in SSAT (Schools, Students and Teachers Network) which provides support and training in teaching and learning, curriculum, networking and leadership development, and which includes iNet, a network of schools in 34 countries.

3.7 Transition to three or two schools/sites

3.7.1 The current Year 6 is the last 'selective' year: under both Models – the C*f*ESC Model and the Alternative Model – in September 2018 those students will transfer to the grant-aided colleges, the Grammar School or their catchment high school, according to their 11 plus results for those who took the 11 plus.

3.7.2 The C*f*ESC Model, perhaps unavoidably, requires a rather convoluted arrangement for students transferring from primary to secondary school in the first two year groups following the abolition of selection at 11. In 2019 la Mare de Carteret would take no new students – they would go to les Varendes instead, where they would spend two years only before transferring to la Mare de Carteret. In 2020 la Mare de Carteret (still operating in its current premises)

would take an enlarged Year 7 but by then les Varendes would be taking no new students. The 'grammar stream' of students already at les Varendes would remain there until taking their GCSEs. In addition to the post-16 college, in 2021/22 les Varendes would accommodate Years 10 and 11 but no Years 7, 8 and 9 and in 2022/23 it would accommodate Year 11 but no Years 7, 8, 9 and 10.

3.7.3 In 2019 St. Sampson's, a six-form-entry school, would take seven forms of entry. Les Beaucamps, a five or five-and-a-half-form-entry school, would take six forms of entry. In 2020 la Mare de Carteret, which typically takes four forms of entry, would take seven forms of entry (having taken no new students the previous year). This means that in 2020 a substantial proportion of the Island's Year 7 (the current Year 4) would enter the secondary school which is already very clearly in the poorest physical condition.

3.7.4 This is worth emphasising: in the C*f*ESC Model, in September 2020, nearly three years from now, the existing la Mare de Carteret High School, pre-redevelopment, would take more Year 7 students than any other school on the Island. They would spend at least one academic year in the current, 'old' school – two years if the contingency plans are required and the new secondary school is not opened until 2022.

3.7.5 The C*f*ESC considers it essential that the States should immediately establish a policy that *"schools should be a minimum of 600 pupils and a maximum of 1,000 pupils aged 11 to 16"*, but at the same time it is proposing that in 2021/22 les Varendes should have fewer than 200 11 to 16 year-olds and in 2022/23 fewer than 100.

3.7.6 The States are being informed of, but are not being asked to approve, the C*f*ESC's secondary school catchment areas from 2021 and the proposed transitional arrangements between 2019 and 2021. The Education Law (1970),

as amended, allows the C*f*ESC to adjust catchment areas without reference to the States and over the years this has happened several times. The Alternative Model, like the C*f*ESC Model, would need to make use of this provision during the transition phase.

3.7.7 The Alternative Model also proposes a two-phase approach: a first phase which is necessary because of the move to all-ability schools; and a second phase which would be necessary later because of the move from four sites to two sites.

3.7.8 In the first phase the C*f*ESC would publish the secondary school catchment areas (or feeder primary schools) for those students who will move to secondary school in the earliest years which follow the abolition of selection at 11. This would certainly include the current Years 5 and 4, who will move to secondary school in September 2019 and September 2020 respectively. The catchment areas (or feeder schools) for these year groups should be published within weeks of the States' debate in January 2018. There is no reason for this not to be done promptly, not least because there is considerable capacity in the existing secondary school estate. The C*f*ESC would need to decide whether, during these years, Year 7 students should be admitted to four schools or, as per the C*f*ESC's current intention, to three schools.

3.7.9 As a result of the timetable adopted by the C*f*ESC during this States' term it has taken longer than it should have for parents with children entering the latter part of key stage two (e.g Year 5) to know where they will be allocated a secondary school place. Every effort should be made to avoid a repeat of this uncertainty. The C*f*ESC should plan on the assumption that for future year groups involved in the transitional phase parents must be informed of their child's secondary school before he or she starts Year 5.

3.7.10 Then, in the second phase, once the States had agreed the two sites to be used for the Alternative Model, the C*f*ESC would publish the permanent secondary school catchment areas (or feeder primary schools) which would apply once the School on two sites was fully operational.

3.7.11 Excepting the current Year 5 students already affected by the C*f*ESC timetable up to this point, the two-phased approach set out above would allow secondary school places in the years ahead to be allocated in an orderly manner with reasonable notice provided to parents.

3.7.12 The intention of the C*f*ESC is that from September 2021 *"each secondary school will partner with a number of named primary schools to ensure ease of transition between primary and secondary education"*. This is to be welcomed. The same arrangement should operate in the Alternative Model.

3.7.13 The authors of the Alternative Model are fully aware of the need to establish certainty about the allocation of secondary school places. However, it must be acknowledged that in this debate the issue of certainty is not clear-cut, for at least three reasons.

3.7.14 First, while it is clearly desirable for parents to be provided with information at least a couple of years in advance, it is debateable whether parents of children, for example, in key stage one (i.e. the infants' section of primary school) are really pre-occupied with secondary school admissions policy. They are more likely to be interested in the quality of their primary school.

3.7.15 Second, a little over a year ago the C*f*ESC asked the States to reverse their decision on all-ability schools and to reinstate selection at 11. A corollary of selection at 11 is that the majority of children and parents do not know where they will go to secondary school until they are more than halfway through their final year at primary school. Hundreds of children who will leave primary

school in July this year will not know their secondary school for another two months after the States' debate in January 2018.

3.7.16 Third, certainty in itself is not an adequate objective. The C*f*ESC claim to be providing certainty, but that is little consolation if it is the certainty of moving to a system which is at best sub-optimal for both secondary and further education. After all, the States are trying to lay the foundations for an education system to last more than the next three to five years. The key objective must be to maximise excellence and opportunity for the thousands of local students in States' schools now or who will be in the years ahead.

3.7.17 Of course professional assistance is required to produce a precise, year-by-year programme of transition. With this in mind, on the 27th of September the C*f*ESC advised that between the 30th of October and the 10th of November it would carry out what it called 'learner transition modelling', i.e. where each student would be educated during the period when the Island moved from the present four-school model to the Alternative Model of one 11 to 18 school on two sites. This modelling was to include 'site specific variations' in order to inform any decision about which two sites should be used for the School in the Alternative Model. Unfortunately no such modelling has been provided. On the 13th of November the then Vice-President of the C*f*ESC advised Deputies Graham and Dorey to expect no assistance from the C*f*ESC in this matter.

3.8 **Transition for staff**

3.8.1 There are long-term advantages which are inherent in the Alternative Model as a result of having fewer teaching sites.

3.8.2 The C*f*ESC Model features one school which is expected to be 60% larger than another school, which would inevitably create disparity in the structure and

provision of staff. The Alternative Model features two sites of a very similar size and therefore less disparity, if any, in the structure and provision of staff.

3.8.3 As an example, in one subject area five teachers are required to teach the total number of students in the Island. If there were three sites, one of the sites would have only one permanent teacher in that subject. If there were two sites, there would be at least two teachers at each site. Thus the Alternative Model is likely to provide for a more equitable and resilient distribution of teachers.

3.8.4 There would be benefits to teachers in the firm commitment in the Alternative Model to a period of transformation in education which would see much more responsibility passed from the Education Office to the level of schools and colleges.

3.8.5 However these are longer-term advantages which would be realised only once the Alternative Model was fully in place. In any transition of this nature first there is a need to recognise the concerns of teachers and other staff and to address these concerns professionally and fairly.

3.8.6 If the Alternative Model is approved by the States the staff structure for the School and both sites should be determined well in advance of any changes to the estate or relocation of staff. It may even be possible to do this in advance of identifying the two sites to be used because decisions about sites are unlikely to affect the long-term staff structure.

3.8.7 On the last occasion when a secondary school was closed, which was around ten years ago, a working party was established with the aim of ensuring that staff affected by the closure were kept well informed of developments. The working party, which was led by the Education Office, included not only unions but also representatives from among the affected staff who had been nominated by them. There has been no mention by the C*f*ESC of this type of

arrangement being employed on this occasion, when again at least one secondary school is to close, but it may be sensible to do so.

3.8.8 The C*f*ESC has stated that under its plans *"staff may have to move schools or change jobs"* and that there are *"agreed processes in place to manage this redeployment"*. Presumably this is a reference to established processes which have been negotiated with unions and if so they would apply equally to any redeployment necessary in the Alternative Model. The C*f*ESC has also stated: *"we do not anticipate any compulsory redundancies as part of this transformation"*. At the present time there is no reason to believe this would be any different in the Alternative Model – there would still be the same number of students to teach and any efficiency savings available could be realised through normal staff turnover. The financial projections on the Alternative Model, which were carried out by the Treasury largely based on information provided by the C*f*ESC, provides for no compulsory redundancies.

3.9 The Education (Guernsey) Law, 1970

3.9.1 The purpose, structure and delivery of education in the Bailiwick are set down in Law – or at least are meant to be. It has been widely recognised for at least the past 15 years that the Education (Guernsey) Law, 1970, amended several times, is not only tragically archaic but wholly incompatible with the needs and objectives of a modern education system.

3.9.2 The Law includes four pages on religious instruction in schools, but almost nothing in relation to the performance and accountability of schools. It is more or less silent on the relationship between the C*f*ESC (including the Education Office) and schools. It contains nothing in relation to higher education or public support of pre-school education, but has at least three pages on the medical health and cleanliness of children, some of which is quite outrageous, including the following:

"The CfESC may…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 such examinations are necessary in the interests of cleanliness…

"It shall be the duty of [the CfESC] to make arrangements for securing that any person or clothing required…to be cleansed may be cleansed, whether at the request of a parent or in pursuance of an order…at suitable premises by suitable persons with suitable appliances."

3.9.3 The Law fails to capture the educational aims and aspirations of a modern, democratic society; nor does it include important educational policies adopted by the States in recent years; nor does it adequately set out the powers and duties expected of a government in relation to education as it approaches the third decade of the 21st century.

3.9.4 This was challenged in January 2012 in Mr Mulkerrin's aforementioned review when he observed:

"The 1970 Education Law…was a re-write of the famous 1944 Education Act formulated by Rab Butler…It was based on problems of 1930s education and encapsulated and addressed the social concerns of England in the 1940s.

"In my opinion, Guernsey's education service has been inhibited in its development of proper strategic planning by a legislative regime that is decades out of date…the current structures and processes devolve much power and discretion to the Education Department, which in practice means its senior management team.

"I am of the view that an urgent review of the 1970 Law should be undertaken to provide an appropriate legislative regime for the delivery of education in Guernsey."

3.9.5 Weeks later the then Education Department committed to laying a new Law before the States in the third quarter of 2013, but by 2015 the States were advised that review of the Law had been placed on hold.

3.9.6 In June 2016 the C*f*ESC, in reply to Rule 14 questions, said of the 1970 Law: *"…it is in the main permissive…this has allowed it to stand the test of time and in many ways it remains as relevant today as when it was first published."* Several times in the reply mention is made of the Law apparently being *"a facilitator…and not an inhibitor"*.

3.9.7 Successive States have recognised that the structure of secondary and post-16 education is in need of significant reform. The same is true of the relationship between the C*f*ESC (and the Education Office) and schools and colleges, which is perhaps 30 years out of date. The legal framework which should be a constant point of reference for professionals and politicians working in education is in fact largely obsolete. Clearly a period of wholesale transformation is necessary and the creation of a new Education Law needs to form an important part of it.

3.10 **Special or additional educational needs**

3.10.1 The C*f*ESC's policy letter advises that approximately 20% of young people have a special or additional educational need. The majority are supported within grammar or high schools or grant-maintained colleges. A small number of students attend one of Guernsey's special schools at which much outstanding work is carried out.

3.10.2 Le Murier, which is co-located with St. Sampson's High on the Baubigny Schools complex, is a secondary school for students with a determination of special educational needs for whom cognition and learning is the primary category of need. There are students at le Murier from Year 7 up to the age of 19. Le Rondin is the equivalent school in the primary sector. Interestingly, senior leaders at le Murier, who gave of their time most generously when the authors of the Alternative Model asked to meet, advised that in recent years they have seen a substantial increase in the proportion of their students with severe and highly complex learning difficulties. Les Voies is a school for learners with a wide range of social, emotional and behavioural difficulties. Les Voies has students of primary and secondary school age.

3.10.3 The College of Further Education also plays an important role, providing an extended programme of life skills and access courses to students with severe or moderate learning difficulties.

3.10.4 During the preparation of this report it became clear to the authors of the Alternative Model that it is necessary to review Guernsey's approach to educating children with disabilities and special educational needs. Some professionals in this sector consider that in the future it may be beneficial for le Murier to provide life skills and therapy to young adults beyond the age of 19. The Guernsey Disability Alliance wrote to States' members to advise that some of its members wished to see a review of the location and existence of special schools while others were very satisfied with the present arrangements. It is a widely-held view that co-location at Baubigny has not realised the full benefits which were intended at its inception. Le Murier makes use of some facilities at St. Sampson's High – it is essential that students with special educational needs continue to have access to such facilities in whatever the model of secondary and post-16 education agreed by the States. Equally 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".

