



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 5th September 2019

*All published Official Reports can be found on the
official States of Guernsey website www.gov.gg*

Volume 8, No. 23

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

St Peter Port South

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

St Peter Port North

Deputies J. A. B. Gollop, C. N. K. Parkinson, L. C. Queripel,
M. K. Le Clerc

St Sampson

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

The Vale

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

The Castel

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

The West

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

The South-East

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and A. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

J. Torode, (Her Majesty's Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur); M. P. Leadbeater (*relevé à 10h 17*) J. P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 10h 17*), A. H. Brouard (*relevé à 10h 17*); J. I. Mooney (*indisposé*).

Business transacted

Evocation	1849
Billet d'État XVI.....	1849
V. Committee for Education, Sport & Culture – Transforming Education Programme & Putting into effect the Policy Decisions made by the States in 2018 – Debate commenced	1849
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.31 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>1890</i>
Transforming Education Programme & Putting into effect the Policy Decisions made by the States in 2018 – Debate continued – Amendment 2 carried; amendment 3 lost; debate adjourned.....	1891
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 6.06 p.m.</i>	<i>1937</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État XVI

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

V. Committee for Education, Sport & Culture – Transforming Education Programme & Putting into effect the Policy Decisions made by the States in 2018 – Debate commenced

Article V.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled Transforming Education Programme & Putting Into Effect the Policy Decisions Made by the States in 2018, dated 5th July, 2019, of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, they are of the opinion:

- 1. To note that the capital costs of the policy of organising secondary education in one 11-18 school operating in two colleges, which was agreed by the States on the 19th of January 2018, will be up to a maximum of £69 million; and to delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure, subject to the submission of appropriate business cases by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, of up to £69 million, which may be drawn down over a period of five years from 2019, for the capital development of the 11-18 school and colleges on the sites of the current Les Beaucamps High School and St Sampson's High School as part of the Transforming Education Programme.*
- 2. To note that the capital costs of the policy of organising further and higher education in purpose-built facilities on a single site, which was agreed by the States on the 19th of January 2018, will be up to a maximum of £47.5 million; and to delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure, subject to the submission of appropriate business cases by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, of up to £47.5 million, which may be drawn down over a period of three years from 2021, for the capital development of The Guernsey Institute at Les Ozouets as part of the Transforming Education Programme.*
- 3. To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure, subject to the submission of appropriate business cases by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, of up to £8.6 million on the transition and transformation costs which are necessary between 2019 and 2024 to establish the 11-18 school and colleges and The Guernsey Institute and to put into effect the policies relating to the future model of secondary, further and higher education which were agreed by the States on the 19th of January 2018; and to note that the maximum sum of*

£8.6 million is expected to be allotted annually as follows: 2019 £1.0 million, 2020 £2.1 million, 2021 £2.0 million, 2022 £2.5 million and 2023 £1.0 million.

4. To note that the capital costs of redeveloping La Mare de Carteret Primary School will be in the range of £13.4 million to £22.4 million; and to delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure, subject to the submission of appropriate business cases by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, of up to £22.4 million, which may be drawn down over a period of two years from 2022, for the capital redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Primary School as part of the Transforming Education Programme; and to note that the business cases associated with this project will include the results of a review of capacity in the primary phase across the Island.

5. To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure, subject to the submission of appropriate business cases by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, of up to £5.8 million on the Digital Road Map, which is intended significantly to improve digital services across the education estate as part of the Transforming Education Programme.

6. a) To note that the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture considers that there is merit in rationalising the number of campuses from which the College of Further Education is operating by relocating provision from the Delancey Campus to the Les Ozouets Campus; and to agree that the Committee will work with the Committee for Health & Social Care and the States' Trading Supervisory Board to establish as expeditiously as possible the feasibility of using the Delancey Campus for a range of health, care and community services provided under the auspices of the Committee for Health & Social Care;

b) To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure, subject to the submission of appropriate business cases by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, of up to £4 million for additional capital developments at each of the 11-18 colleges to accommodate services to children and their families which would benefit from working in closer partnership with the school and colleges;

c) To agree that the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, the Committee for Health & Social Care and the States' Trading Supervisory Board shall jointly investigate the merits and feasibility of the site at Les Varendes which currently accommodates the Grammar School & Sixth Form Centre, or other sites in the ownership of the States which the Board wishes to include in such investigations, accommodating in the future a range of health, care and community services, commissions and other bodies which provide services on behalf of the States; and to direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and the Committee for Health & Social Care to return to the States with their conclusions and any propositions they consider necessary well in advance of the time when secondary education will cease to be provided at Les Varendes.

The Greffier: Billet d'État XVI, Article V, Committee for Education, Sport & Culture – Transforming Education Programme & Putting into effect the Policy Decisions made by the States in 2018.

5 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize, the President of the Committee, will open debate.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

10 The policy letter that is before the States is essentially about capital investment in schools and colleges which is one element, an important element, but one element only of the substantial package of reforms to education which were agreed by the States last year.

15 Of course the strategic policy decisions have already been made by the States over a period of several years. In 2016 the previous States directed that selection at 11 via the 11-plus should be discontinued with effect from September of this year, and after the General Election of the same year the present States confirmed the direction to discontinue selection at 11 and therefore that has happened.

Last year by a two-thirds majority the States directed that as soon as possible secondary education should be provided in two 11-18 colleges operating as a single school and that further an on-Island higher education provider should be brought together at long last in purpose-built facilities. The Introduction of this new model of education is already well underway because that is what the States directed.

Yesterday Year Seven students started secondary school in a non-selective year group and importantly they have been allocated to schools as part of a transition model specifically designed to move to two 11-18 colleges over the next four years.

So the question today as much as any other question is this: having made the strategic policy decisions they did in 2016 and 2018 are the States able – and I use the word ‘able’ advisedly – to see through on the capital investment and the practical changes necessary to put into effect their own strategic policy decisions? Or are the States going to reject this policy letter, or vote for Sursis or amendments which in all practical senses will have the same practical effect as rejecting this policy letter and thus set aside all those strategic policy decisions of recent years, and instead return to the drawing board crucially with absolutely no clear idea of where to go next?

None of the alternatives which will be presented to the States today offer anything new. They simply seek to take the States back several years to spend, some would say waste, more time examining other models which have already been extensively examined by successive committees and which in every instance have been clearly rejected by the States.

The model agreed overwhelmingly by the States last year, the introduction of which is already under way because of the direction of the States, is the only model which over several years of debate has been capable of securing majority support of the States.

What has changed since the States voted for this model last year? Well, the proposed capital costs though of course still considerable are tens of millions of pounds below what the States were told they would be when they voted for it. The annual running costs of the model will be lower than they would be without these reforms to the same value of which the States were advised when they voted for it, albeit we are proposing to reinvest a portion of the savings back into improving educational opportunities. Most importantly, the policy letter explains how the new model is able to deliver not only the educational and extracurricular benefits which were outlined last year but more benefits besides.

So it is clear that when the States, by a two to one majority, have already agreed the future structure and when no serious attempt has been made over the past 18 months to reverse that policy decision, and when the costs are lower than projected and the opportunities and benefits to our young people are, if anything, greater than originally indicated there is no case today to delay, or reject, or wreck these proposals when there is nothing else new on the table and no clear idea of where to go instead.

Sir, Proposition 1 relates to the construction cost of developing the two 11-18 colleges at Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's. The proposed construction cost is a maximum of £69 million. This compares to advice provided to the States when they agreed the model last year that the capital cost of two 11-18 colleges would be between £90 and £135 million.

St Sampson's and Les Beaucamps are the best sites to use. They house the Island's two most recently built and modern school buildings. During the construction period there will be no requirement for additional temporary accommodation beyond that used in secondary schools currently because the existing buildings will remain unusable without unreasonable disruption to students and staff.

The combination of the St Sampson's and les Beaucamps sites is well suited to the geographical distribution of the school population and it is also the least expensive combination in terms of capital costs.

Using the La Mare de Carteret site would add significantly to the capital cost; for example, using it together with the St Sampson's site would cost around £30 million more than the sites selected by the Committee and it would mean more students remaining in unsatisfactory school facilities for longer than necessary, which clearly should be avoided.

The Grammar School building is surrounded by land not in the ownership of the States. Professional property advice is that the building requires around £20 million of refurbishment and students may need to move to a different site while the works are carried out. This mean that using Les Varendes would be more expensive and cause more disruption to a greater number of students than using the sites selected by the Committee.

Sir, it is 10 years since an Education Committee secured States' approval for a major capital project, since then some proposed school redevelopments have foundered on Education Committees proposing abundant space standards which the States considered unjustifiable and simply would not support. This may have felt like glorious defeat to the committees and their officers at the time but the effect on many students has been to leave them in substandard facilities for far too long.

This time the Committee has taken a different approach agreeing baseline space standards with the Policy & Resources Committee after jointly commissioning independent reviews and then item by item identifying necessary additions – to the baseline. These additions include communication and autism bases on both sites, significant improvements in sports facilities on both sites, purchase of a parcel of land adjacent to Les Beaucamps, and allowances for necessary infrastructure improvements at and around the sites. This is the process that leads to the request for a maximum of £69 million.

Although the Scrutiny Management Committee has asserted that the proposed space standards at the 11-18 colleges are, quote:

... raw volume-based building estimates ...

– there are in fact detailed floor plans showing room-by-room use which have been available for public inspection at multiple events hosted by the Committee.

Last week, one Deputy wrote an open letter criticising the space standards based on a calculation of land per student across the Education estate. This demonstrated a serious lack of understanding about the way schools operate and a fixation on elements which are largely irrelevant to students' experiences and outcomes. The analysis assumes that the quality of facilities to which students have access is largely irrelevant and that instead we should maximise the number of square metres across the schools regardless of how frequently the space is used and regardless of gross inequality of space between sites.

Deputy Meerveld: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: The letter I wrote actually asked for the educational benefits of operating in reduced space over what could be available. So the educational differences, how it would actually benefit students to operate in the smaller areas proposed by Committee versus what we have now in four schools or what could have been provided under three schools.

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Fallaize: Land per student is a meaningless measure. If it was relevant the College of further Education spread across three sites with large amounts of land at Les Ozouets would be the jewel in the crown of the education estate. Instead, the space utilisation in parts is as low as 8% and urgent investment is required.

What matters from a space perspective is the number of students allocated to the space at any one time. Currently there are some facilities across schools used very infrequently. In the future existing and new high quality facilities serving a greater number of students in each college will allow space to be used more efficiently, thus ensuring that more resources can be invested in factors which do make a real difference to students' experiences and outcomes.

There has been criticism of PE and sports facilities at the new colleges. This fails to understand that the difference between the existing model and the new model is not the number of students taking part in PE simultaneously it is the proportion of time the facilities sit unused. Students will experience no more crowded facilities and changing rooms than they do today.

Improved facilities at both colleges will broaden the range of sports which can be carried out on site. For example, unlike today, all students will have access to 25-metre indoor pools and extended multi-use games areas with vastly improved 3G surfaces. Students will still travel to use sports facilities off site, but the requirement to do so will be lower than the current travel requirements across the four schools. I am not going to give way at the moment but I will later on.

There has been criticism of space for lunch facilities. At both colleges, half the students will have lunch at any one time and this is similar to the current number of students at St Sampson's and the number for which Les Beaucamps was designed. On the St Sampson's site where the existing space for lunch is smaller there will be an extension to the refectory and so at any one time the same number of students as now will have lunch but in a larger area. At Les Beaucamps there is already space to accommodate lunch arrangements.

There has been criticism of space for school halls. The school leadership team does not consider large halls for whole school assemblies which then sit idle for much of the rest of the time to be an efficient use of space. The addition at both colleges of presentation suites with tiered seating will allow year groups or key stage assemblies or other presentations to take place and use them as required. All students who sit exams simultaneously in the future will be able to do so comfortably within the space at their college.

I will give way to Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I appreciate Deputy Fallaize giving way.

It is just while he was talking about the recreational space and PE space. We have had quite a comprehensive letter from a current PE teacher – I am sure Deputy Fallaize is aware of it. Do you feel you have addressed the concerns raised in that letter or are you going to go on to address the concerns that were raised in that letter we received from that PE teacher?

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Fallaize: Well, the Committee responded to those concerns in a letter which was circulated to all States' Members. Now, it was quite a lengthy letter and to draw information out of it now would extend my speech even longer than the States are going to be prepared to tolerate. So I am not going to run through that information. If Deputy Queripel wants to raise that in general debate I am happy to deal with that when I close.

But the essentials around PE and sports facilities in any event are that there will be additional, improved facilities compared to the present time. All of the students will have access to better facilities than some of the students have ever had access to across the four sites, and all of the modelling demonstrates that the space that is set out is capable of accommodating the number of students on site. But there was quite a lot more detail in that letter of response.

Sir, there will be no change to the existing class size policy in the new model or during the transition period. Tutor groups will be smaller in the new colleges than they are on average at present with an average of 14 or 15 students in each group.

It has been claimed that there will be no staff rooms in the new colleges. This is untrue. At the St Sampson's site it will be moved to a more central location, but there will still be one. In addition there will be a number of new staff bases for departments or faculties and this is in line with the preferences expressed by staff in consultation surveys.

It has been claimed that the move to the new model has resulted in more and more teachers leaving their jobs in States' schools. In fact staff turnover for the year to date is fractionally below staff turnover in 2015-16 and identical to staff turnover in 2016-17.

Sir, finally while I am dealing with apparently widely held myths one more, which admittedly is personal to me, my children are *not* educated privately, they are educated in States' schools – one in a high school and one in a primary school who will be in a high school or an 11-18 college in two years' time. They will live with these reforms including through the transition period.

Sir, although the Propositions are about capital investment the Committee recognises that there is significant public and political interest in how in particular the 11-18 part of the new model will operate, and the policy letter therefore goes into quite some detail about that and I will refer to some of that now, acknowledging that a lot of what I am about to say is as the result of decisions made at school leadership level rather than Committee level and is not directly incorporated in the Propositions even if it is in the policy letter.

The school will meet the individual needs of all of its students including those designated with special educational needs and disabilities. This has been factored into the design of the two new colleges ensuring access for all users. Inclusivity will be at the heart of the school and the school will aim to maximise progress and participation for all and importantly to narrow existing attainment gaps between students with SEND and their peers.

At both colleges there will be a base for students who have difficulties with communication, language and social interaction including autism. Considerably more space has been allocated to this provision than at present and in previous school building plans. Specialist staff are involved in the design and resourcing of the bases and broader stakeholder engagement will follow in due course.

In addition to the communication and autism support bases, significant space within the main part of both colleges has been allocated to provide support for students with SEND. This area will be approximately equivalent to the area covered by four classrooms, substantially more space than would be allocated in most schools of this size and is allocated across the estate at present. This area will encompass spaces for small groups and one-to-one interventions, and will provide a safe and welcoming area within the school; for example, for students with heightened anxiety.

The sixth form will offer A-levels on both sites and IB programmes on one site. In each college the sixth form will be in line with or slightly larger than the average size of sixth forms in England. The Committee intends to provide at least the same number of options as are currently available at Key Stage 5 including A-levels, the IB Diploma Programme and IB certificates, and will also introduce the IB Career-related Programme in conjunction with the Guernsey Institute. This will allow students to combine a vocational technical qualification studied at the Guernsey Institute with relevant IB courses studies in the sixth form. This will increase the range of possibilities open to students at 16 but in a more coherent way than the *ad-hoc* mix-and-match courses suggested previously.

Modelling carried out prior to the publication of what was then called the alternative model published in December 2017, which remains valid today, indicated that 95% of students would be able to take their first preference subjects which is as good as the offer in the current Sixth Form Centre. Approximately 10% will be required to move site in order to accommodate their first choice options either on a subject basis or, if they wish, permanently.

There are elements of the reforms which will be of benefit to St Anne's school in Alderney and which have been developed partly with this in mind. For example, using technology to create immersive classrooms may provide opportunities to broaden the curriculum options available to St Anne's in Key Stage 4 and may allow more flexibility for Alderney students studying post-16 programmes.

The larger size of the colleges in Guernsey will mean there is greater flexibility and resilience in staffing and it will therefore be more feasible to provide staff support to St Anne's. The new school will be keen to work closely with St Anne's on curriculum development, sharing of resources and training and development opportunities, and they will be invited to competitions and events organised by the school wherever possible.