3.10.5 The period of transformation in education envisaged in the Alternative Model, including the drafting of a new Education Law, would provide an ideal opportunity to re-examine how in the future the Bailiwick could best support students with special educational needs and to ensure that such provision is consistent with the work which continues to evolve in relation to the States' disability and inclusion strategy. This calls for the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture to seek a closer working relationship with the Committees *for* Employment & Social Security and Health & Social Care.

3.10.6 It is important to note that the site analysis at Baubigny which was carried out by architects commissioned by the C*f*ESC showed that using it as one of the secondary school sites in the Alternative Model would not of itself require the relocation of le Murier away from that site.

3.10.7 When a federation of schools was proposed in 2016 it was suggested that le Murier and les Voies would be associate sites of the Guernsey School. The current C*f*ESC policy letter includes le Murier and les Voies in the *"potential for the secondary schools to be strategically managed by a single governing body"*, but makes no firm recommendation about the long-term arrangement. Clearly this matter requires further consideration whichever Model is adopted by the States.

3.10.8 The C*f*ESC policy letter states: *"The Committee has reconsidered the best way to support children and young people with autism and communication difficulties. This remains a growing area of need across the Bailiwick and the Committee has agreed that individual bases will be established at each of the secondary schools to support learners with these difficulties rather than building a single all-age unit as part of the redevelopment of la Mare de Carteret site."*

3.10.9 Instinctively the authors of the Alternative Model support this revised approach and in principle would wish to incorporate it in their proposals, but the C*f*ESC Policy letter also states, in relation to the response to the Committee's initial proposals published in July: *"It was felt there was insufficient detail…to provide assurance that the decision to remove the specialist base at the new la Mare de Carteret schools was correct and would ensure that learners with communication difficulties and/or autism have access to facilities that meet their needs and enable them to fulfil their potential."* The policy letter itself provides no such assurance and clearly further work is required in this area whichever Model is adopted by the States.

3.11 Alderney and St. Anne's School

3.11.1 Education is a Bailiwick-wide responsibility. A child growing up at Longis or in Victoria Street should have equal status to a child growing up at L'Ancresse or in Victoria Road. The representatives and people of Alderney should be fully included in shaping a new Education Law. It would need to recognise that St.Anne's School has unique challenges and opportunities.

3.11.2 There is a concern about the removal of selection at 11 which is unique to Alderney. For youngsters in Alderney, selection to the Grammar School is a route – indeed the only well-established route – into compulsory secondary education in Guernsey. The development of a new Education Law would create the space to discuss the sensitive issue of whether students in Alderney, or parents on their behalf, should have any legal right to transfer their education to Guernsey's all-ability, non-selective secondary school.

3.11.3 It is important that St. Anne's School should be able to benefit from some of the pooled expertise and economies of scale which would be available in the

'one school on two sites' model. This would need to include access for staff to the widest possible range of opportunities for professional development.

3.11.4 When a federation of schools was proposed in 2016 it was suggested that St. Anne's would be an associate site of the Guernsey school and would retain its own governance arrangements. The current *C*ESC policy letter includes St. Anne's in the *"potential for the secondary schools to be strategically managed by a single governing body"*, but makes no firm recommendation about the long-term arrangement. Clearly this matter requires further consideration whichever model is adopted by the States.

3.11.5 Improving digital provision would assist the objective of closer collaboration with St. Anne's. Teleconferencing has the potential to allow students in Alderney further to broaden their studies and experiences while remaining on the Island.

3.12 **Information and communication technology**

3.12.1 The inadequacy of digital infrastructure and services is a recurring complaint of education providers locally. This challenge is not unique to any single phase of education.

3.12.2 A typical school in the UK might expect to have a feed of 1 gigabyte per site. In the Bailiwick only 500 megabytes (half as much) are available for all educational establishments and data centres. In the UK a campus of a size comparable to the College of Further Education might expect site links ten times more powerful than those available to the College and a hundred times more in the case of the campus at les Ozouets. Much digital equipment is ageing and some students are now being encouraged to bring in their own devices.

3.12.3 E-learning presents new opportunities for students to develop skills as independent learners and to gain qualifications recognised by industry and higher education providers, but making the most of these opportunities requires better infrastructure and software.

3.13 Competitive sport between schools

3.13.1 It has been claimed that a disadvantage of the Alternative Model is that one school on two sites would put obstacles in the way of competitive sport between schools.

3.13.2 Of course the argument can be run either way: there would be fewer schools and sites to participate in inter-school sport, but at each site there would be more students, which would create more competitive intra-school sport. In any event the total number of students would remain unchanged and they would be divided by site and also into houses, both of which doubtless would compete against each other on the sports field as enthusiastically as schools do today.

3.13.3 The C*f*ESC Model of three wildly asymmetric schools would itself make for an unfair playing field as one small secondary school of 600 students would find itself competing with a school of 960 students.

3.14 Supporting students – further considerations

3.14.1 It is important that 11 to 18 schools should provide opportunities for student leadership not only in the sixth form but also in key stage four. There are a range of ways of doing this which are employed by many leading 11 to 18 comprehensives and which should be integrated into the School and sites proposed in the Alternative Model.

3.14.2 When the States agreed to remove selection at 11 they also directed the C*f*ESC to publish policies on *"the identification and support of the most able, gifted and talented children"* and *"managing disruptive behaviour in order that classroom disruption is minimised"*. The C*f*ESC now intend to publish these policies by the end of 2018.

3.14.3 In relation to behaviour there are several paragraphs in the C*f*ESC policy letter and the authors of the Alternative Model have nothing to add beyond noting that in their discussions with teaching professionals many have reported that the presence of sixth form students as role models in an 11 to 18 school can have a very positive effect on general discipline and pastoral care.

3.14.4 In relation to the gifted and talented resolution, the C*f*ESC policy letter contains less and essentially identifies setting as the key, noting that *"…in three larger 11 to 16 schools…there is greater flexibility to group learners, including by ability, to aid personalised learning"*. If setting is key, clearly the Alternative Model is more advantageous than the C*f*ESC Model because the two larger sites and larger year groups provide even more *"flexibility to group learners"*.

3.14.5 However, the C*f*ESC may not have fully grasped the intent of the amendment which led to the resolution on the gifted and talented. Academic aptitude is only one element – alongside it students can experience social and emotional challenges which need to be supported and have nothing to do with setting. These can include asynchronous development, feelings of being different, social anxiety, etc. It is important that this is reflected in the policies published by the C*f*ESC in 2018.

3.14.6 Schools today face a significant challenge to support students in relation to mental health. Reports suggest that in the UK as many as one in ten students has a diagnosable mental health condition. Many teachers report that mental

ill health in students is rising at an alarming rate and some believe that an increasingly competitive academic environment and the growth of social media are contributing factors.

3.14.7 Over the course of his or her education a student will spend thousands of hours in school, which means teachers and school leaders and the environment they help to create are vital influences in the formative years of life. Students must be provided with support for existing mental ill health and develop the skills necessary for them to be resilient growing up. Activities used to promote such skills include: extra-curricular activities; physical activity; initiatives based on growth mind-set; emotional literacy; mindfulness; drop-in services; buddying and peer mentoring; house and tutor group sessions to build relationships, communication and teamwork; and providing dedicated spaces to promote rest and relaxation.

3.14.8 Mental health is not just about mental illness – it is about having a healthy mental state. Education providers should want to play an active role in the new Bailiwick Health and Wellbeing Commission which the Committee *for* Health & Social Care is to set up. This is one of many initiatives where there is room for the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture to work more collaboratively with the Committee *for* Health & Social Care.

3.14.9 More generally, students need access to well-resourced learner support services to support and advise them in the challenges they face academically, socially and personally. There are examples of good practice in local schools and colleges which would need to be captured and developed further as a key part of the process of establishing one school on two sites. The pooling of resources on fewer sites could assist this are of work.

4. Post-16 education

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 At present, post-16 vocational and technical studies are carried out through a single College of Further Education. A-levels and the International Baccalaureate are studied in the Sixth Form Centre at les Varendes and around half of students there spend all their years in secondary education in an 11 to 18 school.

4.1.2 The **C*f*ESC proposal** for post-16 or post-compulsory education is set out at Proposition 7 of P.2017/110:

"That post-16 provision should be organised as follows:

- *A Sixth Form College on the Les Varendes site offering full-time courses (including A-levels, International Baccalaureate and full-time vocational, applied general and technical courses) predominantly aimed at 16-19 year olds;*

- *A Further and Higher Education Institute on the Les Ozouets Campus offering apprenticeships, further and higher education, and part-time courses."*

4.1.3 In the **Alternative Model**, post-16 studies would be organised as follows:

- The 11 to 18 School operating on two sites would offer sixth form studies on both sites (A-levels on both sites; IB on one site) with 200 – 225 sixth form students at each site;

- The College of Further Education would continue as a single, integrated organisation offering vocational, professional and technical courses for full-time and part-time students, including apprentices;

- It would be an objective of the College to integrate with the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and the Guernsey Training Agency as soon as possible and an ambition to form a partnership with a UK university, ultimately to replace the title College of Further Education with the title University College Guernsey.

4.2 Alternative Model – post-16 collaboration

4.2.1 The Alternative Model proposes a new era of collaboration between the 11 to 18 School and the College of Further Education. The terms of collaboration should be set out in a partnership agreement. The benefits of collaboration are so important to the School, the College and their students that the need for a partnership agreement should be included in a new and long-overdue Education Law.

4.2.2 Once governance is devolved to the School and the College, as it must be, the two sets of governors should become accountable to the C*f*ESC for strengthening collaboration.

4.2.3 The partnership agreement should cover areas such as: the equal promotion of the academic and technical pathways, including opportunities to mix and match qualifications where appropriate; student enrichment; and careers guidance and work-related experience.

4.2.4 Students in Year 11 and their parents must have comprehensive and impartial information which is readily accessible about the full range of post-16 academic, technical and combined courses of study. This does not imply the

absence of professional guidance to students based on aptitude, past performance, potential and student preference, but it does mean there should be co-operation rather than competition over enrolments. There should be further development of joint marketing of the various pathways, for example through a single prospectus. As governance is devolved, including more financial responsibility, care should be taken to ensure that funding incentivises rather than inhibits collaboration on course promotion. In April 2017 the UK Department for Education issued statutory guidance on the need for impartial information about post-16 pathways and this is a useful point of reference.

4.2.5 Students should be able to combine qualifications (mix and match) where there are clear links between school-based and college-based courses and where doing so could enhance higher education and employment prospects.

4.2.6 For example, at level three, the following combined pathways could be offered:

- Engineering pathway: level three technical Engineering and A-level Maths;
- Finance pathway: level three technical Business and A-level Economics;
- Health and social care pathway: level three technical Health and Social Care and A-level Biology/Psychology;
- Performing Arts pathway: level three technical Performing Arts/Dance and A-level Music/Theatre Studies.

4.2.7 The possibility should not be ruled out of introducing the International Baccalaureate Career-related Programme (IBCP) for joint delivery by the School sixth form and the College. The IBCP is a single programme which combines traditional academic and career-related pathways.

4.2.8 Students enrolled on level two courses at the College of Further Education should be supported to take English, Maths or Science at GCSE or below.

4.2.9 The partnership agreement should entitle all full-time students, whether based at the School or the College, to equality of access to a single programme of enrichment activities and personal development. Sports and well-being activities would inevitably feature. It could include The Duke of Edinburgh's Award, sports coaching and courses in first aid, food hygiene and youth leadership. This would probably require both post-16 providers to timetable enrichment activities together at the same time each week.

4.2.10 The partnership agreement need not be restricted to the 16 to 19 phase of education. It should, where appropriate, cover Years 10 and 11 and adult education also. In 2016 the C*f*ESC's predecessor committee acknowledged that *"the possibility of the College of Further Education and the sixth form offering A-levels in the evenings [to adults] could be explored further without the need to combine them into one…college"*.

4.3 Alternative Model – sixth form curriculum modelling

4.3.1 The Alternative Model includes a single sixth form (as part of the single 11 to 18 School) operating on two sites. At each of the two sites there would be approximately 200 – 225 sixth form students (the projected range between the years 2023 and 2043 is 400-450 sixth formers; the modal value during that period is around 430). The C*f*ESC has repeatedly associated the Alternative Model with *"small sixth forms"*, but this is misleading. At each site the sixth form would be in line with the average size of sixth forms in the UK. On average, sixth forms in academies have around 220 students and sixth forms in Local Education Authority schools have around 205 students. There are 225 students or fewer in around one-quarter of the sixth forms in the 100 leading

comprehensives in the UK (measured by attainment). At each site in the Alternative Model there would be around the same number of sixth form students as there are at Elizabeth College and The Ladies' College combined and they would be part of a single sixth form 'offer' of twice the size.

4.3.2 The proposal to provide sixth form studies on both sites was analysed thoroughly by the Education Office and leaders in the post-16 sector. Prudently this work was based on a worst-case scenario using 2017 data. The findings were very encouraging.

4.3.3 The Alternative Model maintains breadth of curriculum and student choice. Ninety-five per cent of students would be able to take their first preference subjects, which is as good as the current Sixth Form Centre is able to offer. Some subjects which are currently not offered at A-level could be offered in the Alternative Model. There would be no diminution of subject choice in the IB Diploma. Students would have greater choice of subjects than is available in many high-achieving sixth forms in the UK and at the grant-maintained colleges.

4.3.4 On both sites there would be a minimum of two specialist teachers in every subject except one, providing greater staff resilience than in the C*f*ESC's proposed post-16 college. Class sizes would actually be reduced: at present they average 14 whereas in the Alternative Model they would average 10. Three-quarters of classes would have between six and 14 students; only one in ten classes would have fewer than five students; and only one in 20 classes would have more than 16 students. Class sizes in the 11 – 16 phase would be unaffected.

4.3.5 In the sixth form phase the Alternative Model requires six to seven teachers more than the current Sixth Form Centre at les Varendes. The additional costs would be offset by the efficiencies obtained by providing 11 to 16 education in

one school on two sites rather than in three (or, as at present, four) separate schools on as many sites.

4.3.6 The vast majority of A-level subjects – based on the current curriculum, around 20 subjects – would be offered on both sites. A small number of less popular A-level subjects would be offered on one site only – approximately ten students per year would need to move permanently from one site to the other or travel between the sites three times a week to pick up their minority subject. The IB Diploma would be offered on the other site only – approximately 16 students would need to move permanently from one site to the other to follow the IB. Students who, following their GCSEs, wished to move into the sixth form would be expected to remain at the same site unless their subject preferences demanded otherwise, which would apply to around 10% of students. Fewer than one in 20 students would have any reason to travel between the sites and if they preferred they could instead move sites permanently without any compromise over subject choice.

4.3.7 The Alternative Model requires the sixth forms on both sites to have one lesson more per day than 11 to 16 students. As an indication only, this could be achieved by lessons ending at 3.00pm for 11 to 16 students and 3.50pm for sixth formers, which would be an extension of 20 minutes on the current sixth form day. This is necessary for efficient timetabling and to maximise students' subject choice, but conveniently it would also assist the movement of traffic in and around school sites.

4.3.8 All of the above is based on sixth form curriculum modelling carried out by professionals appointed by the Education Office and presented to the authors of the Alternative Model on the 3rd of November 2017. Four weeks later, on the 1st of December, the C*f*ESC sent deputies a paper entitled *curriculum offer on two sixth form sites* which contained a number of inaccurate or misleading statements which must now be corrected.

4.3.9 The C*f*ESC paper stated: *"Many individual subjects would only be offered as an IB certificate, rather than as an A-level"*. This is inaccurate. The C*f*ESC's own curriculum modelling shows that across the combined sixth form no subject would be offered as an IB rather than as an A-level.

4.3.10 The C*f*ESC paper stated: *"The Committee is concerned that these qualifications [IB] may not be held in such high regard as A-levels by top universities including Oxbridge and the Russell Group."* This is misleading. In 2017 the Sixth Form Centre wished to offer five subjects in the IB certificate instead of A-level. This was approved by the C*f*ESC – at political level – after it was established that admissions tutors at Oxford, Cambridge and all Russell Group universities (except Warwick) would accept IB certificates as equivalent to A-levels.

4.3.11 The C*f*ESC paper stated: *"Modelling on current provision suggests that in Film Studies, French, History, Psychology and Spanish the offer would be an IB Certificate on one school site and an A-level on the other."* This is presented negatively by the C*f*ESC, but in fact it represents *more* choice because at present A-levels are not offered at all in most of those subjects.

4.3.12 The C*f*ESC paper stated: *"There would be significantly reduced flexibility in the options presented to students…[and] limited choice of subject combinations."* This is inaccurate. The sixth form on two sites would offer no less choice and flexibility than is currently enjoyed by students studying A-levels and the IB. As explained above, a small number of students may choose to transfer sites, but this would *in*crease student choice because some subjects could be offered at A-level which are not offered at A-level currently, e.g. Film Studies, History and Spanish.

4.3.13 In relation to the possibility of a small number of students transferring site at 16, the C*f*ESC paper stated: *"This…could mean that they would be in the minority at their new school"*, which begs the question: the minority of what?

Like all of their peers they would be studying level three qualifications, including A-levels and/or IB. The C*f*ESC paper stated: *"[Transferring] removes any benefit for these pupils of remaining in the same 11 to 18 school"*, but they would remain in the same school, albeit on a different site, and the benefits are related to being in an 11 to 18 environment, not to the particular site. Of course the C*f*ESC Model requires every student, i.e. more than 400 students every year, to move site at 16.

4.3.14 The C*f*ESC paper stated: *"It is understood that the percentage wishing to transfer schools, based on current subject choices, would be around 10%…this assumes that some students currently undertaking an A-level would be happy to study an IB certificate course and this may not be the case depending on their university applications."* This is pure scaremongering: as explained above, the C*f*ESC – at political level – has already accepted that Oxbridge and all Russell Group universities bar one regard the IB certificates as equivalent to A-level.

4.3.15 The C*f*ESC paper stated: *"It has been suggested that the way to improve the choice of subject combinations in [the Alternative Model] is to…offer a significant number of subjects in one school only."* This has not been suggested by the authors of the Alternative Model nor has it featured in any of the sixth form curriculum modelling carried out by the C*f*ESC. The subject combinations in the Alternative Model replicate exactly the subject combinations offered currently in the Sixth Form Centre at les Varendes. This includes around 20 A-level subjects which would be offered on both sites. The C*f*ESC paper claims that *"…this federated approach has not proved to be wholly successful…"* despite it never having been operated.

4.4 Alternative Model – College of Further Education – Governance and Estate

4.4.1 For decades the States' committee with policy responsibility for education has also been the governing body of schools and colleges. In recent years

successive committees have come under pressure to adopt arrangements often referred to as 'local management', which essentially means devolution of governance and leadership. Under 'local management', schools or colleges, whether individually or in consortia, would be governed by boards independent of, but accountable to, the C*f*ESC. The C*f*ESC would cease to be the governing body of schools and colleges and would instead focus on policy and other 'central government' functions. This was first recommended by an external review around six years ago.

4.4.2 It is four years since a 'shadow' board of governors was appointed at the College of Further Education. Any delegation of functions has been limited and the C*f*ESC remains the governing body in Law and often in practice.

4.4.3 The Alternative Model includes a firm and unambiguous commitment genuinely to devolve governance and leadership of both the 11 to 18 School and the College of Further Education. The benefits of devolution are explored in more detail in section three of this report, which explains how it could work in relation to the 11 to 18 School. Many of the benefits apply to the School and the College equally, but there are also benefits particular to the College in view of its more commercial and work-related focus.

4.4.4 A key concern of the 'shadow' governors is that for many years the College has been operating from multiple sites, none of which are ideal and some parts of which are highly unsatisfactory. In the future, College students, like all students, should have access to the best facilities the Island can afford. This requires a purpose-built College, possibly developed in phases as resources allow. Every effort must be made to expedite this development. It is an integral part of the Alternative Model – no less so than the capital works which would be required on the two sites identified to accommodate the 11 to 18 School.

4.5 **Other post-compulsory providers – Guernsey Training Agency, Institute of Health and Social Care Studies, and States' training; and lifelong learning**

4.5.1 Proposition 8 of P.2017/110 from the C*f*ESC reads as follows:

"That the CfESC should return to the States by March 2019 with a policy letter setting out how post-16 provision will work in partnership with the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and the GTA University Centre to become the Guernsey University College, including a co-designed governance model."

4.5.2 The C*f*ESC Policy letter makes it clear that any such partnership or co-designed governance model would include the training college but exclude the post-16 college. For example, paragraph 4.32 of the policy letter states: *"In time, this [training college] could link with the IHSCS and/or the GTA… [o]ne governance structure for these <u>three</u> organisations would help meet the savings identified in the PwC report…"* This is consistent with the initial proposals published in July 2017, which clearly showed the training college and the post-16 college under separate governance.

4.5.3 The training college would in effect be what remained of the College of Further Education after its full-time students had been removed. Many professionals in the post-16 sector doubt the viability of the training college in the form proposed by the C*f*ESC. It may be optimistic to assume that the training college – without full-time students – would be an attractive partner to the Guernsey Training Agency and the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies.

4.5.4 The C*f*ESC policy letter provides next to no detail about the training college. Nevertheless Proposition 8 asks the States to agree that the training college – with no full-time students of its own, but in a partnership with the Agency and the Institute – should in the future be endowed with the title *university college*. It would not be regarded as such beyond our shores. Any apparent cachet

would be synthetic. A university college should be a college of an existing university, which the C*f*ESC's training college, with or without local partners, would not be.

4.5.5 In relation to bringing together providers and seeking enhanced status, the Alternative Model shares some of the objectives of the C*f*ESC Model, but it proposes a more coherent and realistic approach to achieving them.

4.5.6 The terms of the C*f*ESC Proposition 8 are the wrong way around: it is emphatic about adopting the title university when it should be cautious, but it is circumspect about bringing together the various providers when it should be decisive.

4.5.7 Of course the Alternative Model does not partition the College of Further Education but keeps it intact as one integral organisation serving full-time and part-time students and providing at least its current range of courses. The States should commit now to the objective of integrating the College, the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and the Guernsey Training Agency as soon as possible, most probably to operate as discrete faculties under a single governing body. The States' various internal training initiatives could be included in this new arrangement, also possibly as a faculty. This would generate efficiencies as well as educational benefits.

4.5.8 That is not to say integration could happen immediately or would be without challenges. It would need to be pursued sensitively with respect for the unique characteristics and services of each of the providers, but that is no reason to stop short of establishing integration as a firm objective.

4.5.9 Unlike the training college proposed by the C*f*ESC, there is no question about the viability of the College of Further Education in the Alternative Model. The C*f*ESC proposal would create a new but vulnerable organisation by dividing an existing one; the Alternative Model would create a new, stronger organisation

and work towards integrating it with other existing organisations. This would create the best platform for the continuing development of vocational, professional, technical and higher education across the Bailiwick.

4.5.10 From this platform the College – with full- as well as part-time students across a wide range of vocational, professional, technical and higher education – would be better-placed to enter into a full partnership with a UK university and legitimately become *University College Guernsey*. This is a very worthwhile ambition to enhance learning opportunities and strengthen esteem.

4.5.11 The C*f*ESC post-16 proposals are silent on lifelong learning. The post-16 college is designed essentially for teenagers and in the opinion of many professionals in the sector the training college would be too small to spearhead substantial progress in lifelong learning. This may be considered an omission in view of the States' Policy & Resource Plan, which states:

"We want people to have a lifelong enjoyment of learning, not just for the benefit of their work lives but also for their health and wellbeing. The quality and depth of education and lifelong learning will in part determine how successfully we are able to meet the complex challenges of the present and the future."

4.5.12 In the Alternative Model the College would be well-placed to develop lifelong learning. This is a timely consideration: the schedule of business for the States' meeting on the 17th of January includes proposals from the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security on longer working lives which imply a need to enhance opportunities for lifelong learning.

4.6 C*f*ESC Model – an unorthodox experiment

4.6.1 The C*f*ESC published its initial plans in July 2017. At that time the proposed new institution for full-time courses at les Varendes was referred to as a post-

16 college. The *C*fESC now refers to it as a sixth form college. This change in nomenclature is important because it has allowed the Committee to associate its proposals with the performance of sixth form colleges in the UK. There is no doubt that, as a group, sixth form colleges have a reputation for high levels of attainment. However the post-16 college proposed by the *C*fESC cannot credibly be compared with sixth form colleges as a group in the UK – and certainly not with the highest-achieving sixth form colleges. The differences between them are stark.

4.6.2 The post-16 college proposed by the *C*fESC would provide all full-time courses ranging from entry level (below GCSE grade G or 1) through levels one and two to level three (e.g. A-level, IB, BTEC Extended Diploma, etc.). The Sixth Form Colleges Association describes sixth form colleges as *"level three specialists"*. The *C*fESC Policy letter drops the reference to level three specialism, describing sixth form colleges only as *"specialist providers"*, and then claims the title sixth form college for its proposed multi-level institution.

4.6.3 In 2012 the Sixth Form Colleges Association stated that *"more than 150,000 16 to 18 year-olds were enrolled on a course at a sixth form college with most (94%) studying for a level three qualification (A-level or equivalent)"*. In Guernsey, at present, the proportion of full-time students studying at level three is 79%. In 2015/16 it was 76.5% with 23.5% at level two and below. At the post-16 college proposed by the *C*fESC the profile of students and the range of levels of learning would be quite unlike those at a typical sixth form college.