The improvements envisaged in the digital roadmap, which I will refer to in a little more detail later, have the potential to be of particular benefit to St Anne's. Improvements in connectivity and

220 more reliable access to online teaching resources will support learning in the school, helping to overcome the difficulties presented by a relatively small teaching staff and the relative inaccessibility of some physical resources which other schools take for granted.

225 Sir, I want to say something about equality of opportunity which lies at the heart of these reforms and proposals. At present the large difference in size between schools means that staffing in the schools also varies significantly, and this in turn affects the schools offer to its students both in curricular and extracurricular terms. For example some, students today are able to take two GCSEs in modern foreign languages from a choice of three, while others can take only one. Some students are able to take triple science, some only combined science, and others are able to select only one or two of the sciences. The GCSE and equivalent options available differ from school to school. ICT is compulsory in some schools and not in others. Different subjects are allocated different amounts of time per week school to school.

230 Therefore inequality of opportunity is built into our current model of education. I am not talking about the issue of selection I am talking about high schools with otherwise identical profiles of students where there are enormous differences as a result of the size differences between schools. So therefore students have markedly different opportunities based on nothing more than where in the Island they live, particularly in a non-selective model. In the opinion of the committee this is unjust and unacceptable.

235 The relatively small size of the existing secondary schools places pressure on staff resources. In some cases specialist subjects have been temporarily removed for certain year groups in the past because there are no specialist staff available to teach them. It can be challenging to find staff willing to take on temporary contracts in the Bailiwick to cover absences such as parental leave. When this happens, head teachers are forced to choose between compromising quality of provisions or breadth of curriculum offer. The subject offer at Key Stage 4 differs across schools, and even where the same subjects are offered the qualifications may differ.

240 The move to one school comprising two colleges of more or less equal size and a larger number of students will allow better and more equal opportunities for students irrespective of their social background and irrespective of where in the Island they live. The new model will have greater resilience when staff are absent or leave due to the increased number of specialist teachers available in each subject at each college. It will allow a broader and more robust curriculum model as a result of the higher number of teaching staff at each college.

245 The opportunities available to students will be enhanced by new arrangements for enrichment. This will help to promote physical activities and mental and physical health and will contribute to equality of opportunity regardless of family support, home circumstances or reliance on school transport. Currently students who are reliant on school buses or whose parents or carers through no fault of their own cannot provide the necessary support are unable often to access after-school activities.

250 The standard of accommodation and facilities also varies greatly from school to school and this inevitably has a corresponding impact on equality of opportunity. An example of this is the provision of multi-use games areas which allow all-weather access to games facilities by more sports. Students at La Mare de Carteret High School have no such facility. Students at Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's High Schools have access to indoor swimming pools whereas students at the Grammar School and La Mare de Carteret High School do not.

255 The new model of secondary education will remove almost all of these inequalities, providing all students with facilities of high quality which support an individual's development in the widest sense.

260 Quality of teaching is the single factor which has the greatest impact on student outcomes. Recruiting and retaining high-quality teachers is therefore crucial to achieving excellence for all. Whilst sixth form provision is currently restricted to just one of the four secondary schools the new model provides opportunities for a greater proportion of teachers to teach across the full age range from 11-18, which we know is a key factor in the recruitment and retention of a significant

270

proportion of staff and prospective staff. This will broaden the pool of teachers who are interested in working in Guernsey.

So, in summary, in the one 11-18 school two-colleges model all students at the colleges will benefit from: a high-quality learning environment with modern purpose built facilities; excellent facilities for PE and sport including indoor swimming pools and brand new extended multi-use games areas with vastly improved 3G synthetic turf surfaces; a broader range of combinations of subject choices and therefore greater likelihood of students being able to study their first choice combination of subjects at GCSE; smaller tutor groups than the current average creating opportunities to strengthen pastoral support while retaining current average class size policy; the opportunity for a greater number of students to continue into the sixth form on the same site; the ability of the school to recruit from a wider pool of teachers and a reduction in the need for teachers to teach outside their specialisms or preferred subjects; the proposed enrichment programme; the new opportunity to follow International Baccalaureate careers-related programmes; better support for individual needs with significantly more space allocated to students with additional needs, including the communication and autism bases; new performance measures which, unlike the present measures, incentivise improving results for every student across a broader range of subject areas; and the introduction of feeder primary schools to replace catchment areas which allows for transfer to secondary school with friends and strengthens relationships between the secondary colleges and their feeder primary schools.

While there is much to celebrate about educational performance in the Bailiwick, there is certainly room for improvement. The Bailiwick's performance in GCSE results has been unfavourable when compared to parts of England with similar economic, social and demographic conditions. Since 2017, direct comparisons have become impossible because England has moved to new performance measures as a result of grave concerns about the unintended consequences of the old measure of five A* to C grades including English and Maths, especially the incentive to focus resources disproportionately on C/D borderline students. Whereas Guernsey has retained this highly flawed and outdated measure.

The Committee has outlined a timetable of reforms which will gradually move the Bailiwick towards the new performance measure known as Attainment 8. This new measure will remove the distortion of the C/D borderline because the outcomes of all students at all grades contribute equally to a school's overall performance measure. This is critical in ensuring the appropriate allocation of resources for students at all ability levels.

In addition, the measure for each individual student is spread across eight rather than five subjects. These new measures are aligned to the Committee's vision of opportunity and excellence for all and will once again allow relevant comparisons to be drawn with our largest mainland neighbour.

It is likely that the ongoing development of the curriculum will continue to be a key priority for some time. The first iteration of the curriculum going back to 2017 was very largely focused on skills and there is a pressing need to add key content and knowledge alongside skills. There is much evidence collected internationally that a solely or largely skills-based approach leads to declining standards and outcomes. It inevitably and sometimes unnecessarily adds to a teacher's workload and research about how children learn supports an approach which recognises the importance of skills and knowledge. This is not fully where we are at the present time and we require reform.

For example, evidence shows that skills such as critical thinking are subject specific and dependent on background knowledge. We cannot think critically about subjects of which we know next to nothing. *(Interjection and laughter)* Students are best able to think critically when they are able to make connections between new information and prior knowledge. For students to be able to make connections between different topics the curriculum must be carefully sequenced.

International evidence suggests that when content is loosely defined or not defined, as is the case when a curriculum is largely skills based, there is a decline in overall standards and critically

an increase in inequality of outcomes between students from more and less privileged backgrounds. This would be unacceptable educationally, socially, economically and morally.

325 The development of the curriculum will aim to retain its existing benefits including the focus on wider outcomes and involvement of teachers, whilst learning lessons from and avoiding the mistakes of jurisdictions which have experiences of similar curricular, such as Scotland, where standards have predictably been in decline in recent years.

330 Sir, Proposition 2 relates to the construction cost of developing the Guernsey Institute at Les Ozouets. The proposed construction cost is a maximum of £47.5 million. This compares to advice provided to the States when they agreed the model last year that the capital costs of a purpose-built College of Further Education would be up to £67 million, and that was without the GTA and without the Institute of Health & Social Care Studies which are included in the proposed cost of the Guernsey Institute.

335 The external independent adviser's words about the current facilities in use by the College of Further Education should resonate loudly in this Assembly today. They said, quote:

They are some of the least fit for purpose, most dispersed and uninspiring further education spaces that we have seen [*in the sector*]....

They said the quality of almost all the specialist teaching spaces, quote:

... fall far short of those on the new school sites and accordingly they communicate an impression that technical and vocational education is second class. In our view this together with the extent of fabric issues make the case for investment in new and replacement facilities indisputable.

340 Colleagues will recall the extraordinarily negative reaction to the previous three school model proposals which divided further education into separate providers. On that occasion the University and College Union balloted college lecturers – that is a union which ballots its members before expressing their views – and 99% of the college lecturers expressed no confidence in these proposals. This week the UCU has written to Deputies to express its full support for the current proposals and its dismay at any prospect of further delay in putting them into effect, or of the previous unworkable model being revisited.

345 The new model agreed by the States last year is the only model presented to the States in recent years which can command the confidence of post-16 educationalists.

350 Further education has been perceived by too many for too long as the Cinderella part of education not least being forced to operate from wholly inadequate and in some cases dilapidated facilities. This alone is a strong case for the investment in Proposition 2, but in addition further education professionals are excited by the opportunities and benefits of the new integrated model of the Guernsey Institute and these can be realised only by voting for Proposition 2.

355 The case for bringing together the College of Further Education, the Institute and the GTA rests essentially on two advantages: first, in an Island of this size with a relatively small student population it makes no educational, financial or logistical sense to separate three small providers which offer at least some crossover in provision. They will be stronger and more resilient together than apart. Students will benefit from clearer pathways across all of further and higher education.

360 Second, obtaining legitimate university college status rather than just declaring it unilaterally will not be easy, but it would be practically impossible in the case of any of the three providers operating alone, whereas it becomes a reasonable ambition for an organisation which integrates them as the Guernsey Institute has from 1st July this year.

365 Proposition 3 relates to transition and transformation costs which are necessary in addition to construction costs, as part of moving to the new model of education over the next few years. By far the biggest contributor to this budget is additional cost in schools to maintain curriculum breadth, pastoral support and the required number of teachers, as some schools become temporarily smaller in the transition period. This investment is critical to deliver the reforms without detriment to students who are at school during the transition period.

Proposition 4 relates to the construction costs of the essential and long overdue redevelopment of the La Mare de Carteret Primary School. There is a separate amendment expected to this Proposition, which the Committee will oppose, but which in any event will provoke a discrete debate on that proposal and so now I will confine myself to saying only this.

The Proposition is in this policy letter because after extensive consideration of all relevant factors the Committee concluded that whatever the shape of primary provision in the future there needs to be a primary school at the La Mare de Carteret site. That being so, there is a need to get on with completely redeveloping it, because the present school is long past its anticipated lifespan and is in a very poor state of repair. This is the conclusion not just of this Committee but of the past four Education Committees. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) And it makes sense to manage all major Education capital projects in the same capital development programme which is the subject of this policy letter. I will say more about that Proposition when the amendment is debated.

Proposition 5 relates to the need to invest in digital infrastructure and services across Education. There are examples across schools of effective use being made of IT to support teaching and learning. Too often, however, teachers have been insufficiently supported in using IT effectively and the unreliability of much of the technology, for example Wi-Fi black spots and poor connectivity remains a common complaint amongst teachers and students. Additionally much of the equipment provided to schools is reaching, or in some cases has gone past, the end of its useful life.

The previous Committee deserves credit for commissioning the digital roadmap as a starting point for trying to put right these problems and invest in the necessary facilities.

The digital roadmap is aligned with the Future Digital Services programme which was approved by the States recently. There is some provision in the Future Digital Services budget for replacement of equipment on a like-for-like basis but this would be inadequate to realise the objectives of the digital roadmap which has now spanned successive committees. Without additional investment the opportunity will be lost to make a step change in how schools use IT to the benefit of their students, and that is the reason for Proposition 5.

Parts of Proposition 6 will also be debated separately when another amendment is laid by Deputy St Pier. Proposition 6b), however, will not, and I want to say a few words about the important advantages which will be secured through the investment proposed in Proposition 6b) which is about the co-location of Health and Care and Education services and facilities on the sites of the two 11-18 colleges.

This will make it far easier for students and their families to access key professional support and advice. Less time will be lost to education in attending appointments during school time and there will be opportunities for much closer multi-agency working. The proposed developments of the 11-18 sites allow space for a range of professionals to work in this purpose-built environment which is likely to include Children & Adolescent Mental Health Services, social workers and educational psychologists, and provide clinical rooms potentially for use by school nurses, school dentists and physiotherapists.

Sir, before concluding I want to make some brief comments about two further issues which were raised in the Scrutiny Management Committee letter of comment. The letter of comment is critical of the Committee for requesting States' approvals at programme business case stage. I fully acknowledge that the Scrutiny Management Committee has consistent reservations about the model which is now being used by the States for developing and approving capital funding requests. However, the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture has little choice, like all other Committees, but to apply itself to this model. This is as true of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture as it was for the Committee *for* Health & Social Care when it recently made capital funding requests for tens of millions of pounds in relation to hospital modernisation. The approvals process used thus far and proposed in these Propositions is exactly the same as that used by the Committee *for* Health & Social Care and the States approved that programme almost unanimously after relatively little debate.

420 The Committee *for* Health & Social Care policy letter and programme business cases contain no greater level of detail than the current Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture policy letter and programme business case. Now this is in no way a criticism of Health & Social Care, that Committee applied itself to the approvals process now used by the States, my Committee has simply done the same thing. When the States considered the previous Education capital proposals
425 no business case was presented at all. My Committee is not asking to be treated any differently to any other States' committee it is simply asking to be held to the same standards and expectations when considering capital proposals.

Secondly, annual revenue savings. The Committee has spent considerable time establishing the revenue costs of the new model agreed by the States last year, working in conjunction with the
430 States' project finance team which was the same team which calculated the revenue savings associated with previous education capital proposals. The new model will be substantially less costly than if no changes were made to the existing model. The Committee will reinvest some of the baseline savings in improvements to the quality and range of education but the net revenue savings will be around £2 million per years. That is to say, the new model of education will be
435 around £2 million less expensive annually than if no changes are made.

These figures are based on conservative assumptions and it is quite possible that further savings will be achievable when the model is fully in operation.

Sir, of course education is always a contentious area of public policy. Understandably and rightly it is a matter of the greatest importance to most of us in the Island and perhaps most
440 especially to those of us who are ourselves parents of young children, or grandparents. There is no model of education capable of obtaining the support and approval of all parents and of all teachers and of our whole community: not selection, not non-selection, not four schools, or three schools, or two schools, or one school in two colleges, or any other number. Any model, going back to the old model, the current temporary transition model, this model, a different non-
445 selective model – they will all have their supporters and their detractors, and their detractors will always speak loudest and more frequently because it is human nature to be more animated by what you do not want than by what you do want.

So any and every model will face some kind of campaign of opposition but, sir, I make this prediction: the opposition to the model agreed by the States, by a majority of two to one last
450 year, and indeed the opposition to any other model in place previously, or proposed previously by the States, will pale into insignificance compared to the despair there will be if after years and years of debate the States, as the Island's Government, vote against these proposals. But not simply vote against them, but vote against them without having the slightest idea or any consensus about how education should be organised in the future.

Any short-term joy expressed by that section of the population which dislikes the model agreed by the States last year, and there will be some short-term joy, will soon be replaced by
455 dismay at the indecision of the States; at the way the States, despite years of debate, would have been unable to make strategic policy decisions about the future of education and then put them into effect.

Sir, I will conclude by saying that my Committee believes that educational reform must have three underlying objectives: the highest possible standards of education; equality of opportunity for students; and making the most efficient use of the necessarily limited resources the States are prepared to commit to education. And the appropriate balance has to be struck between these
460 three objectives.

On any rational analysis of this evidence this model of education and the practical changes necessary to put it into effect, which are set out in the Propositions before the States today remains by a very wide margin the model best able to strike that balance.

Thank you, sir.

470 **The Bailiff:** Before we move on there are just a couple of matters I will raise at this point.

First of all, several Members who were not present at roll call have now entered the Chamber and Deputies Leadbeater, Brouard and Le Tocq, do you all wish to be relevé?

Deputy Brouard: Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: The three of you are all therefore relevé.

The second matter I want to raise is I have been asked whether Members should declare an interest if they have children in the States' school system. Now, the Comptroller and I are of the same opinion on this that we do not consider that having either children or grandchildren in the States' school system, or children or grandchildren who might in future years be in the States' school system – we do not consider that that is something that gives a special or direct interest for the purposes of the Rules. This is one of those general subjects rather like social insurance, pensions and so on in which anyone may have an interest. So that does not need to be declared. That does not stop people declaring them if they wish to do so and I think that is the way the previous debates on the education subject have been conducted.

There may be other circumstances that people wish to declare and, for example, I can recall in some earlier debates some Members with perhaps a spouse teaching in one of the States' schools who would be directly affected by the changes, and some Members have felt that the changes would have such a direct impact on their spouse that they should declare that.

I am not saying that there are not circumstances that need to be declared, all I am saying that the Comptroller and I are in agreement that under the Rules there is no need for somebody with children or grandchildren to stand up and declare that they have a special or direct interest in the subject matter. I hope that is clear.

If people have other circumstances that they think might require a declaration and they wish to have any clarification I am sure Her Majesty's Comptroller will be only too pleased to assist them.

Is that a fair direction, Mr Comptroller?