4.6.4 This is relevant because the Association of Colleges advises that there are very few full-time-only colleges offering substantial provision for students at lower levels and those which do tend to have suppressed achievement rates. The challenge would be particularly serious in a small college such as that proposed by the *C*fESC.

4.6.5 The C*f*ESC Policy letter states that "*sixth form colleges similar to the one we are proposing operate successfully. Examples include Lowestoft Sixth Form College, Reigate College and Blackpool Sixth"*. In fact these colleges have almost nothing in common with the post-16 college proposed by the C*f*ESC.

4.6.6 The entry criteria for full-time students at Reigate College and Blackpool Sixth are much more selective than they would be at the C*f*ESC post-16 college. At Reigate College the standard entry requirement is five GCSEs at grades A to C (or equivalent) and there are often twice as many applicants as there are places available. They are both genuinely level three specialists, offering limited full-time provision at level two and none at all at level one or entry level. Neither college offers the International Baccalaureate. Clearly they are very different from what is envisaged at the C*f*ESC post-16 college.

4.6.7 When Lowestoft Sixth Form College was last inspected by OFSTED, in 2015, around 85% of full-time students were studying at level three. The remainder were studying at level two. It was rated 'good', but at its previous inspection, in 2014, it was rated as 'requiring improvement' in every category. In 2016, in Suffolk alone, twenty-two post-16 providers obtained better A-level results than Lowestoft Sixth Form College. The C*f*ESC continues to cite Lowestoft Sixth Form College as an exemplar for its post-16 college.

4.6.8 It is expected that the post-16 college would have around 800 – 900 students. Sixth form colleges in the UK, with which the C*f*ESC is trying to make direct comparisons, have an average of 1,800 students and one-third have more than 2,000 students. The teaching and learning in these colleges benefit from economies of scale unobtainable in Guernsey. A report published by the Sixth Form Colleges Association in 2015 acknowledged that "*…small sixth form colleges (those with fewer than 1,200 students)…are under the greatest financial pressure – most have serious doubts about their short- to medium-term viability"*.

4.6.9 Reigate College has 1,600 full-time students and Blackpool Sixth has 1,900. Lowestoft Sixth Form College is of a similar size to the post-16 college proposed by the C*f*ESC, but in 2015 it was issued with a formal financial notice to improve and has been pursuing plans to merge with other post-16 providers nearby in order to remain viable.

4.6.10 The C*f*ESC recently claimed that its post-16 proposals were "*tried and tested in the UK"*. It is quite clear that the post-16 college proposed by the C*f*ESC would have very few of the characteristics of most sixth form colleges. The proposed training college has no parallel anywhere.

4.6.11 The C*f*ESC has cited two training institutions in England (Procat and In-Comm) but neither of them operate on anything like the scale of the proposed training college in Guernsey and the profile of their students and courses is not remotely similar. The College of Further Education takes on around 70 new apprentices each year whereas Procat has around 1,300 apprentices. Ironically Procat also has around 350 full-time students at levels one to three, who would not be at the training college under the C*f*ESC plans. In-Comm's primary focus is the engineering industry: two-thirds of its apprentices are on engineering courses.

4.6.12 The C*f*ESC's post-16 proposals are unorthodox and experimental. Adopting them – especially against the advice of the overwhelming majority of professionals who lead and deliver post-16 education locally – would be a huge risk.

4.6.13 A further consideration is that the post-16 proposals of the C*f*ESC eliminate choice – at least in the States' sector – for full-time students. A school-based sixth form environment may be better for some students and the College of Further Education offering technical and professional studies may be better for others. At present, students in Guernsey and their parents have some

degree of choice whereas the C*f*ESC proposal assumes that a sixth form college environment would be better for every student. Sixth form colleges elsewhere normally operate in a competitive and diverse environment. They exist in addition to, not instead of, school-based sixth forms, further education colleges and tertiary colleges.

4.6.14 Following the decision of the States to remove selection at 11, secondary education in Guernsey is about to undergo its most substantial reform in 70 years. Opinion in the community, as in the States, was extremely divided over selection at 11 and many parents of children of all abilities remain to be persuaded of the merit of all-ability schools. This would be a particularly bad time for the States also to withdraw from the 11 to 18 sector and leave this 'offer' entirely to the grant-maintained colleges.

4.6.15 The C*f*ESC policy letter states that *"[a]t 16 students will choose between full-time 16 to 19 study at the [post-16 college] or entering a workplace environment either full-time, part-time or through an apprenticeship programme"* and that the training college *"will provide learning opportunities for those who have already chosen a course that needs to be delivered in a workplace environment"*. This ignores that many full-time vocational learners are also on a course which needs to be delivered – at least partly – in a practical, realistic workplace environment. The C*f*ESC is trying to create divisions where there are none and should be none.

4.6.16 Based on current enrolments, full-time students in the following subjects require access to a workplace environment: levels one, two and three beauty therapy; levels two and three hospitality and catering; levels one, two and three engineering; levels two and three performing arts; levels one, two and three construction and engineering. If the practical, workplace environments required at the training college are to be replicated for these full-time students at the post-16 college there will be duplication of facilities a stone's throw from

each other. If, on the other hand, these full-time students were admitted to use the practical, workplace facilities at the training college they would be separated from their full-time peers in the post-16 college and the C*f*ESC would have broken the principle, expressed in its policy letter, that *"those studying full-time will not be separated into two separate institutions according to the type of qualification they choose to study or are deemed suitable for…"*.

4.6.17 Post-16 students who need to study at the lower levels may be particularly badly let down by the C*f*ESC proposals. They may be enrolled at the post-16 college but experience and research show they will need to spend a lot of time in highly practical working environments which will exist at the training college. They may need to commute over a distance which is obviously very short but could be significant for this type of student.

4.6.18 The C*f*ESC estimates that around 5% of students may be in this position, but the College of Further Education estimates a higher percentage. In the last academic year 23.5% of students were at level two or below and this academic year the figure is 21.3%. Currently 9% of students are on level one or access courses.

4.6.19 Some students (usually from le Murier) who start full-time entry level vocational courses may take up to six years to achieve full level three qualifications if they wish to pursue learning to that level. If they entered the post-16 college at the age of 16 they would remain there – in an almost exclusively 16 to 19 environment – until around the age of 22. This is not desirable. A college with a broader range of learners, as proposed in the Alternative Model, is a much more suitable environment for these students.

4.6.20 There is also much professional concern that removing full-time courses and learners from what is currently the College of Further Education may result in some of what remains – at the training college – becoming unviable due to

absence of scale. Certainly there is a risk that costly facilities could be significantly under-utilised and that the remaining, smaller team of lecturers may be less resilient.

4.7 Future developments in technical and vocational studies

4.7.1 In the past 18 months it has become apparent that technical and vocational education for 16 to 19 year-olds is about to undergo significant reform in the UK. Thousands of disparate qualifications will be replaced by 15 'routes' which have become known collectively as T(echnical)-levels. The UK Government says this is "*the most ambitious post-16 education reforms since the introduction of A-levels 70 years ago*".

4.7.2 The C*f*ESC policy letter fails to do justice to the significance of these changes. They are mentioned in a single paragraph and no attempt is made to explain any impact they may have on the structural changes to post-16 education proposed by the C*f*ESC. This is especially surprising since T-levels will be introduced around the time when the C*f*ESC proposes to be partitioning the College of Further Education between the post-16 college and the separate training college. There is no indication to suggest that any curriculum modelling carried out by the C*f*ESC has taken into account the substantial curriculum changes which T-levels are likely to require. This does nothing to dispel concerns that the C*f*ESC has adopted an approach of 'buildings first, education policy second'.

4.7.3 In fact the introduction of T-levels, and the thinking behind them, are extremely unhelpful to the C*f*ESC proposal.

4.7.4 The UK Government has said "*employers will…take the lead in setting the standards*" of T-levels. They "*may be taught in a classroom, workshop or simulated work environment*"; they "*are for students who want to develop work-*

related knowledge and skills"; and they will include *"a substantial work placement"*. T-levels may appear to be well-suited to the C*f*ESC training college, which it is claimed will *"be responsive to industry requirements"* and provide *"courses that need to be delivered in a workplace environment"*. However, most T-levels will be full-time courses for 16-19 year-olds – and therefore, under the C*f*ESC plan, such T-level students would study not in the training college but in the post-16 college.

4.7.5 In addition, each T-level *"will be closely aligned to the apprenticeships at the start of each route and it will be possible to move from one to the other"* – except that, under the C*f*ESC plan, the T-level will be in the post-16 college and the apprenticeship will be in the separate training college. Indeed four of the 15 T-level 'routes' are likely to be delivered primarily through apprenticeships, which emphasises how illogical it would be to divide apprentices from other technical studies as proposed by the C*f*ESC.

4.7.6 T-levels and related apprenticeships rely on "*close integration between college-based and employment-based technical education"*. Yet, at the very time of their introduction, the C*f*ESC wants to dis-integrate college-based and employment-based technical education by partitioning the College of Further Education into separate institutions.

4.7.7 In the post-16 sector nationally it is generally assumed that sixth form colleges will not be major providers of T-levels. Yet the C*f*ESC wants to require all full-time students to enrol at what it refers to as a sixth form college. It claims this will promote equality of opportunity when the likelihood is that it will narrow opportunity in modern technical education in particular.

4.7.8 T-levels can trace their origin to *The Report of the Independent Panel on Technical Education*, published in 2016. The report stated: *"[I]t is striking how in many countries with high-performing technical education systems – including*

Norway, the Netherlands and Switzerland – there is widespread integration across the two modes of technical educational learning: employment-based, such as apprenticeship, and college-based, such as a full-time study programme at a college…learners can more easily transfer between pathways, colleges can utilise the same staff and equipment to teach both, and the system can flex throughout economic cycles: when apprenticeship opportunities dry up in a recession, students can still train for their chosen occupation in college."

4.7.9 The introduction of T-levels demonstrates well that what the C*f*ESC is proposing is to divide technical education in a way which is not only unnecessary but also highly unorthodox and in conflict with international evidence and modern developments nationally in the technical curriculum.

4.7.10 In contrast, by maintaining the College of Further Education as a single organisation, the Alternative Model provides for the closest possible integration between college-based and employment-based technical education. The Alternative Model is therefore well-placed to allow the Bailiwick to take full advantage of new T-levels and related apprenticeships. The College's apprenticeship scheme is currently under review to ensure it is able in the future to support the changing needs of the local economy. Apprenticeships remain an essential part of the work of the College.

4.7.11 T-levels are being launched with the *"ambition…that every young person, after an excellent grounding in the core academic subjects and a broad and balanced curriculum to age 16, is presented with two choices: the academic or the technical option."* The aforementioned *Report of the Independent Panel on Technical Education* highlighted the need for parity of esteem between technical and academic studies but firmly recommended that *"the technical option…needs to be clearly delineated from the academic option, as they are designed for different purposes"*. This thinking will inevitably be challenging for those who have long hoped to erase boundaries between academic and technical education, but

Guernsey cannot afford to disregard these developments in post-16 education nationally. In any event the C*f*ESC proposal to partition the College of Further Education, and thereby create new institutional divisions in technical education, would do nothing to raise the esteem of technical education.

4.7.12 Despite this, the C*f*ESC policy letter boldly asserts that under its plan "*learners will benefit from parity of esteem between vocational and academic pathways"*. This is delusional. *The Report of the Independent Panel on Technical Education* explained that there are deep-seated reasons for this disparity in British society. The disparity is rooted in culture, not location. Some people hold that parity of esteem could be achieved by putting learners under the same roof. This is doubtful, but even then the C*f*ESC is not proposing to do that. The need for parity of esteem in Guernsey will certainly not be addressed – and may be made worse – by the C*f*ESC experiment to partition technical studies and then co-locate some (but not all) technical studies with academic studies.

4.7.13 It has been suggested that maintaining the College of Further Education retains 'selection at 16', as if it were comparable with 'selection at 11'. This cannot be taken seriously. First, the C*f*ESC proposals do not provide for every 17- and 18-year-old who is in some form of education to be in the same institution or at the same location. Moreover, most 16-year-olds are rather better equipped than 10- or 11-year-olds to make educational choices; GCSEs are a more reliable method of assessment than the 11+; and post-16 education is not compulsory and cannot therefore provide for 'all-ability' year groups. If one is going to argue against 'selection at 16' one might as well argue against 'selection at 18', but should every university be expected to admit any student?

4.8 **Post-16 teachers and lecturers**

4.8.1 The C*f*ESC proposals create new and unhelpful divisions for teachers and lecturers.

4.8.2 At present around 80% of all teachers at the Grammar School teach in both the sixth form and the lower school and around 90% of those who teach in the sixth form also teach in the lower school. The C*f*ESC proposal denies all teachers – present and future – the opportunity to teach the full range of 11 to 18 studies. This has been confirmed repeatedly by members of the C*f*ESC and the Education Office, who advise that the post-16 college would be staffed independently of other schools/colleges. They know this is a substantial risk because the predecessor Committee advised the States last year not to withdraw from the 11 to 18 sector partly because "*recruitment might be assisted if teachers have the opportunity to teach in an 11 to 18 school (under a federated one-school model this opportunity would be further enhanced and developed for more teachers…)"*.

4.8.3 The C*f*ESC proposal – as well as dividing vocational and technical students based on nothing more than how many hours they spend in a classroom or workshop – also necessarily divides between two separate institutions the staff who currently teach those students. As set out in the preceding paragraph, in the C*f*ESC model the post-16 college would be staffed independently of other schools/colleges – and therefore the same must be true of the training college.

4.8.4 Further education lecturers are typically expert in the full range of provision found in that sector, e.g. full-time and part-time, school release programmes for 14 to 16 year-olds, apprenticeships and higher level studies. Denying lecturers the opportunity to practise across the full range of further education would do nothing to assist recruitment and retention of good staff in the technical sector. Further education professionals may not be attracted to come to the Island by the unorthodox division of full- and part-time courses since their experience and qualifications may not be readily transferable.

4.8.5 In addition there are serious concerns in the post-16 sector about the depth and resilience of the staff structure at the post-16 college proposed by the C*f*ESC. The post-16 college would be organised on a faculty basis and there is no doubt about the depth and resilience of each of the faculties. But the modelling carried out by the C*f*ESC and shared with the authors of the Alternative Model show the teaching time in several subjects would require fewer than two whole-time teachers. At present there are around 19 sixth form subjects which, if isolated from all 11 to 16 studies, require fewer than two whole-time teachers and there are 11 subjects which require fewer than one whole-time teacher. Faculties would not necessarily provide staff resilience: not all teachers and lecturers would have transferable skills to take both academic and vocational courses and many would be unable to take classes in more than one subject within their faculty.

4.8.6 None of these concerns arise in the Alternative Model. The College of Further Education remains undivided and indeed would be strengthened by uniting with other post-compulsory providers such as the Guernsey Training Agency and the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies. Secondary school teachers would be brought together in one 11 to 18 school operating from two sites and teachers would have the opportunity, depending on their professional expertise and preferences, to teach in the 11 to 16 phase only or across the 11 to 18 phase and some may continue to teach in the post-16 phase only.

4.8.7 The professionals who actually work in schools and colleges planning the post-16 curriculum have been able to scrutinise the Alternative Model more rigorously than they have the C*f*ESC model.

4.9 C*f*ESC Model – 'mix and match' programmes of study

4.9.1 In its policy letter the C*f*ESC makes claims which are mutually contradictory, even diametrically opposed, in relation to breadth of curriculum and student

choice. In paragraph 3.63 it states that *"there is strong evidence that a wide choice [of subjects] can be a threat to the academic progress of most students"*, but by paragraph 4.24 it is emphasising the importance of providing students with *"access to a broader range of subjects [and] the ability to mix types of courses at different levels"*.

4.9.2 This section is concerned with the latter claim: that more students should take a wider variety of courses, e.g. by combining A-levels and BTECs (or vocational qualifications). It also asserts that this mix and match approach is best promoted by creating a post-16 college for full-time students only. Both assertions should be treated with considerable caution.

4.9.3 In fact such mix and match options are available to students today. Each year the full post-16 curriculum is presented to Year 11 students and their parents/carers jointly by the Sixth Form Centre and the College of Further Education. Options to mix and match qualifications are presented clearly and openly, but typically fewer than five students per year enrol on such programmes.

4.9.4 It is sometimes argued that mix and match programmes are discouraged by inherent academic bias and because different component courses are provided by different institutions. This begs the question: what is the experience in the UK, where some post-16 institutions run mix and match programmes on a single site?

4.9.5 In trying to answer this question, university applications are a useful source of information. For the application period ending in January 2017, of all 18-year-olds in the UK, 23.6% made a university application while they were studying A-levels only; 3.9% made an application while they were studying BTECs only; and just 1.7% made an application while they were studying A-levels and BTECs together.

4.9.6 The C*f*ESC advises that *"evidence from UCAS shows a shift in the types of qualifications with which young people are applying to university"* – but this paints a rather incomplete picture. In 2017, the percentage of 18-year-olds making a university application while studying only A-levels increased to a record high; the percentage studying only BTECs also increased; but the percentage studying A-levels and BTECs together did not increase. In the past few years there has been an increase in applicants studying A-levels and BTECs, but it is an increase *to* 1.7%. Nearly one in four 18-year-olds is making an application while studying A-levels only whereas around one in sixty is making an application while studying A-levels and BTECs together.

4.9.7 Latest figures show that even in genuine sixth form colleges in the UK which provide blended A-level / BTEC courses 85% of students choose to study A-levels only or BTECs only and fewer than one in 35 students studies an equal blend of A-levels and BTECs (i.e. example two on page 49 of the C*f*ESC policy letter).

4.9.8 The C*f*ESC Policy letter identifies the proportion of students who started (in 2015) but did not finish (in 2017) a two-year level three programme at either the Sixth Form Centre or the College of Further Education. The figures are not dissimilar from those in the UK, although the employment market in Guernsey may make it more tempting for students to leave school or college and enter the workplace.

4.9.9 The C*f*ESC state that it is *"important to explore other and more flexible options regarding programmes of study… [t]he evidence suggests that some students in sixth form colleges with lower average GCSE scores, who may be currently undertaking a three A-level programme, would have improved retention and attainment when undertaking a mixed programme of A-level and Level 3 BTEC qualifications"*. This statement in the policy letter is factual but also misleading

– because what the same data also shows is that for students whose average GCSE grade is C or below (i.e. the lowest-achieving 25-30% of all students at sixth form colleges) the retention rate on a subsequent two-year 'sixth form' course is higher for students who study BTECs only than for students who study any blend of A-levels and BTECs. Indeed the same data shows that students whose average GCSE grade is C or below and who go on to study any blend of A-levels and BTECs drop out of their two-year course at a rate of between 36% and 43%, which is higher than the rate in Guernsey.

4.9.10 The C*f*ESC may be asking the right question but even its own data indicates it may be proposing the wrong solution. The C*f*ESC appears also to be discounting the very real possibility that some students who complete their courses at the College of Further Education would not complete them (and would therefore add to the drop-out figures) if forced into the rather different ethos and environment of the proposed post-16 college, which the C*f*ESC states would be *"organised like a school"*.

4.9.11 This is not to say that mix and match programmes should not be available locally. They should be available; they should be promoted openly to prospective students; they undoubtedly suit the needs and aspirations of some students; and they are included in the Alternative Model.

4.9.12 However empirical and anecdotal evidence suggests that demand for mix and match programmes is likely to remain limited. It should not be the basis for completely restructuring post-16 education, including partitioning the College of Further Education and removing any opportunity for 11 to 18 teaching, and yet that is what the C*f*ESC is misguidedly proposing.

4.9.13 In any event it is not clear from the C*f*ESC policy letter why its proposed post-16 college would be particularly well-placed to take advantage of mix and match programmes – it is simply asserted as if it were fact. Certainly its post-

16 college would be much smaller than most sixth form colleges in the UK which offer more mix and match programmes. It is quite possible that creative timetabling could allow students just as much opportunity to mix and match in the Alternative Model as they would have in a post-16 college without the need to partition the College of Further Education.

4.10 **Other possible amendments to the post-16 proposals**

4.10.1 The C*f*ESC published initial proposals for post-16 education in July 2017. When the policy letter was published more than four months later the post-16 proposals had changed hardly at all apart from a cosmetic adjustment to the titles of the two proposed new institutions. Clearly the C*f*ESC has been committed to its post-16 proposals for many months.

4.10.2 In October 2017 the C*f*ESC referred to its proposed post-16 college and separate training college in the following terms:

"Our proposals make sense; they put our learners' needs at the forefront; they are appropriate for the Guernsey context; they make the most efficient and effective use of our resources; they are tried and tested elsewhere; and will meet the needs of our students, our employers and the wider community for many years to come."

4.10.3 In November the President of the C*f*ESC said that his Committee remained *"absolutely sure that our proposals represent the very best for the future education of our children and young people… The Committee sincerely hopes that States' members will recognise that our proposals are well thought through and evidence based"*.

4.10.4 The C*f*ESC policy letter advises that the proposal for a post-16 college and a separate training college *"have the unanimous support of the Committee"*.

4.10.5 There has been some speculation about ways in which the post-16 propositions might be amended, other than in the way envisaged in the Alternative Model.

4.10.6 The post-16 college and the training college could conceivably be placed under a single governance structure or under single management. However, for several months the C*f*ESC has consistently asserted that the supposed benefits of its post-16 structure rely on the two institutions remaining separate and independent of each other. The policy letter states:

"These proposals allow for both post-16 organisations to focus entirely on [their] distinct areas of provision, ensuring that such focus is not diluted across a broad mandate. Both of these organisations would be of sufficient size to benefit from dedicated senior management teams to lead…and focus on educational outcomes of its respective group of learners, which have different requirements.

"…the [post-16 college] would operate more like a school with a structured day, generally open term-time only…[t]here would be a very different ethos and culture in the [training college] which would need to be more responsive to employer needs, have more of a commercial focus and deliver the requirements of the skills strategy."

4.10.7 The C*f*ESC recently issued answers to frequently asked questions. In relation to the post-16 college and the training college, it said: *"The CfESC feels that to put these two very different provisions under one management team would not provide the necessary strategic focus to ensure both deliver the expected outcomes for all learners."*

4.10.8 The C*f*ESC's Proposition 8 envisages – eventually – *"a co-designed governance model"* which would include the training college, the Institute of Health and

Social Care Studies and the Guernsey Training Agency. On the 19th of December the C*f*ESC claimed that the "*co-designed governance model"* could include all post-16 provision, i.e. the post-16 college as well. However, this is directly contradicted by the C*f*ESC's own policy letter, which could not be clearer that any such governance model would *ex*clude the post-16 college.

4.10.9 Paragraph 4.35 of the policy letter states: "*The [training college] could move towards an LBG (company limited by guarantee) model and work more closely with the IHSCS and the GTA University Centre to become the Guernsey University College"*. Nowhere in this paragraph is there any mention of the post-16 college being part of any such governance model.

4.10.10 Paragraph 1.12 of the policy letter states: "*There will be close partnership working between the [training college], the GTA and the IHSCS…[i]t is envisaged that this would lead to the further development of on-island higher education in partnership with UK universities and the creation of the Guernsey University College. The Committee will set up a working group with all relevant providers to look at this in detail."* Again there is no mention at all of the post-16 college in connection with any of this future work.

4.10.11 Paragraph 4.22 of the policy letter states: "*Keeping them [the post-16 college and the training college] as separate establishments…would enable focused time to develop work with the GTA and the IHSCS to help avoid duplication and make best use of expertise and resources."* Here the success of the future work between the training college, the GTA and the IHSCS appears to depend on keeping the post-16 college out of the picture.

4.10.12 Paragraph 4.32 of the policy letter states: "*In time, this [training college] could link with the IHSCS and/or the GTA to create the Guernsey University College… One governance structure for these <u>three</u> organisations would help to meet the savings identified in the PwC report…"*

4.10.13 All of these extracts of the policy letter are consistent with the initial proposals released by the C*f*ESC in July (see Appendix 5 of the policy letter). Page 25 mentions the possibility of "*…bringing together responsibility for the strategic management of the College of Further Education, GTA and IHSCS under a single governing body"* but the post-16 college is not mentioned.

4.10.14 Indeed the July document discussed moving the post-16 college even further away from other post-16 providers, including the training college, and instead *"recognised that there is potential for the post-16 college and the secondary schools to be strategically managed by a single governing body"*. This is illustrated well on page 14 of the July document.

4.10.15 The post-16 college and the training college have been conceived as two totally different institutions. It would be peculiar to say the least to allow them to be created in the form proposed but also to place them under a single governance structure or under single management. It would also fail to prevent the partition of the College of Further Education, which is one of the most significant weaknesses in the C*f*ESC's post-16 proposals.

4.10.16 It is difficult to understand why anyone would support the C*f*ESC's proposal to divide the College of Further Education between the post-16 college and the training college and then seek to bring it back together, but only partially if not cosmetically, by placing the two institutions under a single governance structure or under single management.

4.10.17 The Alternative Model provides for the College of Further Education to remain intact. The only other way for the College of Further Education to remain intact is for it to absorb sixth form and other post-compulsory studies to form a tertiary college. In paragraph 4.36 of its policy letter the C*f*ESC advises that if the States reject its post-16 proposals it will return in 2019 with plans for a tertiary college, possibly to open in 2022/23. This is an extraordinary position

for the C*f*ESC to have adopted in view of the strength of its criticism of tertiary colleges.