The Comptroller: Sir, I think that is a fair reflection. I think there are so many people with that type of interest that it goes without saying in most cases.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

That then brings us to the Sursis – in the plural. But I understand, Deputy Meerveld, is it the case that you are not wishing to lay the Sursis that you have previously circulated?

Deputy Meerveld: Yes, sir.

Deputy Paint and myself have decided not to lay our Sursis and to support the one being laid by Deputies Dudley-Owen and Prow instead.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Now, Deputy Dudley-Owen, you have circulated two; one is said to be a revised one, but that would require a suspension of the Rules for it to proceed.

Do you wish me to put that one to the Assembly first to see whether they will agree to suspend the Rules to enable that Sursis to be laid? And I assume if they vote against that then you would wish to proceed with the original Sursis. Is that correct?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes, sir, it is.

The Bailiff: So, Members, I am referring to the Sursis, I think it is headed Revised *Sursis Motivé* 39/19, although people have got a different version of it. Mine does not say No. 3 but Members have received something that says No. 3 at the top; that is the one we are talking about.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Sir, am I able to give an explanation to this or not at this stage?

525 **The Bailiff:** No, we normally go straight to the procedural motion to suspend the Rules to enable *Sursis Motivé* No. 3 to be laid. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: That is carried.

So now Deputy Dudley-Owen you may open on your *Sursis* No. 3.

[Sursis Motivé No. 3](#)

To Sursis the propositions until the meeting of the States of Deliberation to be held on 6th November 2019 and to direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture in the meantime to lay before the States, in time to enable them to be considered by the States at their meeting to be held on 6th November 2019, a policy letter containing the Outline Business Cases for all elements of the project, which must include an options appraisal shortlist of familiar models, being the 3 school model with tertiary and selective 4 school with current FE provision as comparators to the Committee's preferred model of 1 school on 2 sites with accompanying propositions which will enable members to compare and note the capital and annual revenue costs of each model.

530 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** For the sake of clarity – sorry, I am now speaking to the amended *Sursis* (**The Bailiff:** Yes.) or I am speaking about why I have –

The Bailiff: No, you are speaking to the amended *Sursis*, the members have agreed that you may lay your amended *Sursis*, *Sursis* 3, so you speak to that one.

535 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Right. Lovely.
Deputy Graham does not think that he has a copy, I think this *Sursis* No. 3 –

Deputy Inder: I do not have a copy either.

540 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you.
So is everyone clear about what we are – I am now?

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett has –

545 **Deputy Fallaize:** Can I just check with Deputy Dudley-Owen?
Was there only ever one version of *Sursis* 3 circulated? (**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes.) So anything which says *Sursis* 3 at the top is inevitably the right version. Is that right?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes. Thank you, sir.

550 **The Bailiff:** Okay. Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.
Just to clarify, you used the word 'amended': does that mean that *Sursis* 2 no longer exists?

555 **The Bailiff:** Yes. Perhaps Deputy Dudley-Owen will clarify –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: That is correct.

Yes, just for the sake of clarification Deputy Prow and I have amended the Sursis to remove the second Proposition and we want the conversation to be limited to a conversation about the best outcome through well-considered plans and we felt that too much distraction was being caused by the second Proposition. So Sursis No. 3 is as stands and is now to be opened.

Deputy Gollop: There are two 3s, one of which is proposed by Deputy St Pier.

The Bailiff: That is amendment 3! *(Laughter)*

Deputy Dudley-Owen: That is an amendment, Deputy Gollop.

The Bailiff: We are dealing with Sursis 3.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I would advise all Members to look up in the top right-hand corner of their Sursis and then you can see whether it is a Sursis or an amendment.

So I will start.

Sir, for the sake of expediency right from the get-go and progression of the debate and also recognition of the level of frustration that some Members felt before our summer recess I intend to speak uninterrupted unless someone raises a point of correction. So I hope Members are sympathetic to that.

The purpose of this Sursis that Deputy Prow and I have laid is to allow the Committee time to return to the Assembly and to set out in further detail their plan for one school on two sites. We are asking for this detail to be presented specifically in an outline business case. This outline business case should be prepared in accordance with the States' approved Five-Case Model and associated stakeholder workshops. This approach will enable the States to scrutinise the evidence contained in such business case and to assure itself that the preferred option identified by the Committee represents the best value for money to deliver the targeted outcomes detailed in the Transformation Education Programme business case.

Any outline business case should include a shortlisted options appraisal which uses the familiar models of education known to us here in Guernsey in order to compare against and evaluate the Committee's preferred one school on two sites model. Only this will allow for objective analysis. Furthermore, it requires that the Committee comes back to this Assembly as opposed to the Policy & Resources Committee with the business case so that we, we can exercise approval.

Last week on Friday 30th August, the Scrutiny Management Committee released its letter of comment on the Education policy letter. Scrutiny's comments give the Assembly a clear view of what is lacking, what work still needs to be done and what expectation we have as custodians of the public purse from the Committee.

Whilst I know that Scrutiny often give comments during debate on capital expenditure projects I do not recall them having written in such detail about a policy letter during this term, but I am happy to give way to the President of the Committee, Deputy Green, if he would like to correct me.

I think it would be useful to have these letters as a matter of course. It is of real value, applying this type of deep objective critique and setting the standard high in terms of the level of expectation that we should have of all committees when they come to the States expecting to receive capital funding, saying 'This is what we expect you to deliver, if you are wanting to spend taxpayer's hard-earned cash'.

The surprise for me is that the information gaps have had to be spelled out in such a way. Not to mention all of our clamour for it in the public domain pointed out in the media and by many here in the Assembly, knowing that the proposal to radically change our education system, which comes at such a high price, exposes a lack of technical detail, financial working and evidence to support the feasibility of the plan.

Are Deputies really able to apply themselves objectively in appraising this plan? If so we are setting a new precedent of dismissing process and procedures adopted to ensure that we have demonstrated due consideration and thereby also demonstrating our accountability.

The approach that Deputy Prow and I are asking from the Committee is a tried and tested business case methodology and recommended best practice used by Guernsey and the New Zealand Treasury. The model has been developed by the UK and Welsh Government and in working through the process it asks whether there is a clear case for change; whether it is the best balance of costs, benefits and risks; and has a range of options been considered. Are the costs realistic and affordable? Do we have robust systems and processes in place to be capable of delivering the project? The robust processes of the better business cases approach are necessary and must be applied to all public spending needs, because it allows the users to set out their research, findings and evidence in a way that provides a clear audit trail for the purposes of public accountability.

If the trail is opaque because of a lack of evidence, consultation and technical detail the route to accountability, which is the opportunity to measure the success or failure of change to public service and delivery, this route is barred.

In this instance, ESC have presented work which is opaque. There is a lack of evidence provided to support that their preferred model is the only way which can achieve the benefits listed between pages 32 and 35 of the policy letter; the lack of meaningful consultation with key stakeholder groups via open meetings and workshop events; the lack of financial information behind the annual costs, and where the savings are made; the lack of detail about key logistical information supporting Appendix 10 regarding transport.

Statements from ESC that their plan will work to increase educational outcomes are not sufficiently evidenced yet to provide us with reassurance that the cost of this plan is justified. It is not good enough for Members to say either 'Yes, I agree with the principle of 11-18 schools or the ideology behind it, therefore I am prepared to take the risk on the lack of details behind the planning'. Or, 'I have been told by the Committee that there is a risk of increased cost to the project because of the delay of being asked to come back with the requisite details'.

Sir, yes indeed there is a risk to the project, not because of any cost to delay but because of the lack of planning applied to it. We must ask for the work to be represented. If it is not in the policy letter, or the programme business case, it is because there is still work in progress; or worse it is still to be done. And through this Sursis, sir, we can achieve that.

That ESC is requesting to delegate the approval function to Policy & Resources subject to them receiving the business cases for all parts of the project of this magnitude is in effect limiting the role of the States in allowing due appraisal of capital projects. This is not what the people of Guernsey voted for when they elected us this term. They did not expect executive government by the back door.

Sir, the system we run is not that of executive government no matter how much some of our colleagues in this Chamber may want this; and if Deputies seek a change from the current consensus position then there are mechanisms in place to help them do so. But we cannot do this on the hoof in order to rush a policy through with undue haste.

There is an expectation from the public that this Assembly will retain a degree of control that enables them to be held accountable, especially on a proposal of this scale and impact. Not to delegate this most important function to Policy & Resources, no matter if it is they who hold the purse strings. As Deputy Merrett has pointed out earlier in a debate this year and I think she may have mentioned it yesterday as well, it only takes a majority of three on that Committee to pass a proposal whereas the gateway we provided here in this Assembly is 21 votes if we have a full Assembly.

Comparisons have often been drawn, in fact wherever he can, since the hospital modernisation debate back in March, by Deputy Fallaize to the Health & Social Care Committee's project. They are not reasonable comparisons; the projects clearly differ, as do the stakeholders, as do the outcomes for the Island's community.

Deputy Fallaize took the opportunity in March to draw parallels, and in fact today, between his plan for delivering the one school on two sites policy and the hospital modernisation plan. However, the level of evidence and technical detail and financial planning that was put into the programme business case by the Health & Social Care Committee far outweighs that which has been put before Members in regard to these Education plans.

I expect each business case that we produce in the States to be of the highest quality and detail proving we have done the research, assisting us to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the policy direction which the business case supports is the best and will provide the best value for money for our community.

I ask Members through you, sir, how Policy & Resources can consider receipt of the delegated authority with so much information currently missing. It is part of their function to oversee the business plan process during the programme development and before it comes to the States for approval – the process which Deputy Prow and I today are reasonably asking for adherence to by this Sursis.

Until we get to the outline business case, which is the meshing of the programme business case and the project business case, we cannot properly ascertain whether or not this is a robust plan which provides value for money against known benchmarks.

In developing your preferred option, sir, you must grade all options in a shortlist against a benchmark – this is a known quantity. This benchmark then presents you with the level of your value for money and we feel that the only benchmarks that we are advocating can be the selective system that we have left behind, the costs of which we know and also the three-school model, which was also fully costed.

Those which have been presented by the Committee on the programme business case, page 74, do not provide us with any meaningful or substantial comparisons against which to appraise the Committee's one school on two sites model. These options need to be changed as they do not provide a meaningful comparison against known quantities.

I ask that the Education, Sport & Culture Committee can prove to the Assembly that their plan will work and to give us the confidence – *me* the confidence – that even if some might disagree with the thrust of the ideological debate that we can all be convinced that their plan is feasible.

On the evidence of the programme business case as presented many issues have not been adequately answered at this point. This Assembly needs full answers in order to proceed with approval at this stage. We need to see further outline business case to give us the information to make an objective appraisal without any bias of ideology.

The question that we must ask ourselves is this: has the Education, Sport & Culture Committee been able to prove their model in the presentation of their workings and against known comparators beyond reasonable doubt?

I ask Members please to support this most reasonable and necessary Sursis.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow, do you second the Sursis.

Deputy Prow: Yes I do, sir, and I reserve the right to speak.

The Bailiff: For the benefit of persons listening elsewhere I should just point out that under the Rules now that the Sursis has been proposed and seconded, debate shall be limited strictly to the Sursis and no other issues relating to the matter including proposed amendments shall be debated until the Sursis has been voted upon.

Deputy Fallaize, do you wish to exercise your right to speak now?

Deputy Fallaize: Not at this stage, thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

715 I certainly will restrict myself to the Sursis but I would also add that my comments about this Sursis and the amendment which also stands to the name of Deputy Dudley-Owen are actually incredibly similar. So in the immortal words of 'Allo, 'Allo! – I would ask Members to listen very carefully because I will make this speech only once.

720 Let me start by stating the obvious: the debate which I sincerely hope we will proceed to hold later today is not going to be about whether to have selective or non-selective systems of education in Guernsey. That has been decided not only once but it has been decided twice. (**A Member** Hear, hear.) First the previous Assembly decided in 2016 they would have a non-selective system of education and then that seminal policy decision was reconfirmed by this Assembly in 2017. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

725 Nor is it a debate about whether or not to provide that non-selective education in two colleges federated into one school. If it was, then policy letter would be full of arguments in favour of such an approach. However, to have made that argument today or in the policy letter would have been pointlessly going around the political merry-go-round because that decision was made just last year by this very Assembly by a majority of two to one. In fact the final margin was even bigger than that because a couple of sensible Members who had voted against the amendment to
730 introduce that system actually voted for it once the amendment has been passed.

That decision was not a decision 'in principle'. It was a firm decision and an instruction to the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture. So this policy letter and the debate I hope we proceed to have should be all about how to implement agreed States' policy.

735 Now, I understand that some Members of the public may not realise that we took a firm decision 18 months ago and as a result they have asked questions like 'How can you appoint key members of staff when the one school two college system has yet to be agreed? Or 'How can you give them names?', or choose a uniform? Or perhaps most importantly, because this Sursis will scupper this element and mean it will have to be rewritten 'How can you publish a full transition plan?

740 I do not blame them for not understanding that the decision on our destination has indeed already been taken by the States. But the fact is that decision was taken by us as a collective Government of Guernsey 18 months ago and it was certainly not before time, having been preceded by a damaging period of flux and uncertainty.

745 The outstanding debate which we are hopefully going to have today is on the necessary capital programme to deliver us to that overwhelmingly approved policy destination.

As I say, sir, I do not blame some members of the public for not fully understanding that after all they do not sit in this Assembly, so they may not fully understand States' processes; but those of us who do sit here must surely understand the proper hierarchy of decision-making. I hope we do, because if we cannot as a parliament bank a clear policy decision and then move on to the
750 implementation stage then frankly, sir, we are going to prove to be a pretty feckless Government. Too many already think we are just that, but I hope that we will prove them wrong this week.

Oh, all right, I will give way to Deputy Trott.

755 **Deputy Trott:** I am grateful to my friend and long-time colleague Deputy Roffey for giving way, because surely in the hierarchy of decision making nothing is more fundamental or important than proving value for money.

Deputy Roffey: Absolutely, sir, but the question is: should that proof of value for money be against comparators that have already been overwhelmingly rejected on educational grounds?
760 (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) That is what this Sursis seeks to have done. So absolutely I want to see – and I will move on to that shortly – the need for value for money.

Of course, I do completely accept the right, that Members have to still feel that the agreed policy of this Assembly is profoundly wrong or misguided; that was exactly what I thought when the States decided to retain selection in 2001. For me that was the most disappointing decision made in my time in politics but, do you know what? I accepted it.

Indeed I said to colleagues at the time who felt the way I did, that it was a decision that should not be revisited for another 10 years as a minimum. I supported all of the capital projects that flowed from that debate, because to do otherwise would have been playing fast and loose with Guernsey's educational system for ideological reasons.

We owed it to Guernsey's young people to provide certainty rather than treating education as a political football. So I bit my lip, that last time – I will give way to Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

Sir, I may be being really naïve, or just not understanding this, but this Sursis does not talk about looking at selection or non-selection. It is just saying to look at the models, isn't it?

Deputy Roffey: Deputy Oliver is indeed being naïve (*Laughter*) because it asks us to come back with an outline business case which actually compares the cost of capital and revenue for the overwhelmingly approved system, against the one that was rejected 18 months ago and against the old, now defunct – because my grandchild I declare is one of the first raft of non-selective to go in – selective system that we have had hitherto. Now why would we be making those comparisons if we were not seeking to bring them back on to the table as possibilities to actually produce?

So I have said it is for the last time and I am going to make some progress now. I have been watching the *Parliament Channel* that is what they say, I am going to make some progress (*Laughter*) I think we have all been watching the *Parliament Channel* a bit too much recently.

So I bit my lip and I threw myself behind making the best of a system back in 2001 which deep down I believed was deeply flawed, and I call upon supporters of selection to do the same today; and, likewise, those who feel that two colleges are not enough. I respect their views, although I disagree with them, but if they felt that this Assembly made a huge mistake last year they have had 18 months to try and force a policy U-turn. Instead, they have allowed us to do a huge amount of detailed work, and we have, on implementing the clearly agreed policies of this States and at the end of that process it is not the time to say 'Hang on, I think we might have preferred a different destination instead'.

If any Member wanted the decision of January 2018 revisited, the mechanisms existed to bring those decisions back to this Assembly for fresh consideration. No-one did that, instead they allowed us to carry on working on the policies approved by this Assembly.

They sat on their hands until now when we bring back the capital proposals required to turn that decision into reality and then a few, and I really hope it is only a few, suggest the possibility of a complete policy U-turn, and that is exactly what this Sursis does. You would not compare costs against alternatives unless you were suggesting those alternatives might become a live reality again. Highly irresponsible! Not so much because you would have wasted the time of Committee Members and their advisers –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Point of correction, sir.