4.10.18 In October 2017 the Committee stated:

> *"A tertiary college would mean very complex strategic management of two distinct provisions – part-time and full-time…separating provision enables greater clarity of purpose and greater focus on improving learner outcomes…outcomes from tertiary colleges are the lowest in [the] post-16 landscape…[and] most very successful tertiary colleges have a much larger catchment than Guernsey."*

4.10.19 The C*f*ESC's policy letter states that a tertiary college would *"not meet the principle of improving education outcomes as tertiary colleges have the lowest outcomes of all proposed models"*.

4.10.20 When publishing its initial proposals in July 2017 the C*f*ESC drew on the unanimous advice of the head teachers of the Bailiwick's secondary schools in support of the decision not to propose a tertiary college. This was their view, expressed in a letter to the President of the C*f*ESC dated the 19th of January 2017:

> *"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."*

4.10.21 It is difficult to imagine a Committee which has been so consistently opposed to a tertiary college enthusiastically leading the development of proposals for such a college. In addition, the aforementioned timeline (2019 – 2022/23)

provides the States with little or no certainty that rejecting Proposition 7 would in practice lead to the creation of a tertiary college.

4.10.22 Only the Alternative Model provides certainty that the College of Further Education will remain intact and be afforded the support it needs to be expanded and strengthened.

4.10.23 As this report was nearing publication, an amendment was circulated by Deputy Meerveld. His amendment proposes that a debate entitled *The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education* should exclude consideration of post-16 education.

4.10.24 In July, when Deputy Meerveld was the Vice-President of the Committee, the C*f*ESC stated: *"The preferred option for the 11 to 16 estate is strongly interlinked with the Committee's preferred model for post-16 education. Both elements will be contained in the policy letter to enable explanation and debate of the interdependencies at the same time…It is important that a debate about the future of post-16 provision in the Island should be had at this time…This needs to be a significant part of the debate…In terms of workforce planning, a decision on the future structure of post-16 education is required by the States now."*

4.10.25 The C*f*ESC policy letter presents the 11 to 16 and post-16 proposals as an integrated package. Paragraph 2.1 explains *"the purpose of this Policy letter"* and cites the need for the States *"in particular to debate how post-16 education should be provided"*. In paragraph 1.16 the C*f*ESC advise that *"a new staff transition plan bring[s] together staff appointments for both the secondary and post-16 phases into a single process."* Paragraph 3.84 states:

"Deciding between [the] options for the delivery of post-16 education is the next key policy decision that needs to be made by the States <u>before</u> the optimal structure of the education estate can be determined."

4.10.26 If Deputy Meerveld's amendment should be approved, the propositions, as amended, would then invite the States to spend tens of millions of pounds to build a new secondary school while closing the only 11 to 18 school in the States' sector – all before making any policy decisions about the future of post-16 studies. Deputy Meerveld has suggested the States could then decide to provide for sixth form studies on one of the three secondary school sites, but that would take the number of students at that school over (and possibly well over) the '600 to 1,000' range which the C*f*ESC insist should be established as States' policy.

4.10.27 What cannot be escaped is that at present, in terms of both the structure of education and the layout of the estate, post-16 studies and 11 to 16 studies are integrated. Decisions cannot coherently be made about one without decisions being made about the other.

4.10.28 Deputy Meerveld's amendment introduces the possibility of the Sixth Form Centre at les Varendes being left somewhat in limbo while the States decide what to do in relation to post-16 education and then execute that decision. The Sixth Form Centre would remain in its current status as a provider of A-levels and IB only but the 11 to 16 part of the school would be rapidly contracting before closing altogether. It is conceivable that 450 sixth formers or fewer could be left there isolated from any other students in a Sixth Form Centre which the C*f*ESC itself has advised *"would potentially be difficult to recruit to"*.

4.10.29 Deputy Meerveld's amendment envisages that the structure of post-16 education could be re-considered by the States in March 2019. However, it should be noted that the 11 to 16 phase of the C*f*ESC Model, which Deputy Meerveld is not seeking to amend, proposes committing the staff at the Sixth Form Centre to teaching Year 10 and 11 students at les Varendes until the

summer of 2023, which would seem rather to narrow options for reform in the post-16 sector until that date at least, which is more than five years away.

4.10.30 Of course Deputy Meerveld's amendment does not preclude the possibility of implementing the C*f*ESC's current post-16 proposals after another debate in 2019. This is unfortunate in view of their very obvious weaknesses, which most likely provoked the amendment in the first place.

4.10.31 The C*f*ESC had 18 months to prepare its post-16 proposals. They have been in the public domain for nearly six months. Deputies who disagree with the proposals have been afforded sufficient time to prepare alternatives. There are not very many different ways of providing post-16 education – they are set out on page 22 of the C*f*ESC Policy letter. The arguments for and against them have been well rehearsed. There are reports on the post-16 structure dating back to at least the late 1990s. It is difficult to see what is suddenly going to become known in the next year to enable the States to make a decision about post-16 education which they could not make now. The case for further deferral of the post-16 structure is weak to say the least.

4.11 **Reaction to C*f*ESC post-16 proposals**

4.11.1 Section five of the C*f*ESC's policy letter acknowledges there are serious concerns among educationalists working in the post-16 sector "*…with the view that the [CfESC] proposals just split learners in a different way to the current provision"*. It continues: "*Concern was raised about the staffing of the different establishments both in terms of attracting and retaining good quality staff and in avoiding duplication of provision…and the need for further evidence that a structure with a post-16 college and a training college would provide the best outcomes for all learners."*

4.11.2 States' Members who in recent weeks have met the leaders, teachers and lecturers who deliver post-16 education will know that the policy letter scarcely does justice to the depth of professional concern about even the viability, let alone the merits, of what the C*f*ESC is proposing. The C*f*ESC plans doubtless have some professional support in the post-16 sector, but the proposers of the Alternative Model feel able to state with absolute confidence that the overwhelming majority of professionals in the post-16 sector prefer the Alternative Model to the C*f*ESC proposals. There is a large body of professional opinion in the post-16 sector which fears that the C*f*ESC proposals may be almost unworkable.

4.11.3 This was emphasised by a ballot of local members of the University & College Union (UCU), which represents lecturers and support staff at the College of Further Education. The week before this ballot the C*f*ESC released its policy letter and the authors of the Alternative Model visited the College to set out their counter proposals. The result of the ballot could not have been more decisive: 97.7% were opposed to the C*f*ESC proposals and 79.1% indicated support for the Alternative Model.

4.11.4 The two most-recent Principals of the College of Further Education before the present incumbent have publicly criticised the C*f*ESC proposals. Ms Famili (Principal between 2014 and 2016) has indicated support for a tertiary college and Mr Wakefield (Vice-Principal between 2000 and 2003 and Principal between 2003 and 2013) supports the Alternative Model, as set out in a letter he wrote which was published, in which he stated:

"*The current plans outlined by the CfESC for post-16 education seem to be ill thought out and I suspect that they will be impossible to implement in an efficient manner. The plan to merge the current Sixth Form Centre with the full-time provision of the College of Further Education and then create a separate training*

college for part-time courses is, at best, clumsy, and could lead to huge problems in delivering education and training in the future.

"The teaching staff at the College are skilled and experienced in their own vocational areas and the efficiencies in the College are created by using these staff to teach both full-time and part-time courses. For instance, engineering staff can teach both full-time and part-time apprenticeship students in their workshops. The same applies for catering, health care, hairdressing, etc.

"In the current Sixth Form Centre, similar efficiencies are achieved by having staff who can teach GCSE and A-level courses. If you separate out the sixth form and full-time College students, these efficiencies disappear. Staff who are skilled and qualified at teaching A-levels or the International Baccalaureate would not have the skills and experience to teach vocational subjects, and vice versa. Those efficiencies and synergies will be destroyed by the CfESC plan…

"The Alternative Model would be a much more sensible model, maintaining the efficiencies in staffing which currently exist, and providing a broad curriculum for all post-16 learners…

"I believe that the Alternative Model will be the most cost-effective solution and will also be attractive to teachers wishing to work in Guernsey, unlike the CfESC plan. There is a misunderstanding that teachers are queuing up to come to work in Guernsey. My experience in recruiting staff for the College was that it is very difficult to attract teachers to the island. There were many occasions when posts were offered but, having considered the situation regarding the housing licence and the high cost of property, the candidate declined the offer. Implementation of the CfESC proposals would make the island even less attractive to potential teaching staff.

"11 to 18 schools work extremely well in the UK, achieving excellent results at both GCSE and A-level, and I can see no reason why such a system would not work well in Guernsey."

4.11.5 The C*f*ESC Policy letter states that the proposed training college will *"provide a flexible, business and skills-focused organisation that can offer work-based training and on-island higher education (degree level) options to the wider community…able to work responsively to address employers' needs to deliver the priorities of Guernsey's economic development."* However the island's largest industry representative group, the Chamber of Commerce, supports the Alternative Model and has called the C*f*ESC's proposals *"disastrous"* and *"fatally flawed"*. The Chamber released a statement which included the following:

4.11.6 *"The CfESC's preferred proposal will sign the death knell of the College of Further Education at a time when equipping youngsters with necessary skills on-island is seen as pivotal for the future of business here…*

"What students need, above all else, are the best possible teachers and lecturers. The best teachers and lecturers need a structure that allows career progression, local management and the age span and depth appropriate to their chosen subjects. That issue…presents a serious threat to recruitment and retention…

"Chamber believes that the Alternative Model to be considered by the States in January will ensure that the College of Further Education remains a viable and vibrant centre for young people to acquire the theoretical and practical skills needed. Voting for this proposal will also enable the College to enjoy some certainty about its future plans and begin organising its expansion and development…

"Chamber believes that the CfESC's plan to split vocational education across two institutions will prove disastrous for many students and industry as a whole. There is no question that if industry wants to properly work with their vocational students and for that to be effectively viable, they have to have the whole lot under one roof.

"Chamber feels that only the Alternative Model before the States in January will provide an opportunity for students to benefit from working with industry, will give them the best possible choices and scale as well as the ability to enable effective self-management. Having the university college in charge of its own future will allow the full incorporation of the benefits of industry involvement. We owe this to Guernsey's future workforce."

4.11.7 The 'shadow' board of governors of the College of Further Education support the Alternative Model and have been highly critical of the C*f*ESC proposals. Their advice is clear:

"The Board of Governors supports the Alternative Model for the following reasons:

- *While not all educational purists will fully agree with the detail, all teaching staff agree it is the only viable option for Guernsey;*
- *It is the only option that provides sufficient scale to maximise the opportunity for breadth of choice for students;*
- *The Alternative Model will allow recruitment of the best teaching staff in all categories;*

- *We believe that the complete segregation of 16 to 18 students, including A-level, IB and L1, L2 and L3 BTEC students in a school is both wrong and not scalable to Guernsey;*

- *It is the only option that allows Guernsey to provide the best of both academic and vocational expertise, and their myriad of differing benefits, to be optimised for students;*

- *It is the option that allows the broadest choice for all stakeholders without compromise. Stakeholders include: students, staff, parents and the States of Guernsey.*

"…we have looked at a number of other options that could work in a perfect and…much larger world…Guernsey cannot afford this much choice – nor has it the scale to provide everything for all stakeholders. Overall we believe the option that offers the best and broadest achievable choice is the Alternative Model."

4.11.8 The local representatives of the National Education Union said: *"…teaching staff at neither the Sixth Form Centre nor the College of Further Education had confidence in the CfESC proposals as offering the best model in the post-16 sphere"*.

4.11.9 The C*f*ESC has tended to dismiss such criticism of its post-16 proposals as self-interest. In October 2017 the C*f*ESC stated: *"The challenge we face is that [our proposals] represent a change from the current structure which most people are comfortable with and so in many cases are keen to resist regardless of whether educational outcomes could be improved by such a change."* This is unfortunate and perhaps indicates a rather dismissive approach towards educationalists in the post-16 sector.

5. Analysis of existing secondary school sites

5.1 Traffic and transport

5.1.1 The *Cf*ESC commissioned studies to assess the impact of the Alternative Model on traffic and transport at and around each of the four existing secondary school sites. Arup studied les Varendes, Baubigny and les Beaucamps and BuroHappold studied la Mare de Carteret. Though necessarily not exhaustive, in total the studies ran to well over 200 pages.

5.1.2 The studies allowed for no great change in the method of transport by which students would arrive at and depart from school in the future. They assumed a total number of students at each site (between 1,450 and 1,861) which was beyond the upper limit of the actual numbers projected. They were also based on traffic movements at peak morning time and assumed no variation in the times at which the various phases of the school/sites would start and finish. This is not to criticise but rather to emphasise that understandably the studies were based very much on a worst-case scenario. Arup recommended the adoption of travel plans for each of the two sites selected for use in the Alternative Model in order to reduce the number of unnecessary single occupancy car journeys made to and from the sites.

5.1.3 At les Beaucamps, anticipated traffic movements were assessed at three key junctions around the school and all of them were forecast to operate within capacity in all assessment scenarios. A recommendation was made to upgrade the footway on les Beaucamps, create a pedestrian connection between the school and the car park to the west for sixth form students and consider increasing the length of time for which special constables remain on traffic duty at peak times.

5.1.4 Adjustments would be necessary to the way space is managed in order to accommodate an estimated six additional school buses. This could be done without making physical changes to the site by 'double stacking' buses, i.e. parking them next to each other in two rows.

5.1.5 At les Varendes, anticipated traffic movements were assessed at three key junctions around the school. It was forecast that two of them would operate within capacity in all assessment scenarios and the third would operate within capacity as long as a nearby pedestrian crossing was called every other cycle rather than every cycle. Every other cycle was considered to be the most realistic scenario.

5.1.6 Greater use may need to be made of special constables at peak times. It was recommended that a footpath be installed along the southbound link between les Baissieres and Foote's Lane, for which there appears to be sufficient width but this would need to be confirmed. It was noted that currently the Foote's Lane car park is used predominantly by sixth formers and that in the Alternative Model there would be only half of them on this site and that this could provide additional space for parents in cars.

5.1.7 At Baubigny, anticipated traffic movements were assessed at four key junctions around the school. It was forecast that two of them would operate within capacity in all assessment scenarios. The other two would operate within capacity as long as nearby pedestrian crossings were called every other cycle rather than every cycle. Every other cycle was considered to be the most realistic scenario, but if the less realistic scenario came to pass it would be necessary to purchase, or negotiate the use of, a limited parcel of third-party land, in one case to re-route pedestrians and in the other case to re-route vehicles. States' officers raised concerns about the performance of the filter at Hougues Magues / Marette and it was recommended that this should be included in a traffic impact assessment as part of any planning application.

5.1.8 In relation to les Varendes, Baubigny and les Beaucamps, it was concluded that *"all three schools perform well in this analysis with les Varendes marginally scoring the highest"*.

5.1.9 Overall in relation to those three sites the C*f*ESC's advisors stated: *"The only potential 'showstopper' identified in this analysis is that all three schools would struggle to meet the demand for additional buses in their current configuration…only les Beaucamps can come close to accommodating [11] buses without additional land take…in all cases there appear to be greenfield or brownfield land available around the schools, however this would require purchase. Based on this initial assessment we conclude that there is little to choose in transport grounds between the three schools assessed."*

5.1.10 At la Mare de Carteret, it has long been recommended that the new school development proposed by the C*f*ESC should incorporate a new junction at Route de la Mare de Carteret. The Alternative Model would necessitate no additional work at this junction. The Rue du Galaad junction would be expected to operate satisfactorily, but it is recommended that at peak times a special constable should be present to guide buses in and out of the site or a physical island could be considered at the access to the site to guide vehicles out left only. No material issues were raised in relation to parking or the movement of buses on the site itself.

5.1.11 These reports do not allow a reliable conclusion to be drawn about which would be the best two sites for the Alternative Model in terms of transport.

5.2 Services

5.2.1 The C*f*ESC commissioned Buro Happold to carry out an assessment of the utilities infrastructure at each of the four sites. None of the conclusions in their report provided material concerns about the viability of the Alternative Model.

5.3 Selection of architects to assess sites

5.3.1 Originally the C*f*ESC advised that different firms of architects would be commissioned to study the feasibility of each of the four sites to accommodate the Alternative Model. The C*f*ESC then changed its mind and commissioned one firm of architects to study all four sites. The firm selected was Design Engine, the UK firm appointed as the architects for the C*f*ESC's proposed redevelopment at la Mare de Carteret.

5.3.2 The authors of the Alternative Model must draw attention to their concerns about the wisdom of the C*f*ESC's change of mind – in particular in relation to the study of les Varendes. The chronology of events is set out below.

<u>14th June 2017</u>

The C*f*ESC decides of its own volition to commission local architects Cresswell, Cuttle & Dyke (CCD) to assess the feasibility of les Varendes to accommodate:

- A post-16 college for up to 950 students; or
- An 11 to 18 school for 1,310 students (810 in the 11 to 16 phase; 500 in the 16 to 18 phase).

This is prior to the C*f*ESC publishing any proposals in relation to secondary and post-16 education.

<u>7th September</u>

The C*f*ESC and the authors of the Alternative Model hold their first meeting and discuss some of the work which may need to be carried out to understand the implications of two 11 to 18 schools or one 11 to 18 school on two sites.

13th September

The C*f*ESC advise CCD that they may be commissioned to conduct a further feasibility study on les Varendes as one of the schools/sites envisaged in the Alternative Model.

The C*f*ESC subsequently advise the authors of the Alternative Model that different firms of architects would be commissioned to study the feasibility of each of the four sites.

The C*f*ESC identifies CCD, who are already carrying out detailed assessments of les Varendes, as the architects who will assess les Varendes for use in the Alternative Model.

27th September

CCD submit their report which was commissioned by the C*f*ESC on the 14th of June. CCD advise that the second option above, i.e. an 11 to 18 school for 1,310 students, is feasible at les Varendes.

9th October

The C*f*ESC informs the authors of the Alternative Model that it has changed its mind in relation to which architects to commission. The C*f*ESC now wants to commission a single architectural practice to assess all four sites.

The C*f*ESC advises that it will no longer commission CCD to study the feasibility of les Varendes for use in the Alternative Model. Instead it will commission Design Engine to assess all four sites, including les Varendes.

Design Engine are the firm appointed as the architects for the C*f*ESC's proposed redevelopment at la Mare de Carteret. The C*f*ESC omit to stand down CCD.

3rd November

The authors of the Alternative Model learn for the first time (but not from the C*f*ESC) of the study of les Varendes carried out by CCD between June and September.

6th – 7th November

The authors of the Alternative Model learn that C*f*ESC has issued CCD with an instruction that their original study of les Varendes must not be provided to others, including the authors of the Alternative Model. This is not known by the Acting Chief Secretary of the C*f*ESC.

7th – 8th November

The authors of the Alternative Model ask the Acting Chief Secretary of the C*f*ESC to withdraw the instruction to CCD not to disclose their original study of les Varendes. The Acting Chief Secretary of the C*f*ESC agrees.

10th November

The authors of the Alternative Model receive a copy of CCD's original study of les Varendes. It is a detailed, room-by-room study running to the equivalent of 122 A4 sides.

In relation to the C*f*ESC's current proposal to use les Varendes for a post-16 college, CCD advise that the project is feasible with little alteration or extension required, but also advise that *"the excess space within the existing building means that it would not be efficiently utilised within this [proposal]"*.

In relation to the possibility of les Varendes accommodating 1,310 students as an 11 to 18 school, CCD advise that the project is *"feasible…within the existing building plus an extension"* and that *"there are a number of locations on the site where an extension could be located. These have various advantages and disadvantages and the optimum solution could be pursued once further information is available"*.

At this point the authors of the Alternative Model learn that when CCD were commissioned in June they were told to apply older building standards rather than the most recent standards which specify smaller rooms. CCD's report advises that *"application of the reduced space requirements would be likely to reduce the overall extension size required on les Varendes site"*.

The authors of the Alternative Model also receive the feasibility studies on all four sites carried out by Design Engine. These are high-level studies. In relation to les Varendes, the study runs to the equivalent of 24 sides of A4.

Design Engine's advice on les Varendes as a site for use in the Alternative Model is generally negative. They conclude that the site *"presents a number of challenges and risks, in particular the limited opportunity for extension options…on States-owned land"*.

Design Engine's advice on la Mare de Carteret as a site for use in the Alternative Model is generally positive. They conclude that *"it would be an obvious site for further development… [and] there would be great efficiencies in*

design and construction costs… [and] the building can be designed to all current codes and standards".

The C*f*ESC maintains that the CCD study is of no relevance to the Alternative Model because, although the number of students overall is very similar, the CCD study was for a scheme with more sixth formers and fewer 11 to 16 students. The authors of the Alternative Model believe that the CCD study is highly relevant to their proposals.

5.4 Assessment of sites

5.4.1 The C*f*ESC commissioned Design Engine to assess each of the four existing secondary school sites for use in the Alternative Model, both as the smaller site (i.e. nine forms per year plus sixth form) and the larger site (i.e. ten forms per year plus sixth form).

5.4.2 The assessments confirmed the viability of the Alternative Model. The existing secondary school estate is capable of accommodating the schools/sites proposed in the Alternative Model.

5.4.3 They advised that Baubigny was an obvious candidate for further development and that the current building and site provided good opportunities for additional accommodation to be added. Using Baubigny as one of the sites in the Alternative Model is not predicated on the relocation of le Murier School.

5.4.4 They advised that la Mare de Carteret was also an obvious candidate for further development and that developing a new school rather than extending an existing school would provide efficiencies in design and construction costs. Using la Mare de Carteret as one of the sites in the Alternative Model is not predicated on the relocation of la Mare de Carteret Primary School.

5.4.5 They were unenthusiastic about using les Varendes, primarily because of space constraints on the site and the challenges presented by carrying out extensions while the school continued to operate.

5.4.6 In reaching conclusions about space constraints the study assumed that the gross internal area required for a nine-form-entry 11 to 18 school at les Varendes would be 15,712m² and the gross external area would need to be 94,804m² (a ratio of 6m² of land for every 1m² of school building). At present the gross internal area of the Grammar School is 11,440m² and the net area of land on the site which is in the ownership of the States is 24,029m² (a ratio of 2.1m² of land for every 1m² of school building).

5.4.7 This illustrates an important point to bear in mind when considering the feasibility studies: in relation to outside space there are compromises made today on the existing secondary school sites and there will continue to be compromises irrespective of which model is approved by the States.

5.4.8 It should be noted that adjacent to the Grammar School site are playing fields of an area of 32,403m² which are owned by the Old Intermedians and used by the school; and to the east of the school site are other playing fields and sports facilities of a total area of 101,568m², some of which are owned by the Old Elizabethans and some of which are owned by the States.

5.4.9 The architects advised that les Beaucamps, as a recent development, was built to the latest education standards and therefore from a building perspective would be an obvious site for further development, but they also identified challenges due to the smaller area of land which is in States' ownership around the school. There is considerable undeveloped land bordering the school site and some of it would need to be acquired to make les Beaucamps suitable for use in the Alternative Model.

5.4.10 At present the gross internal area of les Beaucamps is 9,881m² and the net area of land on the site which is in the ownership of the States is 40,610m². It was assumed that the gross internal area required for a nine-form-entry 11 to 18 school at les Beaucamps would be 16,496m² including the swimming pool, an increase of 6,615m² on the present building, and the area of undeveloped land identified in the feasibility study which is not in the ownership of the States was 40,127m².

5.4.11 The latest school building bulletin identifies some spaces which may or may not be included on a school site. The brief issued by the C*f*ESC advised that in their study of the four sites the architects should generally include such spaces. The building bulletin also provides a minimum and maximum area for external spaces based on student numbers. The brief issued by the C*f*ESC advised that in their study of the four sites the architects should always use the maximum area for external spaces. This advice is not to be criticised. Indeed issuing such instructions could be considered prudent. It does emphasise, however, that the feasibility studies were necessarily high level and did not start from the premise of assuming a site would be used and then working out how best to use it, which was the approach CCD had the time to adopt in their study of les Varendes.

5.4.12 The brief issued by the C*f*ESC also slightly over-estimated the classroom space necessary for the 11 to 16 phase on the sites in the Alternative Model, thereby adding about 4% to the assumed size of a ten-form-entry 11 to 18 school. This relatively small variation pales into insignificance when one considers the substantial effect on space requirements of Guernsey's admirably generous policies in relation to class sizes, etc. A ten-form-entry 11 to 18 school in Guernsey might require several thousand square metres of building more than a school with an equivalent number of students in England.

5.4.13 Returning to the central issue, clearly two of the existing sites could be used in the Alternative Model; a third could be used with the acquisition of additional undeveloped land; and enough is known about the fourth to warrant further analysis. On the basis of the information currently available it would be irresponsible to make firm commitments to include or to exclude any of the four sites for use in the Alternative Model. The architects referred to their report as a high level feasibility study and noted that further work would be required to identify the two most appropriate sites for use in the Alternative Model. This work should be carried out as a matter of priority if the Alternative Model is approved by the States at their January meeting.

5.5 Estate changes – the historical context

5.5.1 Both models envisage substantial change to the Island's secondary schools' estate. The C*f*ESC Model would end secondary compulsory education at les Varendes and requires the development of a new 960-student school at la Mare de Carteret. The Alternative Model would end secondary compulsory education on two sites. It should be noted that change to the secondary schools' estate is nothing new.

5.5.2 In the past decade the States have closed one secondary school and two secondary school sites. In the 1980s the States merged two secondary schools, closing their existing sites and opening a new school elsewhere. A little over 30 years ago half of the current secondary schools' estate did not exist and a little over 40 years ago three-quarters of the current estate did not exist. In the grant-maintained sector, one of the colleges has relocated twice in the past 25 years.