Deputy Roffey: I suppose that goes with the territory.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: This Sursis does not seek to reintroduce a debate about alternative models. I have clearly stated that the objections appraisal shortlist – and if Deputy Roffey understood the technicalities of presenting evidence beyond reasonable doubt he would know

that the shortlisted appraisals option must contain known comparators. The comparators that have been put in the programme business case are not known.

The current transitional structure was not modelled, it was not costed; the option that they also used –

A Member: Speech. (*Interjections*)

A Member: That is not a point of correction; it is not a point of correction.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: – which was an alternative model of the (*Interjections*) second one school on two sites, was also not known and not costed.

In order to give an objective appraisal so that we can make a good, clear case for the one school on two sites they must be put against known comparators and Deputy Roffey is misrepresenting the Sursis and misleading the Assembly.

Two Members: Hear, hear.

Deputy Roffey: No, I am not going to give way any more. I am going to respond to that though, sir.

I have been in this Assembly slightly longer than Deputy Dudley-Owen and I know what will happen when this report comes back to the States comparing the costs of the old selective system and the deeply flawed system that her Committee put forward, and which was rightly overwhelmingly rejected, and the system that was approved. It would open up the debate on those three options.

If the NASUWT sitting in the UK do not understand that, at least I think Members of this Assembly probably understand that. So I am not misrepresenting ... I may be misrepresenting what she *intends* by the Sursis but I am certainly not misrepresenting what the outcome of the Sursis would be, if approved.

Sir, if that happens everything will be back in the melting pot – parents, pupils, teachers, everyone else involved in education would really be plunged I think into despair and frustration as the good old '*States of Indecision*' decided to make yet another expensive trip around the mulberry bush.

Both this Sursis and the following amendment, which is a Sursis dressed up as an amendment, are really about nothing but delay, vacillation and introducing the prospect of a possible hugely damaging policy U-turn.

Both set completely unrealistic timetables. In order to come back for the meeting that has been suggested the policy letter would have to be laid three weeks today – three weeks today. In reality it is more likely to be the beginning of next year.

As the last Committee kept telling us, a few months delay actually does not translate to that because of the way that projects work with the school term and the need to do capital works during the long summer period, it is going to be about a year. More than that, the certainty that has been provided to every parent in this Island by having a transition programme given to them saying where your son or daughter will be at which particularly year, will have to be torn up and started again. Hugely damaging, hugely irresponsible.

I also actually think I disagree ... Well, I do not know whether I disagree or agree with Deputy Dudley-Owen about our current capital procedures. I actually do not believe that this Assembly and the floor of the Assembly, should try to actually work through the fine detail which is better done forensically by experts responsible to P&R as far as value for money is concerned. I think it is a Committee with a mandate to carry out such work and we should allow them to do that work.

But, let me say here I am not talking about here about how much use should be made of delegated authority and whether or not things should come back to the Assembly after that work has been done. I know some Members have concerns about that issue and I fully understand

those concerns. But, as my President has said in opening, ESC has followed the current agreed procedures to the letter, and if anybody wants to revise or look again at those procedures I understand that, but that should be a separate policy debate and not used as an excuse to attack or delay this project.

870 Sir, I am also not entirely clear what the Sursis is asking us to benchmark against. It says 'familiar systems such as three 11-16 schools and a tertiary college But how familiar is that? The last time the States even considered such a system was back in 2001, and if we are going to have to go back to 2001 and start to revisit all of that again it is going to be many months of delay. Or is Deputy Dudley-Owen talking about the system put forward 18 months ago by her Committee

875 in which case it is utterly misdescribed.

Members may remember that I was one of the few Members of the States that actually thought a tertiary system should be looked at again, and I was told by her Committee and by Deputy Le Pelley that a tertiary system would be the worst possible system, it would provide the worst possible outcomes. They were very clear that what they were putting forward with the

880 training college and the other institution for post-16 was not a tertiary system. So we are not even clear what we are supposed to be benchmarking against.

Deputy Meerveld: Point of order, sir.

885 **The Bailiff:** Point of order? Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Yes.

Sir, I am concerned that we are straying into general debate on the Education policy letter as opposed to talking about the merits of the Sursis.

890 **Deputy Roffey:** Sir, if this Sursis had simply asked us to come back in a few months' time with the worked up outline business plan for this system before a decision, then I would think that is a fair criticism. But I am sorry the way it is drafted is putting back on the table other systems that I think I need to address in relation to this Sursis.

895 Sir, why are we also going to be looking *just*, when it comes back, side by side with the capital costs of three systems and the revenue costs of three systems? We know from the work we have done and work we have produced they are actually within spitting distance of each other although we are convinced that both on capital and revenue the two college one school model is the best. What really counts is what provides the best educational system.

900 When the States in 2016 decided to get rid of selection it was not because it was too expensive, it was because a majority of the States felt the time had passed for that system to continue. Likewise in 2017, when we overwhelmingly rejected the proposals from the Le Pelley, Dudley-Owen Committee 18 months ago, it was not because they were too expensive it was because they did not work educationally and we were told so by the profession.

905 So what is the point in just comparing costs that we know are going to be really quite similar, when actually what really counts is what is best for our kids' education?

Sir, if this goes through I think it is going to be really poor government. Let's go round and round in circles like a dog chasing its tail. Why don't we?

910 Let's look at the actual reasons that are being put forward, not just today but in recent weeks, over the reason why we might want a delay today. The first is that the policy letter is lacking in detail. What complete nonsense! Quite the opposite. In my long experience this is one of the most substantial and detailed policy letters to come before the States in very many years.

I realise in making that statement, two things: the first is that those who in the heart of hearts cannot reconcile themselves with the clear policy direction chosen by the States, will always be

915 tempted to be highly critical of any policy letter which then seeks to turn that direction into reality.

To be blunt it is simply a useful line of attack. Frankly, sir, I think we could have produced a document the length of *War and Peace* and with detailed costings down to the price of the door handles and those who simply did not agree with the direction of travel would have described it as inadequate.

I also realise that I will be accused being biased in claiming this is a good policy letter because I am a Member of ESC. Indeed I am, although I am afraid I have been somewhat of an absentee Member over recent months which I deeply regret.

So if I am biased, let's try and bring some objectivity into play. Let's compare this detailed policy letter, published fully two months before today's debate, with two others that have come before this current Assembly. In doing so, I am not seeking to savage either of those other policy letters but simply to compare and contrast the level of detail and the subsequent political reaction.

First, as discussed earlier, we do have the HSC policy letter on the future development of the PEH site, and it too involved a very big sum to be spent on a series of capital projects.

I challenge ... Well, I know one who will rise to the challenge because she already has. But I would seriously challenge any Member to put their hand on their heart and suggest that that policy letter was not *far lighter* on detail than the one before us today. It was adequate and nearly all of us accepted the outline case made. I certainly did and I voted for that policy letter with enthusiasm and, by the way, safe in the knowledge that P&R would deeply probe the detail and the value for money at the next stage.

So a very brief policy letter authorising a massive capital spending programme was not criticised for lack of detail but a few months later a *far* more detailed policy letter is savaged for alleged lack of clarity.

Why, what is the difference? I can tell you, because it is obvious. The policies lying behind the modernisation of the PEH campus are not politically controversial, while transforming education in Guernsey is hugely controversial.

Sir, the criticism of the policy letter for lack of detail is motivated politically and not objectively.

Deputy Soulsby: Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction from Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Apologies, I did not really want to distract Deputy Roffey, but I think because there seems to be a bit of a misunderstanding about what was the hospital modernisation policy letter.

Deputy Meerveld talked about £100 million which was just agreed like that. Well it was not. We agreed in principle to spend £73 million to £93 million and gave delegated authority for £44 million to P&R, but the two subsequent phases will have to come back to this Assembly.

Deputy Roffey: I do not disagree with that at all.

The other comparator I would select is the policy letter on the proposed three 11-16 schools with two post-16 institutions put forward by the last ESC Committee and which this Sursis, whether it seeks to resurrect or not, will have the effect of resurrecting. In comparison to that policy letter, the one before you today is a paragon of clarity and detailed information.

Incidentally, we have also been criticised for our very substantial and first-class programme business case, which has been peer-reviewed, I understand, and has come through all of that process with flying colours. We have been criticised for that. Well, how does that compare ...

In fact lots of that criticism has come from Members of the former Education, Sport & Culture Committee. So I ask, how does our business case compare with the one they put forward in favour of the three-school model? I would like to be able to tell you but I cannot because they simply did not produce a business case.

The second reason they have asked for a delay is that these proposals have allegedly been rushed. Well that depends I suppose on what you mean. Huge amounts of work have gone into this project but have we moved with as much despatch as possible? Yes, we have, we have moved as quickly as we could and rightly so.

I think it was Deputy Ferbrache after we voted for the one school two-college model who gave us a warning. He had voted for the two college one school model and said he would continue to support the project despite personally believing in selection but only if we cracked on with it, only if we get on with it. 'Get on with it!' he said 'Tell us where the two colleges are going to be. Tell us how much capital spending will be required and what the revenue costs will be'.

In effect he said 'Put this to bed. Education has suffered enough uncertainty'. He was right, I agree with him. So I make no apology for moving as quickly as we could while ensuring we were being both rigorous and thorough which we have been to a fault.

The third reason that has been put forward in recent days for advocating a delay, and it was referred to slightly by Deputy Fallaize, is the amount of opposition. Well, sir, I have news for Members: whatever system of education comes before this Assembly it will attract vocal criticism – most of them, probably an awful lot more than the *relatively* small numbers that have actually attacked these particular policies.

That is not an excuse for delay. If it is we will never get any system of education through this Assembly. It is certainly not an excuse for revisiting the proposed comprehensive system which received even more opposition – think back 18 months, far more opposition – and which was completely demolished by the profession. It is not an excuse to consider reverting to a selective system which has been rejected by successive Assemblies including this one. What it is, is a reason for showing a bit of backbone and resolution, because if Members cannot do that today then they will never be able to sign off any system of education. Each one which will come forward will come in for scathing comment from those who think it is the wrong one for Guernsey.

Finally I come to the weakest possible reason for delay and admittedly only two or three people have put this forward, but they have put it forward quite vigorously: that the Committee putting forward these proposals, 'Ooh, haven't they come in for a lot of flak from many fronts recently so we should not trust anything that they produce'.

So it goes like this: you go about throwing lots and lots of mud at a group of people then you give a startled look, give a cry of alarm and say look at them, they are covered in mud, we had better not trust them. This is not a proper debating point. It is just Machiavellian, tautological rhetoric.

I know people care very much about this subject and I cannot blame them for that, I do too. I know that sometimes strong feelings can lead to ill-thought-through hyperbole. We are all guilty of that at times when we get hot under the collar. I know I am. But some of the aggressive nonsense spouted over recent weeks has at times sounded more like the offerances of frustrated and anonymous keyboard warriors on social media than the considered critique of colleagues and respected commentators.

I regret that, and I have tried hard not to fall into the crack of offering tit for tat; but instead keeping my comments robust as my comments always are, but largely respectful. I think we should all do that today and tomorrow maybe it will not be easy (**A Member:** hear, hear.) at times, but I think we owe it to our community. (**A Member:** hear, hear.)

Sir, I have a lot more to say on the proposals themselves if we ever get on to debating them, and do not forget this is a motion not to allow us to debate them. On the costs, on the savings, on the educational advantages, on the size of the building, on the space available for pupils, on sports, but that is not valid points to raise now, that is valid points to discuss if we are allowed to have a debate. If we are not allowed to have a debate today what on earth will the members of the public think out there?

This Sursis has no merit at all. It is taking us back several stages to reconsider matters that were put to bed after prolonged and exhaustive debate.

Sir, I have lost many seminal debates in this Assembly, I have not lost them all I have sometimes been on the winning side on big issues, and I have sometimes been on the losing side, but you know what I have always respected the outcome. Today, I think we should respect the decisions taken in 2016 to end selection, and in 2017 to end selection, and overwhelmingly in 2018 to organise secondary education one school comprising of two colleges, of course subject to the right processes being gone through to ensure that the capital plans have value for money. And I have no doubt that Deputy Trott and his colleagues will make absolutely sure that that would happen.

This Sursis and its evil twin to follow, the amendment, just throw away years of work and put the whole future of secondary education in Guernsey back into the melting pot. That will be the effect, once you compare those three systems, it will be open season for actually saying which of these are we actually going to select?

By contrast, the policy letter before you delivers on the very clear policy decisions of the States and it does so at a capital cost which is much lower than the States was led to believe at the time they those decisions. It delivers a revenue saving of £2 million a year even after reinvesting some of the efficiency savings in enhanced educational provision. And, by the way –

The Bailiff: You are in danger of straying into general debate.

Deputy Roffey: I am, sir, I am starting to – I was just showing it is such a no-brainer there is no need to delay it.

But let me say one final thing: if we really want to compare costs to make sure we are doing the right thing, actually comparing costs of a model that had a slightly higher pupil-teacher ratio which has actually been proven elsewhere had very little effect on educational outcomes and yet would produce massive revenue savings, would be far more logical than the comparators that have been put in here.

Now, I am not advocating that because I do not think our community is ready for that or wants that, but that is the way if we are really are looking to have more cost-effective education that we will be doing it.

Sir, let's get on and actually debate the policy letter today; let's not walk away here after this pregnant expectation and actually not have had a debate. It is nonsense.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, my speech will be a lot briefer than Deputy Roffey's, who is advocating we get on and do things but then speaks for 15 minutes on why we should not follow the Sursis. But never mind.

If this were a pure school debating society then the calm, measured and articulate approach of Deputy Dudley-Owen would be much more informative to me than the effusive ideological expansive language used by Deputy Roffey. **(Two Members: Hear, hear.)** But that is not the case. We have to get on and debate the issue.

I will not be supporting the Sursis, although I respect the integrity of the people who are bringing it and I understand the logic of it, but I cannot support it because we must get on and debate the substantive proposals.

I was a little disappointed that Deputy Fallaize did not at least respond initially to the Sursis, so I hope he will, or one of his colleagues will deal with the point that is made in the explanatory note to the Dudley-Owen/Prow Sursis, where it says:

The Committee for Education Sport & Culture have advised that the delay and additional work that this Sursis Motiv  is likely to involve could amount to £1.5million.

Well, the actual time delay is two months from September to November; and 'could' – does that mean will? On what degree of probability are we talking about? Are we talking about 10%,

20%, 60%, 70%? And how will a delay – because we are talking about *the* delay, i.e. a delay of two months, because that is what the explanatory note says. How is this delay from 5th September to 6th November going to cost £1.5 million?

I would very much like Deputy Fallaize or somebody else from his Committee to explain what I regard as a potentially expansive comment and quotation picked from the air in relation.

The only other point I would make before I sit down – because, as I say, I think we ought to dispense with the Sursis and get on with the main debate, then see what we have got to say in relation to that – is that I do agree with him, i.e. Deputy Roffey, when he says point 4, if that is put forward as a reason for delay, if that is a reason for the delay all the criticism about Deputy Fallaize *et al* that has got absolutely nothing to do with this key issue. This is probably the most important issue that we have had to consider in the lifetime of this States – I might have said that with something else. But I think, we are now at 5th September 2019 and we should get on and debate it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

I usually reserve my speeches for the end of debate as I usually like to address issues raised, but Deputy Roffey's effusive and misleading speech has driven me to my feet earlier.

Selection: this debate has absolutely nothing to do with revisiting selection. I was if anything the poster boy for ending selection in this term, and I certainly do not want to revisit selection.

But as Deputy Dudley-Owen pointed out you have to benchmark both costs and benefits of any policy or any plan to change something as fundamental as our education system against something that is known. What is known today is not the transitional system we have now, where we are transitioning from selection to non-selection, it is a selection model we had previously.

So I think Deputy Dudley-Owen is perfectly right and Deputy Prow, in bringing forward a Proposition which says you have got to compare it with the four-school model as it was, you can look at the curriculum, the outcomes for young people and the costs, and benchmark it against –

Deputy Tindall: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: The actual model business case – which has just disappeared from my screen – does not require such benchmarking as has just been described. The 2018 document which has been referred to actually says:

To avoid scope creep in this particular stage they must not exceed the potential scope for the project as defined within the strategic case section.

The strategic case section does not mention these other models and therefore in accordance with the project open options framework it should not be included in this way.

Deputy Meerveld: I am not saying that there is any document you should; I am saying it is prudent practice. You certainly would do in any business and you should do when you are looking at something as important as Deputy Ferbrache pointed out, possibly the most important decision we have made in this Assembly in this term.

You should be looking at what we have now, or had, which is a commonly known system and looking at the cost and benefits of what you are transitioning to. I think it is perfectly valid to also look at the previously proposed three-school model that was displaced.

Now, the part of Deputy Roffey's speech I particularly enjoyed was the misdirection regarding the firm decision this States has made to deliver our two-school model. He seems to be forgetting his recent history. In March 2016 this Assembly made a firm decision to end selection and proceed

with a three-school model. At no time during that debate was any Proposition laid for a two-school model. I wonder whether Deputies who are now supporting it, sitting on their hands as Deputy Roffey would say.

Then in November 2016 the then Committee – the new Committee of the States, a new Assembly – brought back to the Assembly, ‘Do you want to confirm the decision of the previous Assembly to end selection and proceed with a three-school model?’ And the firm decision of this Assembly was that we were going to proceed with a three school model and we were going to end selection.

Right, where was the Proposition at that time to introduce a two-school mode? Why was it not proposed then or were the individuals involved sitting on their hands to quote Deputy Roffey? No, that Committee was left – and remember that was a Committee that was made up of selectionists, non-selectionists, a very diverse group – to go away and put their differences aside and diligently worked to deliver exactly what this States had instructed them to do – a three-school model. Then after having spent months and great amounts of money working up that model in incredible detail, including having approved plans to proceed and being ready to tender the project and proceed with immediate construction, then out of the blue comes a two-school model.

Deputy Yerby: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Yerby.

Deputy Yerby: I am reasonably certain that, unless he can provide me with references to the contrary, that Deputy Meerveld is rewriting history to a degree because I seem to recall us all being invited to a workshop hosted by his Committee, at which various different sizes of models of schools were on the table. So it cannot have been the case there was a firm decision for a particular model before that point.

Deputy Meerveld: There was a firm Resolution of the States to proceed with a three-school model. Yes, various models were put on tables as should be. In fact actually I am very grateful to Deputy Yerby she has highlighted exactly what this Sursis is trying to do. It is saying put various models on the table and look at the cost. It is not suggesting a change of model but it suggesting we examine them.

Now, the three-school model: all of a sudden we have this two-school model come out of the ether after years of delay, years of deliberation, after two firm decisions by this States to proceed with a three-school model – a two-school model comes out of the ether. At the time that was presented as a U-turn of the States to move away from three schools and introduce two schools, it was presented as a better model in principle.

The reason that people like Deputy Ferbrache pounded the table and said ‘I will support two school but only if you return promptly with the detailed plan’, was that there was no plan to deliver it. At that time there was nothing on the table in detail saying either it could work or how it could work, when it could be delivered or how much it could cost.

Deputy Roffey would pretend that the people like myself had been sitting on our hands doing nothing. We should have objected and come forward with an alternative model before then. No, we have not, we have been sitting, waiting and giving the existing Committee the space and time to deliver the plan that we were told in debate was going to be a few months, and it has turned into 18 months.

I now see a plan that is lacking all the detail and the advancement that the three-school model was, desperately presented at this late hour in our Assembly's term to try and get it through the Assembly and get some form of implementation put in place to lock it in concrete prior to the next election. I see this as a desperate political attempt to lock in an ideologically driven model

designed by the Deputies involved. But certainly it is not, as presented, a travesty that we should consider this further.

Going on, right, let's address the issue of whether this is going to put us back a year. Again, Deputy Ferbrache has asked for clarity from Deputy Fallaize about whether it would, or how much and the consequences. In the letter given saying that there might be a £1.5 million cost and a further delay of a year in implementation, it states two things: it would delay submission of plans and it would delay the tendering process. Well, sorry, those can run concurrently, there is no delay, they can go ahead and lay their plans, they can start a tendering process. I will come to those issues with that later, but they could do that concurrently. I do not see how that creates a delay.

Even if it did create a delay, we are looking at something here that is of a magnitude of times over more important than the modernisation of the Health Care System. In the transformation of the Health Care System we are looking at the modernisation and improvement of an important provision of service in Guernsey. In the Transformation of Education we are looking at scrapping a model that was flawed – and I agree it was flawed – and moving to something totally new; and a model that affects this Island and our young people in fundamental ways for generations to come.

It has an economic impact, it has a social impact, you cannot ... It is hard to describe just the breadth of potential damage if you get this transformation wrong. Consequently, if it did delay it by a year, if it did cost £1.5 million which after all is 1% of the money that is being requested, then surely we have the obligation to take that time to consider this properly before proceeding if we do not believe that we have been presented the evidence to make an informed decision.

So, moving on to my actual issues and the reason why I think this Sursis should be supported and why we need more time for consideration. The plans as presented are nowhere near as advanced as the plans were for the three-school model. When we presented the three-school model we had a full curriculum delivery model, and as of Monday night when I went to the presentation at St Sampson's School I was told there were three potential curriculum delivery models and we would not know how we were going to utilise the school until relevant heads had been appointed and we had discussed it.

We had a curriculum model which was criticised at the time for various reasons. But we cannot criticise their delivery of the curriculum because they do not have one.

The previous Committee did a Traffic Impact Study which said that the two-school model whilst it did say in theory it was deliverable said there were massive issues with it, and that to be able to handle the traffic you would have to compulsorily purchase peoples land, put pathways through people's back gardens, put footpaths through – I am not giving way – and put in new roads and new junctions to be able to service these two large schools on these two sites. That was pooh-poohed in debate by simply saying 'Oh well it says you can'. Sure you can. If you have got enough money, you have got enough will and you do not mind displacing other people's gardens you can do it. But it had major issues.

On 14th August I requested in writing the traffic impact study for this existing proposal. On 15th August I went to the meeting and I requested the traffic impact study and I was told what had been done –

Deputy Inder: Sir, point of order.

I think Deputy Meerveld is drifting off the amendment.

Deputy Meerveld: No. (*Interjections*) I understand the point but this is specific to why the Sursis should be granted. Very specific.

I requested a traffic impact study that had already been produced. I was told it had been read into and it would be released once they had read through it. On Monday night I went to the presentation at St Sampson's and was informed that the traffic impact study had not delivered the information desired, and that a new instruction had been given to the consultants and they had been sent away to do a new one or provide more information.

Now, that raises two major issues: one, traffic impact and the viability of the site was a major issue in January 2018, so surely a new incoming committee would look at a traffic impact study as soon as possible to prove that the two sites are viable before writing a business case. If so, why was it not supplied?

1225 Then, how can you possibly write a policy letter, ask for the release of £157 million with delegated authority, to build on something where you cannot even provide Members like myself with evidence that you can utilise the site and it will not have an adverse effect on the transportation?

1230 One of the mitigating points raised in my discussions with officers on 15th August, when I requested details and did not receive them, was the suggested drop-off points mentioned in the policy letter. The idea of the drop-off points is they will be to mitigate traffic to the schools. We will instruct parents to drop kids off at up to three offsite locations from which the young people will walk to school. I raised in that meeting, okay, first of all there is an issue will parents do it or will they just drive to the school? But assuming that the parents co-operate and drop their kids off
1235 what happens when little Johnnie or Jessie wants to take their double bass to school? Where is the health and safety and supervision of the child while they are walking to school –?

The Bailiff: I think you really are straying off the subject of the Sursis, you are going in to an awful lot of detail that I cannot see how that links in with what –

1240 **Deputy Meerveld:** The point I am making on drop-off points, are again a major ... I will raise these in general debate if we ever get there, but the problem is drop-off points. Planning applications.

1245 Actually, sir, I would assert that this does have a direct impact on the Sursis. What the Sursis is saying is go away for two months and come back with more information. So if we have got to justify that decision we have to detail the information that is not there. We have to explain to the Assembly *why* we want this delayed.

1250 I am not talking about the merits of two schools or three schools or anything else in my words here, I am actually talking about the information that is missing from the policy letter – the things that I as a Deputy want to see presented to me to prove the business case for proceeding with the schools. Not the ideological benefits of a two school or three school, a one school on two sites, a comprehensive versus selective system. I am talking about what is missing in this proposal.

1255 Yes, sir, it does require some detail but that detail I think is required so that the Members understand why a delay is an absolute requirement and why it would be a travesty if we approve this plan as it stands and particularly delegate authority without further scrutiny on our part.

So with you permission, sir, I will continue.

The Bailiff: As long as it relates to the outline business case, I am not sure how where little Johnnie drops his double bass off is part of the detail that would go into a business case –

1260 **Deputy Meerveld:** Okay, I will skip the analogy, sir.

Drop off points have not been specified. I asked for details of where they would be and what would be the supervision of children between the drop off points and the school. I was told that, 'Oh no, our responsibility for the children starts when they set foot on the campus'.

1265 I said, 'Okay, but what happens when in between the drop-off points, you have told the parents to drop off at drop-off points and say their child gets attacked by bullies or does something silly and injures themselves. What is the health and safety provision?'

I asked for details on that; it was not provided.

1270 Now again, coming back to the point, sir, this is information I requested to be able to make an informed decision. Information I would expect a well worked-up plan to have available –

The Bailiff: But the point I am making is that Sursis calls for an outline business case and I am not sure that that sort of detail that would form part of an outline business case. Health and safety requirements, it seems to me are something different.

1275 **Deputy Meerveld:** Okay, so outline business case. Let me go on to specifics that are applicable to that directly.

Planning applications. No planning application has been for this development yet. I was told by officers it is in the outline programme and will be delivered by 21st October. That is when the application will be made. I also asked for a copy of the outline programme, i.e. the business plan
1280 for this project, I have not yet received that either.

So, again, we are being asked to approve a plan for £157 million when the plans have not been even submitted. We are told in the policy letter and in the outline business programme that tendering will be conducted concurrent with an application. When I spoke to my brothers, who are rather familiar with this business practice or the practice of tendering for building projects,
1285 they said this is an absolute nonsense. What company can possibly tender on plans that have been submitted and not yet approved? They could change a dozen times before approval is reached. You have to have approved plans.

Will the company say, 'We will participate?' Of course they will. They will say we will participate because they do not want to give up the chance of a very large contract, but they will not be able
1290 to tender for the project or give a value until the end of the application process. In other words, this Assembly does not know how much this is going to cost and will not do until that process is completed.

Potentially there could be massive cost overruns, there could be planning requirements that create those cost overruns which are unforeseen, but if you have not even started the planning
1295 process ...

Now, going back to three schools, the plans were approved. They had been submitted, gone through the process, approved and ready to go. Here, they have not been submitted.

Part of the reason for this Sursis is –

1300 **Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, point of correction.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, Deputy Meerveld keeps saying the plans were approved for the three-school model. What he forgets is that a significant portion of the College of Further Education which the Committee was proposing to split away from the rest of it, was nowhere near developed, it was only a concept, they had not even identified where it would be. And yet the States were being asked to sign up to that model and commit to capital expenditure in relation to
1305 it.

Deputy Meerveld: Well, actually, sir, the plans for the model were fully approved and the Committee on the previous proposal committed to come back to the States with a proposal for the development of higher and further education that would be costed at that time.
1310

So, again, very much as the Health project has been done: phase one development, go away; phase two, you agree the overall project in principle, you agree the first phase and you come back
1315 to the Assembly for its approval on the second and third phases –

Deputy Fallaize: Point of correction, sir.

1320 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: That is highly misleading. What has happened in relation to the £47 million project or whatever it is that the authority has been delegated, that is not coming back to the States.

1325 What Deputy Soulsby said was that they had split their programme into phases and subsequent phases would come back to the States, but in relation to phase one for £47 million at programme business case stage the States have approved it and given delegated authority to the Policy & Resources Committee. So what Deputy Meerveld just said is completely misleading.

Deputy Meerveld: I do not believe it is.

1330 At the end of the day, a plan has come to the States, it is split into phases, and the principle is that the Committee for Health will come back to the States for approval with subsequent phases. Here we are being asked for the entire project to be done when there is no possibility to even determine the exact costs.

1335 One also must remember, whilst Deputy Roffey would claim that this policy letter was printed two months prior to debate I would raise the issue that of course it was printed over a school holiday when parents, teachers and unions, for instance, could not call meetings of their members to debate this and it was not provided property scrutiny by those individuals, and give them the opportunity to engage in the way that was done for the three-school model.

1340 The programme business case that provided some level of detail but actually highlighted the glaring gaps was only published five working days before the deadline for submitting amendments or Sursis. Therefore the States and States' Members had very little time to read through 170-odd page document and work out what should be submitted.

1345 Again the reason for our Sursis is to say, 'Look, delay the decision, do not delay the process, do not delay submitting your plans, going out to talk to people about tendering. Do not delay any of that. Just delay this decision long enough so that we actually have enough information to be able to make an informed decision

1350 I believe if this Sursis is rejected and we go on to debate two schools, the two-school model will be approved because, as I think has been pointed out, an alternative is not being proposed. It is not being challenged on that basis. The Sursis asks for more time to make an informed decision and I believe it would be a travesty, and we would be letting down our young people if we rush into making a decision on the back of a proposal, on the back of an envelope, as far as a business case is concerned for doing it; and doing it in desperation to get something done before an election rather than giving it the proper consideration it deserves as something that will have an impact on our young people of this Island and our entire society and our economy for generations to come.

1355 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stephens.

1360 **Deputy Stephens:** Thank you, sir.

I see this Sursis as a trapdoor to the ESC proposals and a route to delay and I cannot support it. Now that may not be Deputy Dudley-Owen's intent but I see it as a very high risk.

1365 I also find it really rather difficult to speak on this matter today because my emotions are more than usually engaged. I want to indicate to Members early, in what is going to be a very long debate I think, that I have two particular interests that have potential to influence my votes. These are not at the moment special or material interests but they are personal interests.

1370 Now one of my adult children lectures at the College of FE, soon to be the Institute, and one of my grandchildren yesterday began secondary education as one member of the first of the all-ability cohort transferring from primary to secondary school. My more urgent interest is in my grandchild.

The summer term ended on Friday 19th July and yesterday morning, 4th September my grandchild went for the first day of term with, as far as I know most if not all of the Year Six pupils from the primary school setting to begin Year Seven at the neighbourhood high school.

1375 So I am now going to speak on behalf of all those families who, like mine, have accepted the previous Resolutions of this Assembly, and the previous Assembly, and have continued to trust the States' education system and have bid an encouraging 'Chirree' to their children at the gates of the big school this term.

1380 Families have experienced their children's progress through Year 6 for the first time without the stress of the 11-plus, or a results day, or the application yesterday of a segregation process that is discredited and has in the Guernsey context no real relevance in my view. It is the success of this cohort, these new Year 7s that will demonstrate year on year the success of the new system described by ESC in the policy letter, and the system that has been accepted by previous votes in this Assembly. With the greatest respect I would suggest that Members should be focussing on that future success and not on this Sursis.

1385 Deputy Dudley-Owen says that this Sursis is not about the reintroduction of selection, but I also would suggest that Deputy Dudley-Owen cannot control the future, and any attempt to delay and then possibly reverse decisions that are already made, will do harm to the confidence of the students and the adults around them who should be the first ones to promote that confidence; and these Members seated here today are those adults who should be promoting that confidence
1390 in the young people in their education system. Any attempt to reverse or rework structural decisions now will, I think, make this Assembly look ridiculous in the opinion of the community.

1395 This Sursis and any other motion that results in delay are attempts to stop what has already started and it is too late. I am not going to look my grandchild in the eye or any of my constituents and say 'Well I, as a politician, made a decision that was important to your education and your future and then once the changes had begun I voted to reverse them or delay them'. The door is open, this horse has bolted. I see this Sursis, yes, as an attempt perhaps to gain more detail but it is exactly what I dread. It is an attempt to reverse a process and thereby dent the enthusiasm for school and learning of the children who entered Year 7 yesterday and all the Year 7s of the future.

1400 Now, in addition to my personal interest I have professional interest although at arm's length now. So I am thinking critically about something about which I do have some knowledge and I remember back in the 1990s much discussion about all-ability secondary education in the Island, and at some point I think early in the 2000s, an open letter signed by all the head teachers of the primary schools appealing for the end of selection at 11. And it is a pity it has taken so long to
1405 address this reversal of the system of selection. I do not think anybody could describe what I have just referred to as 'undue haste'.