5.5.3 Very few people would now argue that these changes should be reversed, or that they were not changes for the better overall, but the decisions which led to them were hard, unpopular in some quarters and required imagination and

courage from policymakers. Trying to preserve the estate in aspic now, out of fear of change, would hold back the development of education, much to the detriment of future generations of young people.

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

6. Financial considerations

6.1 Operating costs

6.1.1 Indications have been provided about the future annual operating costs of various options for organising secondary and post-16 education: the current system; the system now proposed by the C*f*ESC; a variation on the C*f*ESC proposals; and the Alternative Model. Inevitably the figures used in relation to the Alternative Model were based very largely on information provided by the C*f*ESC.

6.1.2 After taking into account the projected increase in the number of students, the annual operating cost of the current selective system, if maintained, is estimated to be £27.5million.

6.1.3 The annual operating cost of the proposed C*f*ESC Model, including three separate 11 to 16 schools and two separate post-16 institutions, is estimated to be £24.1million.

6.1.4 On the 17th of November 2017 the authors of the Alternative Model were advised that its annual operating cost was forecast to be £25.4million, i.e. £1.3million more than the proposed C*f*ESC Model. It was acknowledged that these figures required further analysis. Nonetheless on the 1st of December the C*f*ESC advised all deputies that the annual operating cost of the Alternative Model would be £1.2million more than the proposed C*f*ESC Model but £2.2million less than the current system in four secondary schools.

6.1.5 Then, on the 19th of December, following further analysis by the Treasury, officers advised that the annual operating cost of the Alternative Model was forecast to be around £400,000 more than the proposed C*f*ESC Model but £3million less than the current system.

6.1.6 It is worth noting that over the next 25 years the cumulative operating cost of secondary and post-16 education is forecast to be in the region of £600million (at today's prices).

6.1.7 In the mainstream sector, the C*f*ESC Model proposes five separate organisations on five sites: three 11 to 16 schools, a post-16 college and a training college. The Alternative Model proposes two separate organisations on three sites: one 11 to 18 school on two sites and the College of Further Education.

6.1.8 The table on the following page shows the forecast annual operating costs of the Alternative Model based on the analysis which it was possible to carry out by the 19th of December.

	Annual Running Costs £
School Costs	
Established Staff	1,625,693
PSE	649,127
Lunchtime Supervision	278,932
Supply Teachers	223,928
Teachers	11,801,532
Learning Support Assistants	496,179
Train & Dev Courses	81,136
ICT MFDs Print Copy	105,760
Property Fees	530,934
Utilities	502,587
Exam & Assess Fees	300,209
Exercise Books	649,540
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS	**17,245,557**
Central Costs	
Additional Estate Costs	-69,231
Additional Training Costs	-5,527
Additional ICT Costs	-4,605
ADDITIONAL CENTRAL COSTS	**-79,363**
SCHOOL REVENUE COSTS	**17,166,194**
CFE REVENUE COSTS	7,996,000
Rationalisation	-637,416
	7,358,584
SECONDARY AND POST 16 REVENUE COSTS	**24,524,778**

6.1.9 There are reasons to believe that more detailed analysis of operating costs will in due course show that the Alternative Model could obtain greater economies of scale than have been assumed thus far by the C*f*ESC and in practice prove less expensive and better value for money than the proposed C*f*ESC Model.

6.1.10 In 2016, when the States debated whether to maintain four secondary schools, and there were suggestions that having three schools instead would allow a reduction of around £2million a year as a result of adjustments to the pupil-teacher ratio, the then Education Department claimed that such suggestions were based on *"a cavalier approach to costings"*, but the current C*f*ESC policy letter identifies that moving from four schools to three would indeed realise a reduction of almost exactly £2million for the very reason suggested and dismissed two years ago.

6.1.11 In total the C*f*ESC now estimate that rationalising the number of secondary schools from four to three would save £3.4million a year in operating costs.

6.1.12 The authors of the Alternative Model do not for one moment suggest that any figures provided now or in the past represent anything other than a sincere assessment of future costs, but it is undoubtedly the case that States' education authorities in their various guises have consistently under-estimated the likely reduction in costs which could be obtained by rationalising the secondary education estate.

6.1.13 It is accepted by all parties that in relation to the 11 to 16 phase of education the Alternative Model would be less expensive annually than the C*f*ESC Model. In relation to the post-16 phase of education there is less certainty about future costs because the two models propose very different structures and both differ from the present structure too.

6.1.14 In the post-16 phase the C*f*ESC has assumed that annual operating costs would be lower in its proposed Model than they are currently. At present the Sixth Form Centre has one teacher for every ten students, but at a meeting held at the Education Office on the 1st of December 2017 it was advised that the post-16 college proposed by C*f*ESC would need 68 teachers for 850-900 students – or one teacher for every 12.5 to 13 students. Some professionals in the post-16 sector doubt the reliability of this modelling. The forecasts in relation to the Alternative Model assume no diminution in the number of teachers – indeed they assume a slight increase as a result of providing sixth form studies on two sites.

6.1.15 At the same meeting it was advised that the training college proposed by the C*f*ESC *"envisages a different mode of delivery in some areas"* to that provided currently by the College of Further Education, but in the further education sector there remain serious concerns about the viability of the proposed training college. The financial forecasts in relation to the Alternative Model have allowed only for limited efficiency or transformation savings at the College of Further Education beyond any cost reductions which the College anticipate making in the near future anyway.

6.1.16 This is an extract from a previous section of this report: *"The Alternative Model includes a firm and unambiguous commitment genuinely to devolve governance and leadership of both the 11 to 18 School and the College of Further Education…. [t]he devolution of governance, leadership and responsibility would inevitably lead to a material reduction in the size of the Education Office – some resources would be reallocated to schools and colleges and some would be saved altogether."* At present it is not possible to quantify what proportion of these resources would be reallocated and what proportion would be saved altogether and therefore none of the latter have been included in the financial forecasts in the Alternative Model, but they cetainly exist.

6.1.17 In both Models – the *Cf*ESC Model and the Alternative Model – the cost of maintaining premises has been estimated purely with reference to the total floor area of the schools and colleges. In the Alternative Model these floor areas are considered to be at the very least generous. In addition no allowance has been made for further economies of scale which may be obtained by moving to two sites.

6.2 Capital costs

6.2.1 There are essentially two ways of deciding how to organise secondary and post-16 education in the future. The first way is to afford priority to making the most economical use of the existing estate and to shape the education system accordingly. In the opinion of the authors of the Alternative Model this is largely what the *Cf*ESC is proposing to do. The second way is to afford priority to educational outcomes and arrange the estate accordingly. This is what the Alternative Model does. The first way – prioritising economical use of the existing estate – inevitably incurs less capital expenditure.

6.2.2 Therefore it is no surprise that capital costs would be greater in the Alternative Model than in the *Cf*ESC Model. This is largely because the *Cf*ESC Model would require substantial development at one existing secondary school site whereas the Alternative Model would require substantial development at two. The extent of the difference in capital costs is uncertain and disputed.

6.2.3 The *Cf*ESC has stated that its proposals for restructuring secondary and post-16 education would require capital expenditure of around £93million. About 55% of this figure relates to the 11 to 16 phase and about 45% relates to the post-16 phase. The latter should be treated with considerable caution because it includes the establishment of the proposed training college at les Ozouets, the role of which remains remarkably ill-defined and the viability of which is doubted by many professionals in the post-16 sector and in industry.

6.2.4 On the 6th of December the C*f*ESC publicly stated that the Alternative Model would require capital expenditure of not less than £93million to establish one 11 to 18 school on two sites. The figure released by the C*f*ESC in relation to the Alternative Model should be treated with extreme caution, for several reasons.

6.2.5 The figures were produced as a high level assessment of potential costs based on a high level feasibility study of sites which included space specifications which were at the very least generous and possibly quite extravagant.

6.2.6 The figures include nearly 1,000m² of sports hall space at both sites (at an estimated total cost of around £7million) which appears to be in addition to the extra requirements for sports hall space already included in the architects' high level feasibility studies.

6.2.7 In the C*f*ESC Model about 80% of the estimated capital costs have been subject to considerable value engineering. Inevitably in the Alternative Model there has been no value engineering because the capital projects which would be necessary have not yet been worked up in detail.

6.2.8 The figures also do not include the opportunity for property disposals which are exclusive to the Alternative Model, i.e. selling redundant secondary school sites. Indicative figures obtained from the Treasury suggest that such property disposals could raise between £6.3million and £10.3million.

6.2.9 Also on the 6th of December the C*f*ESC suggested that providing purpose-built facilities for the College of Further Education, as required in the Alternative Model, would cost £67million. However, just three weeks earlier, in its own policy letter, the C*f*ESC suggested that redevelopment of the College would cost £47million – almost a third less. This is an indication of how much weight can reliably be placed upon the many rather excitable claims made by the C*f*ESC in relation to the Alternative Model.

6.2.10 In the preceding section of this report it was stated: *"…further work would be required to identify the two most appropriate sites for use in the Alternative Model. This work should be carried out as a matter of priority if the Alternative Model is approved by the States at their January meeting."* Clearly this work would need to include a more detailed analysis of the estimated capital costs of the various options.

7. References

Below is a list of references where the source of information is not immediately clear in the text itself.

Paragraphs/Sections

3.2.1 – Initial proposals published by the C*f*ESC in July 2017

3.2.1 – Billet d'État X of 2015; page 1,094

3.2.7 – States' Resolutions of March 2016

3.2.9 – N.E.U. letter dated 20th of November 2017

3.3.3 – Question-and-answer booklet published by the C*f*ESC in November 2017

3.3.4 – Public statement issued by the C*f*ESC in November 2017

3.3.4 – UCL report commissioned by the Education Department in 2015

3.3.17 – States' Resolutions of March 2016

3.4.3 – Proposals of the Education Department in March 2016

3.5.1 – Review of Education Services in Guernsey; Denis Mulkerrin CBE; 2011/12

3.5.2 – Public statement issued by the C*f*ESC in July 2014

3.5.3 – C*f*ESC presentation in October 2017

3.7.5 – Current C*f*ESC propositions – P.2017/110

3.7.12 – Current C*f*ESC policy letter – attached to P.2017/110

3.8.8 – Question-and-answer booklet published by the C*f*ESC in November 2017

3.9.5 – Education Department response to Mulkerrin Review issued in March 2012

3.10.4 – UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

3.14.2 – States' Resolutions of March 2016

3.14 – Marshall, et al. – Survey of Character Education in Schools in England; 2017

3.14 – Lancet Psychiatry; October 2014

3.14 – Cross-age Peer Mentorship Programmes in Schools, UCLA

4.2.10 – Proposals of the Education Department in March 2016

4.3.1 – C*f*ESC public reply to letter from Deputy P J Roffey in October 2017

4.6.2 – Sixth Form Colleges Association: 2017 Key Facts and Figures

4.6.3 – Sixth Sense; published by the Sixth Form Colleges Association in 2012/13

4.6.3 – Figures obtained from the College of Further Education

4.6.7 – From the Margins to the Mainstream: Sixth Form Colleges, etc.; June 2015

4.6.10 – OFSTED inspection of In-comm; March 2017

4.6.10 – OFSTED inspection of Procat; November 2016

4.7 – HM Government post-16 skills plan; 2016

4.7 – The Report of the Independent Panel on Technical Education; 2016

4.8.2 – Proposals of the Education Department in March 2016

4.9.5 – UK Application Rates by the January Deadline – 2017; published by UCAS

4.9.6 – C*f*ESC presentation in October 2017

4.9.6 – UK Application Rates by the January Deadline – 2017; published by UCAS

4.9.7 – Snowblind: Sixth Form Colleges Performance Report; 2016

4.9.8 – Study presented to the British Educational Research Association

4.9.9 – Snowblind: Sixth Form Colleges Performance Report; 2016

4.10.2 – C*f*ESC public reply to letter from Deputy P J Roffey in October 2017

4.10.3 – Public statement issued by the C*f*ESC in November 2017

4.10.8 – CfESC e mail to deputies on the 19th of December 2017

4.10.8 – C*f*ESC public reply to letter from Deputy P J Roffey in October 2017

4.10.28 – Initial proposals published by the C*f*ESC in July 2017

4.11.4 – Open letter written by Ms Famili

4.11.4 – Open letter written by Mr Wakefield

4.11.5 – Public statement by the Chamber of Commerce; 2017

4.11.7 – Open letter written by the 'shadow' governors of the College; 2017

4.11.8 – N.E.U. letter dated 20th of November 2017

4.11.9 – C*f*ESC public reply to letter from Deputy P J Roffey in October 2017

5 – Studies commissioned by the C*f*ESC and circulated to deputies

6.1.8 – Minister, Education Department in March 2016