I do agree with Deputy Roffey that revisiting the arguments now several times defeated has no appeal. I liken the arguments having heard them before not to my dog's tail, but to my dog's bone. The third time he digs it up and presents it to me it is less attractive than the first time he
1410 did it, and the first time was not particularly palatable, and though I can understand my dog wanting to share with me what is really precious to him, in this matter of the Sursis I can see nothing that is precious or to admire at all.

So to my political interest. My political responsibility *has* to be moving the ESC plans forward. Now, I am sure some here will think that I am reneging on my responsibilities as a Member of
1415 P&R by moving forward on the basis of the information in the policy letter, and in contrast to that I seem to remember the P&R Committee is sometimes criticised for being too scrupulous in their attitude to business cases. But I would like to say that Policy & Resources do not operate with a 'horses for courses' approach, we are consistent in our scrutiny and our standards (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and later this debate – I was waiting for Deputy Trott to contribute – I am confident
1420 that the P&R amendments will be laid and it may well be said at that point that they only describe what the Policy & Resources Committee should do anyway.

But I will say to the Assembly that those amendments if approved will set the context of expectation for the next and subsequent P&R Committee, and the next and subsequent Education Committee and that is important because this is going to be a very long project.

1425 So there is plenty to debate on the proposals to follow but I do ask Members to think about the transfer process which began yesterday in the schools when making a decision on this and any other delaying motion and I hope, like me, Members will dismiss this Sursis emphatically.

Thank you, sir.

1430 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Langlois has stood a number of times, so I will call Deputy Langlois.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you, sir.

1435 The central premise of the Sursis appears to me to be that the policy letter presented to us is inadequate and that it would only be fair to the Committee and to the States to allow the Committee a bit more time to bring it up to the exemplary standard of the policy letter that the previous Education, Sport & Culture Committee brought to the States.

1440 Examples of the inadequacy that Deputy Dudley-Owen gave and Deputy Meerveld repeated to some extent, was that it lacked any comparative outline business cases, and as an example of those such comparative outline business cases they chose, obviously not at random, Deputy Dudley-Owen's favoured alternative option and Deputy Meerveld's favoured alternative option. But when –

I am sorry I am not going to give way.

1445 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

1450 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** The options that have been asked for have not been expressed as favoured, they are factually known, researched and costed.

Deputy Langlois: I never said they were not that, I just was pointing out that Deputy Dudley-Owen has been in favour of the four-school with selection model for a considerable number of years.

1455 But when the Committee of which she was a Member brought the policy letter to the States for the three-school model they did not include any comparative outline business cases in that paper. What they brought was appraisals of options – the ones Deputy Yerby referred to – in nothing like the kind of detail that you would describe as a business case, it was just a list of potential options and some overall figures so the States could take a rough comparison between them.

1460 Then, following that, the other inadequacy pointed out in the current policy letter was that the States is going to be in dereliction of its duty if it simply just delegates authority to Policy & Resources to make critical decisions, but the previous policy letter the one brought by the Committee of which Deputies Meerveld and Dudley-Owen were members, amongst their Propositions states and I will read out just one of the Propositions – this is after asking the States
1465 to approve the three-school model:

- a. Following a review of the outline business case for the new secondary school, give agreement for the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to go out to tender for the rebuild of an 8 form entry secondary school and sports facilities on the La Mare de Carteret site; and,

This is again delegated to Policy & Resources:

- b. Following a review of the full business case, open a capital vote of a maximum of £52.6m for this project ...

So in other words the point Deputy Fallaize made right at the beginning is that the criticism that the policy letter is somehow inadequate when what the Committee has been doing is following standard procedures in the same way that Health & Social Care did recently when they brought a policy letter to the States, and also the way the previous Education, Sport & Culture Committee structured their presentation to the States – they were all very similar. So I think it does not make much sense to me to criticise what this Committee is now presenting to the States as somehow a derogation of our duty to our electors to take control of and to approve the business cases and to insist on comparative business cases being built up in a lot of detail for models which we have previously rejected.

So in other words it took me a long time to understand what on earth the positive outcomes of the Sursis might be, or were intended to be, and I simply could not understand what they were, and I still do not. I still see the only outcomes from this Sursis as being entirely negative and with uncalled-for requests for information which will not really inform any of the decisions the States has made.

Deputy Meerveld went on at length about one detailed aspect of the schools and the States simply is not going to be debating that almost operational level of detail, and to imagine it would be just a fallacy.

We make our decisions in stages and there is a process, it might have some flaws and it might need fine tuning, but it does not work too badly and it does rely on Policy & Resources having delegated powers and rigorously examining the value for money of the projects and the business cases. That is what Policy & Resources are doing and they have launched some amendments which really emphasise their role for those people who do not quite understand it.

There is no reason for us to vote for this Sursis. It is completely unnecessary because our processes will look after the value-for-money aspects of it, and the amount of detail provided in the policy letter is perfectly adequate for us to make a decision today to approve the Propositions as written in the policy letter.

So I think the debate of this Sursis and, as Deputy Roffey said, the virtually identical amendment are really a waste of the States' time, they simply will not get us anywhere. All they will do is delay the excellent progress that has been already made, and cost the Island considerable amounts of money and bring uncertainty back into the equation.

I will not be supporting the Sursis.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Mr Bailiff, thank you very much.

I think there is some merit in the idea of insisting on an outline business case being produced ahead of a further parliamentary opportunity to debate these capital projects, and I think that is a good idea in principle, and my Committee has called for the outline business cases for the individual components of this programme to come back to the States.

But I think there are some problematic issues with this particular Sursis. In a nutshell, sir, this Sursis is not calling simply for a further States' debate on the financial rigour or otherwise of the two-school model, nor on its evidence base, it does go much wider and much further than that, and I think that is unfortunate.

First of all, the question I would ask the proposer and seconder of this motion is this: do they consider that the Sursis will provide the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture with sufficient time to do all that is being asked of them in terms of the further information and the evidence gathering, given the return date of 6th November 2019? November is not that far away to state the bleeding obvious and presumably any report by Education, Sport & Culture would need to be submitted ahead of that in October, which is even closer. *(Interjections)* September Members are telling me, right, well that makes the point even more. That is a short time frame.

Now, it might be that Deputy Dudley-Owen wanted a relatively short return date out of the best of intentions and out of a sense of not wanting to unfairly delay and elongate matters more

than necessary and I think if that is the case that is perfectly understandable, but this does seem to be a challenging time frame in any event and I think Members of the Assembly need some clarity, reassurance, on that challenging timeframe.

Secondly, sir, I also have an issue with the business of comparing the two-school model with the three-school model and with a selective four-school model - particularly the latter. The reality is as others have said making open comparisons with any sort of selective model is in my view wholly inconsistent with the policy direction set by this States on two different occasions, and to make open comparisons with three or four-school models is in principle again inconsistent with the direction of travel set by the States 18 months ago or so, when the decision was taken to adopt a two-school model.

But, sir, we do need to find a way through this where there can be more comfort and more confidence about the lack of detailed granular financial information underpinning the current proposals. My Committee's letter of comment did speak to this, particularly concerns about the lack of evidence in support of the alleged savings, and on the value-for-money considerations, and on the proportionality of the capital costs more generally.

Certainly what underpins that to some extent, sir, was an unease with the way in which the current capital allocations process has seemingly evolved with projects coming to the States for political endorsement perhaps before they are properly formed and really ready and the further details coming before P&R subsequently when they decide if they are to exercise their delegated authority.

This system seems to only ordinarily allow for one parliamentary opportunity, one parliamentary debate before delegation of authority is invoked. So the inclusion in effect of another stage of a States' debate in this Sursis is to some extent attractive. But this does seem to envisage not a States' debate purely on whether further and better particulars as it were and more flesh is put on the bone in terms of the financial details of the two-school model but a number of comparative options that rather tend to suggest that all options in effect be revisited including selection, which I would find absolutely unacceptable.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Apologies. Thank you to Deputy Green for giving way.

That is not the case and we really need to put this to bed. The options appraisal within the outline business case is merely a mechanism by which to appraise the preferred option and to reinforce that the preferred option really stands up to scrutiny. That is what the Sursis is requiring that is uses within the options appraisal otherwise we cannot objectively assess its merits against known models.

It is not an intention for it to be brought back to this Assembly.

Deputy Green: I accept that is the intention, but I do not think that is the effect or the consequence of this Sursis if it were to be carried.

I accept the good faith in which Deputy Dudley-Owen makes that point, but I think the reality is that that would be lost very easily and the effect would be exactly as I have said.

So, sir, we do not have a proposal here to merely debate the outline business case or cases in respect of the two-school model alone, it includes matters that have already been decided and upon which we have moved on from, and any further debate here should be about examining the two-school model on its own terms and in terms of whether the financial and practical matters that underpin this are actually evidence based and subject to proper value-for-money considerations.

I think, sir, at the end of the day in the absence of such a debate option being on the table that the financial concerns that were outlined in the Scrutiny Management Committee's letter of

comment could be met at least in part by the Scrutiny Management Committee, or an independent body entirely commissioned by SMC to provide some added assurance and oversight within the parameters of the delegated authority, possibly with a public hearing on top.

1575 As I say, in many ways it would be preferable for there to be an added parliamentary opportunity to debate the financial rigour but what we are not talking about is one that would purely be on the terms of the two-school model and I think that is why I cannot vote for this Sursis. So it is those circumstances, sir, that I will vote *Contre*.

1580 There is just one final matter, which is the point that Deputy Ferbrache raised about the £1.5 million. I think it is *really* important for Education to clarify that. So I associate myself with everything that Deputy Ferbrache said on that. That is a big claim and I think when you make big claims like that which will probably influence quite a lot of States' Members in terms of the consequences of voting for this, I think there has to be absolute clarity as to how that figure has been worked out and whether that is actually justified.

1585 But, sir, for those reasons and in these circumstances I cannot support the Sursis.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I would like to move a motion under Rule 26(1).

1590 **The Bailiff:** Rule 26(1) is the guillotine motion. Will those Members who have not yet spoken and wish to do so, please stand in their places. We have eight and a half, perhaps nine. *(Laughter)* Nine people are standing, do you wish to go ahead with the motion, Deputy St Pier?

I put to you, Members, then, the motion that debate on this Sursis be terminated. Those in favour; those against.

Some Member voted Pour, others voted Contre.

1595 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Can we have a recorded vote on that please, sir?

The Bailiff: Recorded vote. It was close and often when we have a recorded vote I think some people change their minds, so I will not attempt to guess.

1600 **The Greffier:** The voting starts with the Castel.

There was a recorded vote.

Not Carried – Pour 14, Contre 21, Ne vote pas 4, Absent 1

POUR

Deputy Graham
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Yerby
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

CONTRE

Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Stephens

ABSENT

Deputy Mooney

Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies

The Bailiff: So, Members, the voting on the motion under Rule 26(1), the guillotine motion, was 14 in favour with 21 against and 4 abstentions. I declare it lost, debate will continue and I will call Deputy Smithies who has stood quite a number of times.

1605

Deputy Smithies: Thank you very much, sir.

I am unable to support the Sursis as the decision to proceed with the 11-18 school comprising two colleges on different sites model has already been taken and to now take into consideration four or three school models is too late.

1610

The Sursis wishes to deny us the opportunity to debate proposals which specifically refer to appropriate business cases which must be provided. The success of this Sursis will delay matters and lead to another debate which will further delay the implementation of the extant policy beyond that which is reasonable. I do speak as someone who voted against the removal of selection but has now accepted the decision of the States so to do.

1615

I stop short of suggesting the motivation of the Sursis, or the *Motivé*, is to delay or indeed fight a rearguard action but that will be the effect. We need to move on with the substantive debate.

Two Members: Hear, hear.

1620

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Okay.

The Bailiff: Sorry, Deputy Fallaize is standing I –

1625

Deputy Fallaize: I will defer to Deputy Inder, sir, who I am sure has a very short speech and then I will stand. (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

1630

Deputy Inder: Well, that will certainly be a first!

It has been a bit of an odd debate and I was half inclined to vote for the 26(1) not that it would have helped at all, but from the beginning if you actually look at the Sursis itself, and I will stick to it and keep all the emotion and rhetoric out of it, what it actually says is:

... a policy letter containing the Outline Business Cases for all elements of the project ...

1635

Now I come from a sort of PRINCE2 background, from what I can remember of it, it has been a few years, and I am not entirely sure what Government applies in terms of project management to the language that it uses. Now, the outline business case as I see it is the policy letter. You can shake your head, Deputy Tindall, but I will go through it –

1640

Deputy Tindall: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: The outline business case is not the policy letter –

1645

Deputy Inder: Okay, well I will go through what I was –

Deputy Tindall: We are adhering –

The Bailiff: One person at a time. Sit down Deputy Inder until Deputy Tindall has finished.

Deputy Inder: Right, okay.

Deputy Tindall: According to both the Sursis and according to our policies we adhere to the 2018 document referred to at the bottom. The strategic outline case is the programme business case and the outline business case is the next stage, the stage that we are delegating. So the policy letter is not the outline business case.

Deputy Inder: Okay. I will marginally accept that but it probably means I do not.

But I will go through what I understand is an outline business case, it is effectively the brief (*Laughter*) Trust me. Deputy Fallaize, you can laugh but I am actually on your side in this one. But it sets out the preliminary thoughts on a project which is in the policy letter, it normally sets out the outcomes, which is in the policy letter; and benefits and potential risks.

The detailed business case: now, that normally sets out or includes project plan, risk register, costs and timescales, and I suppose at the end could the costs be viable. Well of course it is viable, it is the taxpayer. Everything is viable. So under normal processes you would be talking to your client and saying 'Look, this project is going to work; we have done the outline; we have done the project map; this is the detailed business case, do you still want to go on with it?

What we have got here is the mentioned Proposition 1 I believe it is the use of the words 'submission of *appropriate* business cases'. To be perfectly honest with you I am not entirely sure what an appropriate business case is because my expectancy is that I see this as an outline business case, the whole policy letter is the outline business case, I believe. And I am afraid it is a criticism of the authors, what I think they should have done is a detailed business case. So in this case I am unable to support the Sursis because to my mind I think what should have been replaced with this is the detailed business case of which I think the amendment coming from Policy & Resources is likely to go into further detail – but I am happy to give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir, and to Deputy Inder for giving way.

I understand what Deputy Inder is trying to say, and what he is trying to say and the process that he understands is actually as Deputy Tindall referred to before a process we follow now and what he is referring to as the detailed business case I am afraid confusingly, and I agree it is confusing, is called the outline business case.

I did not choose the terminology, I would not have chosen that terminology, I did not choose the methodology either, but it is the methodology that we have adopted. So what he understands as the detailed business case is actually referred to as the outline business case.

Deputy Inder: Well, maybe that is something Deputy Fallaize can talk about later on but I am not entirely sure of an appropriate business case. But I will take that, maybe I missed that, but you know what I am like with reading.

But Deputy Dudley-Owen may have drawn me back in, but basically in my reading the outline is way before the detail. So in my world the outline is way before detail and if Government decides to say black is white and white is black, the detail is the detail and that is what you do at the end of the process. It is an industry standard done all around the world, except in the States of the Guernsey. Well, there you go.

That is where I am at the moment, but picking up where Deputy Stephens spoke about her grandchildren going into Year 7 this year and just possibly for a bit of levity in what is going to be hopefully not too nasty a debate, I got a text off my daughter who is in Year 9 today 8.41 a.m. – she said *Le Mare*, and that is really annoying. I got a text off her from *WhatsApp* and usually it is

me taking her surfing, or picking her up, or buying her ice-cream or doing something, but it is never actually a real question. And she wrote 'Is Le Mare getting knocked down?' I wrote 'Eventually, yes.' Her response: 'Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha'. (*Laughter*) Five minutes later, 'Can you ask them about St Sampson's?' My response: 'I will talk to you later.' (*Laughter*)

Thank you very much.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Chip off the old block. (*Laughter*)

I think I can help Deputy Inder in terms of the timeline that would have to be followed if not necessarily the terminology around business cases.

Sir, the timeline in the Sursis is I am afraid unrealistic. It is completely undeliverable. Even if we had unlimited resources it would still be undeliverable.

The Sursis requires the outline business cases for all parts of the capital programme which are in the policy letter, that is to say the 11-18 school, the Guernsey Institute, La Mare de Carteret Primary School etc. etc. to be presented to the States at their meeting on 6th November, and this would require the policy letter to be submitted this month.

The outline business case for the Guernsey Institute is due to be completed by April 2020 and we know that secondary and further education are two sides of the same coin and they cannot be disaggregated and considered separately.

The outline business case for La Mare de Carteret Primary School is due to be complete by June 2021. This will not, I do not think, come as a surprise to most Members of the States because whether they support or do not support the programme they will recognise that a programme of this size has to be carried out in phases and so the various projects are proceeding in phases, both in terms of the outline business cases and subsequently the final business cases and construction.

So the States need to be clear that voting for the Sursis will make it impossible for the States before the end of their term to establish any kind of resolution or certainty to the future of education despite having debated it for years.

I will have to stand up on 6th November – I think that might be the date of the Budget meeting actually, but the 7th November or whenever it would be – and I would have to say it is not possible to lay the outline business cases for all parts of this programme for all projects before the States at this meeting; the Committee will do so as soon as it can, and 'as soon as it can' will not be in this term of the States. I am sure that is not Deputy Dudley-Owen's intention but that is the effect of the Sursis.

Now, even if it could be done – which, as I say, it cannot – it would inevitably result in a one-year delay of the construction projects for the 11-18 colleges. That is because, as Members of the previous Committee and indeed of all prior – I will give way in a moment – Education Committees know, there is a relatively small window of opportunity to start construction projects on school sites because it has to be done during the school summer holidays, which is the only window of sufficient length. Inserting this requirement on the Committee would insert a delay that was long enough to mean that we would not be able to mobilise contractors to take advantage of the next school summer holiday. So it would have to be deferred from summer holiday 2020 to summer holiday 2021 and that is what causes the one-year delay. That is the reason for the £1.5 million cost, it is a run rate on the construction costs if the project has to be delayed by one year.

Perhaps the States are prepared to accept a one-year delay in the 11-18 construction projects, but as a consequence of that the transition model for students would need to be ripped up and started again. That is the schedule that parents have been provided with last October to advise them which school their children will be in, in which year, over the course of the next three or four years of the transition period and indeed thereafter.

But it is worse than that ... So a replacement transition model would be needed, but how would a replacement transition model be constructed? Because there would no longer be any

certainty about the future long-term model of education into which the children were being transitioned.

The likely changes to the transition model, if the Committee had to go about doing it, would require year groups at La Mare de Carteret and Les Varendes to transfer to their new sites in different years than is currently set out in the schedule; or running Les Varendes with a Year 13 only and no other years on site for one year; or splitting a cohort of students in half and moving them half-way through the Sixth Form between Years 12 and 13. Now, all of these options, Members will appreciate I am sure, are worse for students and schools than the current transition model.

Now I am happy to give way to Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I am grateful to Deputy Fallaize for giving way.

I was just trying to get to grips with the timeline as described in regard to the business cases. So if the business cases came back to the Assembly they would come back staggered – they would not be able to come back all at once, they would come back staggered. So does that apply in regard to P&R as well then, that they will only see them at the various stages? It would not be any different in regard to whether it came back to the States or went to P&R. Is that correct?

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, that is correct. Obviously the problem is getting it to the States, and the problem is that that is the timeline for the production of the business cases.

Now, I think what has to be understood here is – and this is one of the reasons why the Sursis creates such difficulty – the States have already voted for the model, and the model comprises of different component parts. La Mare de Carteret Primary School could be disaggregated but the Committee does not want to do that – but it could be and that would be the subject of a separate debate on a later amendment.

But you cannot disaggregate the secondary sector from the further education sector. So I know what Deputy Queripel is getting at: how can the Policy & Resources Committee consider an outline business case for the secondary sector if they have not got one for the further education sector? But the reason of course is because the model has already been agreed by the States and so various component parts of the model can be tested against conditions of value for money and all the other details, without looking at other parts of the programme.

But if the States want all the outline business cases to come back to them – and I shall talk about that in a moment in terms of how that process would work compared to what happens at the moment in the States – then be certain that it is going to mean the whole range of outline business cases coming to the States after the General Election. It cannot be done in advance of the General Election because various parts of the programme are at different phases.

I will give way to Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, Deputy Fallaize, I appreciate that.

When we had that debate, and I accept that was the decision of the States, there were some Members that said they would vote for it. They were putting a marker down that they would vote for it at this stage but when it came back to the States, not to P&R, they wanted to ensure that it was value for money and their decision may change the other way.

So at the moment, from my understanding of what you are saying here and indeed the delegation to P&R, that shifts it completely away from the States' Assembly, States' Members themselves, who may have voted for that in all good faith and yet will not have the final say on whether that goes ahead or not.

Deputy Fallaize: Well, that is the purpose of the policy letter that is before the States. If any Member who feels that way will vote against the Propositions attached to the policy letter, but

they would be departing significantly from the conventional process now in place for developing and managing capital projects.

1805 Now to carry on, on the Sursis. Deputy Dudley-Owen calls for what she terms 'an options appraisal shortlist of familiar models, being the 3 school model with tertiary', and Deputy Roffey has already referred to this. This is very confusing and Deputy Dudley-Owen does not seem to be clear – or, if she is, she has not expressed that in her opening speech – about the model which was developed by her Committee and rejected by the States last year. That *must* be the model that she is referring to because she described it in the Sursis as a familiar model, but their model
1810 was not for a tertiary solution at post-16. A tertiary college would combine A-level, IB and all further education in the same provider.

Last year, Deputy Dudley-Owen's Committee advised the States that a tertiary college would be the worst solution, based on the evidence of results from all possible post-16 models. It is unclear from the Sursis, but maybe what Deputy Dudley-Owen means is the post-16 model which
1815 was proposed by her Committee which involved dividing further education studies between two different providers. But the States has to remember that that model was condemned as completely unworkable by almost every educationalist in the post-16 sector.

In any event Deputy Dudley-Owen, and indeed all States' Members have already received an options appraisal of the other models required by the Sursis. It is this document here that was sent to States' Members last month at the request I think of Deputy Dudley-Owen possibly
1820 Deputy Meerveld. That is the document that was produced by officers, without any involvement of my Committee, which sets out the capital and revenue costs of the models which Deputy Dudley-Owen now wants to come before the States. It showed that the model with the highest capital costs was the model favoured by the previous Committee, and the model with the highest revenue costs was the other model set out in this Sursis – four schools with selection.
1825

It also included an analysis of the curriculum offer in the various models which highlighted, again, significant curriculum compromises necessary in the other models. It also set out the additional capital expenditure which would be necessary to deliver in four or three schools all of the improved facilities and educational benefits which will be delivered in the one school in two
1830 11-18 colleges model agreed by the States last year.

Now, I understand why Deputy Dudley-Owen may not have welcomed that options appraisal because it confirmed what was suspected by the two-thirds of the States who last year voted for what is now the agreed model, which is that the agreed model is able to deliver greater educational benefits and provide greater equality of opportunity across school sites at lower cost
1835 than the other models which she is now trying to resurrect. I will give way in a moment. But I am afraid that requiring the same work to be done again is not going to produce a different result.

I will give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I am very grateful to Deputy Fallaize for giving way.

1840 Sir, I am afraid that Deputy Fallaize is misleading the States in this instance. The information that was delivered to myself, Deputy Prow and oddly given also to Deputy Meerveld when it had not been requested by him, was not the information that we had requested, it contained various assumptions which we had *expressly* asked not to be included, which added a further nearly £20 million on to the cost of the already-costed and presented three-school model that had been
1845 looked at by the previous Education Committee.

I would like to add also that that information was requested back in July on the 14th, and it did not arrive in our in-boxes until 23rd August which was a matter of I think of one working day in order for us to lay our motions. So that arrived at I think five o'clock on 23rd August, being Friday of a bank holiday weekend and we had to submit our motions against any policy letter considered
1850 on the Tuesday at three o'clock. I think that is entirely unreasonable and so therefore Deputy Fallaize is misleading the States that it is already out there and we have had ample time to look at it. That is absolutely not the case and the figures contained within that information were not the ones requested.

Thank you.

1855

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, it is the case; it was produced.

Deputy Dudley-Owen says that additional costs were included in the three-school model for facilities which she did not request – she said that totalled £20 million; actually, it did not, it totalled £9,180,000 – and it was disaggregated. They were disaggregated in the options appraisal, so there was a side-by-side comparison which did not add anything to the three-school model and then in addition to that there was set out the capital expenditure that would be required to deliver equality of provision at the same standard as can be achieved in the one school on two colleges model. But that is it. That is the options appraisal.

1860

So in fact what Members need to be aware of is that the difficulty with the Sursis is not the options appraisal bit of the other models because Deputy Dudley-Owen already has that. The difficulty is and the bit that will cause the very significant delay and guarantee that this States would not be able to bring any resolution to this long-standing debate on education, is the requirement to lay all of the outline business cases for all projects within the programme before the States.

1865

There is also a misunderstanding in the Sursis in the words, and I quote:

1870

... the Committee's preferred model of 1 school on 2 sites ...

It is the Committee's preferred model but more importantly it is the model agreed by two thirds of the States last year and which the Committee was directed to put into effect.

So the strategic policy decisions have already been made, as has been said, to remove selection at 11, twice in 2016, and to have one school in two 11-18 colleges in 2018. The effect of this Sursis – and the intention of it we can all accept is honourable, but we are not debating the intention of it we have to concern ourselves with the effect of it – would be at the very least to delay and quite possibly to wreck the implementation of those strategic policy decisions simply so that the States can be represented with other education models which they have already considered and debated extensively and rejected.

1875

Deputy Dudley-Owen is saying she is not trying to reopen debate on selection at 11 and the number of schools, but that is the inevitable effect of the Sursis. It will kick the matter into the next States and the next States will then be presented with a policy letter which sets out the model agreed by the States last year, and the model rejected by a two-thirds majority last year, and the model with four schools and selection at 11, and how on earth can Deputy Dudley-Owen say 'Oh, at that point, there is no way the States are going to want to reopen debate about the future structure'.

1880

1885

Now, Deputy Dudley-Owen is critical that my Committee has not continued to investigate and appraise lots of other possible ways of organising education alongside developing the model agreed by the States last year. Sir, this is absurd, Committees do not have the resources to get on with projects the States have directed them to lead and at the same time work on multiple alternative projects which the States have already expressly rejected.

1890

Deputy Ferbrache spoke yesterday about how governance can easily become bureaucracy for its own sake, I think he called it 'nonsense', but requiring committees to do lots of things which the States have expressly rejected would take this to a new level of paralysis in Government. Nevertheless, to be certain, our officers spoke to the gentleman who designed the five-case business model which the States now use to develop and approve capital projects, and he advised that if the Government has already approved a model and rejected other models you do not then invest lots of time and money doing further work on the rejected models. He said, 'Under no circumstances should any time be spent carrying out detailed comparisons with an option that has already been rejected. Focus should be on the best way of delivering the States' decision to move to one school in two colleges'.

1895

1900

As Deputy Langlois has already said, the process that is set out in the Propositions attached to this policy letter of delegating authority to approve business cases to the Policy & Resources

Committee is exactly the process that was set out in the Propositions of the previous Committee when they laid their policy letter before the States.

Now, briefly I want to deal with the view that the outline business cases should come to the States before any capital proposals are approved. Perhaps this is an issue best addressed by the seconder of the amendment, Deputy Prow, given his membership of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care which is applying itself to the same process of approving capital projects as set out in our Committee's policy letter.

I did not hear at that time Deputy Prow, I think Deputy Laurie Queripel did in fairness to him but I do not remember any other Member of the States at that time arguing that it was essential for the States to withhold their approvals for the Committee *for* Health & Social Care until their outline business cases came back to the States, because they will not come back to the States. Phase one, contrary to what Deputy Meerveld says, has already been approved and delegated to the Policy & Resources Committee only on the production of a programme business case.

Sir, if the Sursis is to be approved will it be that from now on different Committees will have to negotiate different approvals processes for capital projects, or is it that the States' approvals already obtained by the Committee *for* Health & Social Care a few months ago will need to be revoked until the Committee puts before the States all of its outline business cases for the whole of its capital programme? The reality is that the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture is seeking States' approval at the appropriate time in accordance with what has become the conventional way of developing and approving capital projects in the States.

I have to say in passing that I am bemused by the implication that somehow the current process for approving capital projects has left the States bereft of information on which to approve capital votes. Before this process was put in place typically Committees would turn up – and this was not that long ago, including in the last States' term – with policy letters that were perhaps commonly 30, or 40 or 50 pages, with *far* less detail than is set out in the policy letter and the programme business case submitted by the Committee, and the States would provide approval for capital votes on that basis.

So actually the new process provides the States with much more information than they would ever have had previously. The programme business case which the States have now for this programme is to a much greater level of detail than the States would have had previously.

I think what is most objectionable about this Sursis is that in practice it derails at least to some extent and for a considerable period of time, certainly beyond this States' term, the implementation of the education model agreed by the States but with no clear alternative in mind and with no new ideas about how to bring this years' long debate on education to a conclusion.

If Deputy Dudley-Owen, or indeed any other Member, wishes to propose one of the other models of education mentioned in the Sursis or considered elsewhere, they have all of the necessary information available to them now. But, oh no, let's not have the conviction to put them before the States because then the States might reject them again. Let's instead try to insert any delay or derailment to the agreed model that we can think of in the hope of causing death by a thousand cuts – and even if that is not the intention, that is likely to be the effect.

So, sir, in conclusion what we have is a Sursis with a hopelessly unrealistic and undeliverable timeline which would inject considerable delay and additional cost into the model agreed overwhelmingly by the States last year; and which would require the transition model for students to be ripped up and started over so that in the meantime the States can step outside of their own agreed process for approving capital projects and be presented with options appraisals which they already have for other models of education which the States have already rejected.

Sir, that would be ludicrous and I ask Members to reject the Sursis.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Yerby.

1955 **Deputy Yerby:** Sir, I would like to try the guillotine again please. Rule 26(1).

The Bailiff: Oh, another guillotine motion. Those who have not already spoken and wish to do so, please stand in your places. This time it is six. Do you wish to proceed?

1960 **Deputy Yerby:** Oh, yes. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: So I put to Members the Proposition that debate on the Sursis be terminated. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I think that is defeated.

1965

Deputy Lester Queripel: Recorded vote please, sir. *(Interjections)*

The Bailiff: She has accepted it is defeated –

1970

Deputy Lester Queripel: Yes, but I would like a recorded vote please, sir.

The Bailiff: We will have a recorded vote then and then we will rise for lunch.

There was a recorded vote.

Not Carried – Pour 12, Contre 20, Ne vote pas 6, Absent 2

POUR

Deputy Dorey
Deputy Yerby
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Roffey
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy St Pier

CONTRE

Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Smithies

ABSENT

Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Mooney

1975 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, the voting on that guillotine motion was 12 in favour with 20 against, with 6 abstentions. I declare it lost. Debate will continue at 2.30 p.m. when we resume.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.31 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

**Transforming Education Programme & Putting into effect the Policy Decisions
made by the States in 2018 –**

Debate continued –

Amendment 2 carried; amendment 3 lost; debate adjourned

The Bailiff: We continue debate on the Sursis and I call the seconder, Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

1980 I submit to this Assembly that there is insufficient detail and evidence available for this States to be able to allow delegated authority to be given to Policy & Resources to spend a massive £157 million of public money at this time. It is not only that, but the limited information that has been supplied has come at the eleventh hour.

1985 Could I first deal with and respond, which I very happy to, to Deputy Fallaize with regard to the HSC hospital modernisation project? This comparison of the Education policy letter and the HSC policy letter is, in fact, a red herring. The fact is that the States were completely satisfied with the HSC policy letter and the programme business case. The difference with this case is that quite a few Deputies who have spoken, and the Scrutiny Management Committee, are not satisfied with the amount of information that they have received with the Education policy letter.

1990 Can I please draw out that there was in fact a different approach with the Education submission, when compared with the hospital modernisation programme? In saying what I am going to say, I completely accept that there are some similarities and it is the differences that I want to draw out. Just for the record, and Deputy Soulsby has helped on this in the debate, the HSC business case for this was worked up in advance of the policy letter, and was submitted to
1995 Policy & Resources on 15th January 2019, after undergoing a programme assurance review by NHS Wales. The HSC policy letter was submitted on 11th February 2019 for the 27th March sitting.

The hospital modernisation programme policy letter references the development of the programme business case and a copy of the document available on gov.gg in a redacted form and a full version was available in the Members' room. In accordance with the medium-term
2000 financial plan and the P&R Plan, the Hospital modernisation programme is phased over 10 years and HSC only requested delegated authority for the first phase of a range between £34.3m to £44.3 million. This means that for phases two and three of the hospital modernisation HSC asked to support and note a return to the States for consideration in the future rounds of capital prioritisation.

2005 In contrast, the Education Propositions under consideration today ask this States in six separate Propositions, 1 to 5 and 6b), to delegate authority to Policy & Resources for a massive £157 million, covering the entire programme.

Sir, I submit that this is a bridge too far – in asking for delegated authority on everything in one big hit. It must be the duty of this Assembly to ensure value for money and thoroughly
2010 examine and scrutinise the technical and financial information to assure itself that the preferred option represents the best value for money and, most importantly, deliver the target outcomes.

I thank Deputy Carl Meerveld for all his research and challenge, and for making his findings available to Deputies and the public on these issues, and I will not repeat them now. But, if the Sursis is not successful, I am sure that they will come forward later.

2015 Deputy Dudley-Owen and I believe that the only responsible way can be to follow the States-approved five-case model and, vitally, the associated stakeholder workshops.

In answer to Deputy Inder and the helpful intervention during his speech, it does not particularly matter what you label these things, whether you call them the programme business case or the outline business case. In this instance, if the information that has been sought by
2020 Deputies in this debate and by Scrutiny Management Committee, had appeared in the policy

letter or the programme business case, then we would not be having this debate today. The fact is that they did not.

In the analysis that Deputy Dudley-Owen and I have done, we have teased out that the outline business case will deliver that information that we pray for. Incidentally, and I will be talking to this briefly later, in the implementation plan the outline business case for the 11-18 school is actually due to be delivered in October this year.

So there are many benefits that are described in Education's preferred options. Some of those do appear in the policy letter and in the programme business case. However, listing them is just not good enough. The work has not yet been completed to justify the individual elements as outlined in the six Propositions.

These elements are described in the guide to developing the project business case, which we do not have a sight of at this time. It is the case for change. Is it made out in financial terms, benefit versus costs? It is essential that options appraisal is carried out and stakeholder engagement and workshops take place, as the States' business case model recommends.

This process also requires a more detailed analysis of the risks associated with this massive undertaking, which go beyond the financials, and the issues of contract. But also deals with the ability of the ESC to deliver on the options. So far ESC have rightly identified many of the risks but, crucially, there is no tangible information available on the assessment of the risks and how they would be mitigated.

But, sir, as I have already said, do not take my word for it. Please may I refer to the excellent commentary letter sent to all Deputies from the Scrutiny Management Committee and I thank SMC most sincerely for this work. It independently confirmed precisely all the research Deputy Dudley-Owen and I have undertaken when considering the *Sursis Motivé*. The SMC letter draws out the difficulties for States' Members in the structure and timing of all the elements of the policy letter, the supporting information and the programme business case which appears after the publication of that letter.

It further endorses a view, I know firmly held by other Deputies, around the concerns regarding the financial figures. Again, I will not repeat them but they refer to the lack of cost benefit analysis. However, I shall quote from Deputy Green's findings on page two of the letter I have referred to. It says:

The financial figures are, at best, indicative estimates presented with limited justification ...

Further, in the same paragraph:

The policy letter and supporting information does not provide the detailed financial data that we would have expected to be contained in a document of this type; specifically, we have significant concerns regarding the basis on which the anticipated financial benefits resulting ... have been arrived at.

Sir, the SMC importantly also deals with the highly unsatisfactory aspect of the delegated authority to Policy & Resources for the entire funding at this Meeting of the States.

In my view, it must be for every Member of this Assembly to be satisfied that ESC has made out its case on each Proposition referred to in a delegated authority, before passing it on to the higher level of financial scrutiny which we expect from P&R. With the deficiencies in the policy letter and supporting information, we are simply not at the point where we can leave P&R to be the final arbiter. Consideration by the States' Members of the cost-benefit analysis contained in the outline business case is the only vehicle available to ESC to provide the States with the ability to undertake this scrutiny.

SMC also makes a further point regarding its view that the Propositions go beyond the accepted understanding of delegated authority and that transparency. SMC also points out that should such delegated authority be granted in one tranche, it could have a negative impact on the capital allocation process for other capital projects.

They conclude, and the movers and supporters of this *Sursis* entirely agree with them, that there is insufficient detail at this time to allow proper, effective consideration. Furthermore, it

states the proposals would benefit from further scrutiny by this Assembly of the individual business case.

2070 Deputy Green, when he gave his speech, has in fact drawn out many of these points but I think his main objection is around the timing. What Deputy Dudley-Owen has already pointed out is that this Sursis is not about delaying the outcome, it is about ensuring that we have the essential information that must be our responsibility to scrutinise before we do so.

I think Deputy Green's main concern is the timing. One of the reasons why we have approached this the way we have done is –

2075 I give way to Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: I thank Deputy Prow for giving way.

2080 I think the first thing that I said was concern about the timings, but I think my overarching concern was in terms of the sheer width of the policy letters that the *Sursis Motivé* is calling for, which I think is too wide and going into matters which would almost inevitably be inconsistent with the policy direction that the States has already decided.

Deputy Prow: I thank Deputy Green for clarifying what his concerns are.

2085 That is not the intention of the Sursis. We had hoped to be very specific. One of the reasons why we amended the Sursis was because what we did not want is for the policy letter to go as wide as Deputy Green is perhaps suggesting was our intention. It was not. We simply want to look at the cost benefit. Can the benefits and outcomes be delivered?

2090 Certainly one of the ways of doing that is to benchmark against the familiar models. Deputy Dudley-Owen and I attended two meetings where we made it absolutely clear what we meant by the familiar models. The information came back to us very late in the day and has not satisfied, in our view, the questions that we asked.

2095 Returning to Deputy Green's point – I am not giving way – the information that we are asking for, and the reason and the way we have asked it, is that we believe the information contained in the outline business case will, provided it does a cost-benefit analysis as we have outlined, satisfy those criteria. Any policy letter that surrounds that would, in our view, only be limited to that.

2100 Just moving on, sir, I would urge Members to Sursis all the Propositions, which would require ESC to return to the States as quickly as possible, two months, with a further policy letter as I have described which will present the outline business case on 6th November. This will have the effect of deferring the delegated authority to Policy & Resources to approve the expenditure after the States have been able to examine the more detailed, technical and financial information in relation to the capital and revenue costs.

2105 Again, returning to the point that Deputy Green has raised, work must already be in train by Education on the first business cases, as they will be required by P&R in any case before expenditure can be released. As all the options the prayers are referring to the familiar alternative education options, all the necessary information is already held.

2110 In closing I would like to explain our motivation for the Sursis and respond to some criticism. All Deputies need to take care around accusations of delay and not acting in the interests of students. This States is not a good place at all with education and in that sense we are all culpable. Labelling challenge as irresponsible, and even the stronger language that was used, is being disingenuous. It is the democratic process so far that is responsible for the poor position, deciding upon a clearly very contentious subject, the transforming of education, at this very late juncture of this States' term.

2115 There are two sides of any argument and I can say with certainty that the public are divided on the right way forward and this has been agreed throughout this debate. While we need citizens to continue throughout this term to voice with passion all sides of debate, on one hand the Education Committee has indeed brought to the States the one school and two sites option, following the January debate, and has worked very hard to promote the concept. Undoubtedly it has many supporters who have clearly told us.

2120 But there are also people who have voiced the selection models, the three-school model, which was worked up by four Deputies, not elected by the Assembly, to fulfil the ESC mandate, but funded by P&R. The Committee resigned following the States' debate in January 2018 and elected a new Committee. This has not been a pretty spectacle. It has already caused massive upset, uncertainty and disruption to students, parents and teachers. I remind the critics of this Sursis of one Biblical quote:

Let he who is without sin cast the first stone.

2125 Please may I refer to the implementation timetable on page 14 of the programme business case, which followed the publication of the policy letter? This loosely sets out the milestones.

Sir, I would draw Members to the dates projected, allocated to the 11-18 school, remembering it is one school on two sites. It has construction starting in June 2020. Spookily, this is the same time as the Islandwide election.

2130 It is my submission that this date has driven Education's timetable at a perceived and indecent haste. This is the real reason why you are being asked to approve the delegated authority on the *whole* £157 million programme today. This is despite the plans showing there are clearly separate construction elements to the programme, starting in September 2021 and September 2022.

2135 What is also noteworthy is the plan indicates, as I said before, the outline business case for the 11-18 school will be submitted next month. My late mum, who incidentally was a school teacher, taught me: act in haste, repent at leisure.

2140 Returning to public opinion, this rushed approach has not only led to scant detail but has crucially left no time for a proper consultation process. The outline business case, according to the guidance, should include structured stakeholder engagement workshops. What has happened to date is public drop-ins, scattergun, often reactive Education press releases over the school holidays, and very little time to digest the limited information available.

2145 We therefore urge the States to Sursis these proposals until those workshops are completed, combined with a further consultation of students, teachers and parents. Let's have the debate with all we need in front of us on 6th November, in two months' time, following sufficient public and key stakeholder engagement.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

2150 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I would first like to just pick up some points, which have been made previously.

2155 I think Deputy Meerveld said Members had been sitting on their hands. Well, I have got a history back to 2015 on the La Mare de Carteret debate, and Deputy Bebb proposed an amendment, and I seconded, which was a wide-ranging amendment specifically looking at other models for delivering education, because we believed that if we were not going to continue with selection that the two 11-18 schools was the only other viable model. I made a speech specifically on that in 2015 but it was rejected, only by one or two votes.

2160 Deputy Dudley-Owen mentioned, I think in an intervention, about the side-by-side comparisons which gave her the information she had requested in the Sursis and which was also given to Deputy Meerveld. Well he asked for exactly the same information. I was at two separate meetings, with Deputy Dudley-Owen first and Deputy Meerveld second, I believe it was that way around, it might have been the other way around. They both asked for exactly the same information, so that is why we supplied exactly the same information to both of them.

2165 There has also been comment on the dates in supplying the information. Well, we have had a detailed list of the various dates of contacts between the Department and the proposers, seconders of this Sursis. The first contact was made with staff back actually on 11th July when a phone call was about a possible amendment. There has been a series of emails and meetings. The meetings were on 23rd July and 15th August – I think Deputy Dudley-Owen was off Island at the

beginning of August – where the details of the request were discussed and clarified, because we were not clear at that time what exact models the request was for. It was only through those series of meetings that we had the clarification and then the information was supplied to them on 23rd August. Obviously, that involved finance officers from outside the Committee and also quantity surveyors. So the Department worked with others as quickly as it could, once clarification was given, to provide the information.

Deputy Meerveld also mentioned about traffic impact studies. Well, versions have been produced and discussed with traffic and highways at E&I and some of the politicians, including myself, who sit on E&I. Further studies have been commissioned. We should be looking at all the possible developments, particularly in the area of St Sampson's. So we are actively working on that and work is being done and discussed on that issue and there is £1 million allowed in the budget for measures in relation to the traffic.

At various points in the debate, these business cases and what are the names of various business cases have been mentioned. What we have produced is a programme business case, but it also includes the next level, which is a strategic outline case. So we have combined basically the programme business case and the strategic outline case in the document that is available to Members online through the Education web page.

The next level of detail is the outline business case, which has been mentioned in relation to this Sursis; and then the final stage is the full business case. But for the smaller projects, like the digital road map, where it does not justify having such a detailed number of business cases, a business justification case is a less onerous template for small investments. So those are the various business cases.

The previous speaker just mentioned on page 15 of the programme business case, the implementation timetable. The dates for the various projects were available to Members. So, as he said, the outline business case for the 11-18 school was due in October 2019, and this Sursis is saying they would have to be lodged by 30th September, so even that one is not possible in relation to the timetable in the Sursis.

As Deputy Fallaize mentioned, the Guernsey Institute business case was due in April 2020. It was very clear from that, and you just cannot shorten those timescales down. The digital road map business justification case was or is due this month, in September. The outline business case for the La Mare de Carteret primary, which is one of the elements which is referred to in the Sursis is not actually listed in these steps, but it is quite clear that the work is going to be done in 2021 from the various information in that implementation timetable. Actually, as Deputy Fallaize said, it is due in June 2021. So that clarifies why the dates are just not achievable in the timeline that the Sursis is asking for.

On the models included in the programme business case, it would be totally wrong for our staff to consult with the author of the five business cases, who is also the capital portfolio investment adviser for P&R, about what cases to use, and then we do that detailed work and then we ignore that advice that has been given to us. So we have specifically included the comparisons that we said we needed to do, which was the 'do nothing' option, which is the existing four schools with no selection; the 'do minimum' option, which is one school with two colleges, with maximum revenue savings; and the preferred option, which is our option, which is two colleges with the enrichment electives.

So it is quite clear that we, in putting the comparisons in the programme business case, have taken the advice that we were given and included them. But, as I have said earlier, we have supplied the information requested, which effectively is comparisons, to the proposer and seconder, and it is available to Members as well, of what is requested in the Sursis.

There has been criticism, including the last speech, about the amount of information. The policy letter has 130-plus pages and the programme business case has 170-plus pages. I think we have included all the necessary information in the programme business case, which includes what would have been in the strategic outline case, and that is based on the advice that the Committee was given by P&R who have the ownership of the guidelines.

People talk about the scrutiny of those business cases. What is key is that they are scrutinised and reviewed. I sat on the project board for the Waste Transfer Station and I can assure you that, having sat through interviews and seen the reports that were done by independent professionals of the States, of the business cases, I can assure you they are professional, comprehensive and very challenging about the details in those business cases. So I can assure you that the process is a very good process and is comprehensive.

I am personally not convinced that the level of detail that would be in the outline business case, which has been asked for in this requête, is suitable for a parliament. I think, as a parliament, there is a certain level of detail, which we should be debating, and that is what we have learned over the years in terms of capital projects, which is ensure that Members have the right level of detail so that they can make decisions, but details have been included that are not appropriate for the scrutiny of a parliament in terms of a debate in this Chamber.

So I think we have the right level of detail, but we are not the owners of the guidelines. As a Committee, we have followed the guidelines which have been given by P&R, into what details to include and at what stages should they be debated by the Chamber. So if Members do not like the level, I think they should go back to P&R and challenge them as owners of the guidelines about them.

Deputy Ferbrache asked earlier about the £1.5 million. I think Deputy Fallaize did touch upon it, but the £1.5 million is the estimated cost of the delay just based on running the team managing the construction project for another year, assuming similar costs to the years 2021-22 continue into 2023, with the current expected course for 2023-24 delayed into 2024-25.

While it may be possible to delay hiring some of those roles should the construction projects be delayed, thus reducing the costs, say, in 2019 and 2020, any savings are likely to be outweighed by the likely need to provide additional staff in schools for longer. So that is how the amount was calculated. Of course the savings estimated from this project of £2 million per annum, will be delayed if this project is delayed. So any delay will not only cost more, it will put back the savings.

I conclude that the timetable is totally unachievable for ESC. ESC cannot write the outline business cases and do all the required work in now, 25 days including weekends, when they are scheduled to be written up to June 2021. That reason alone is enough to reject this Sursis. It is simply not deliverable in the timeframe that it has set out.

The comparisons which are included in the programme business case were based on advice given to the Department about what should be included and we have also, since we have done that, based on the meetings that we have had, supplied the information on the comparisons that have been requested by the proposer and seconder of the Sursis.

The work that has gone into those comparisons, we have discussed them and seen versions of them at a number of stages. All the criteria that they are based on are included in the appendix in the programme business case, but there are some very detailed calculations and we have responded to the Scrutiny Committee on the points they have made and I do not wish to repeat all those. But I think their criticisms of the lack of financial details are totally wrong.

It is a pity they did not have the public hearing that they initially asked for, where this could have all been explained to them because the figures are there. There is a considerable amount of work that has been done behind them in order to develop them. Although they might not be visible there, they have been done in the background.

So ESC has followed the guidelines given by P&R and their advisers on the content and the level of business cases that are debated by the States, so I ask you to vote against this Sursis.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, then Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, I think this is the first education speech I have made without having to first think whether I have an interest to declare through my children attending a school, because

my youngest will be off to university in a few weeks' time and I am counting the days! (*Laughter*) Bless him, though, I do not mean that.

2275 I would just like to pick up a point made by Deputy Inder and following on from what Deputy Dorey said just a moment ago about business cases. Deputy Inder said something like businesses cases here are nothing like elsewhere. Well, actually they are absolutely taken from Her Majesty's Treasury Green Book in the UK, also the Red Book in Wales. It is a comprehensive document, so you can Google online all about how these business cases are put together. They are very long, 2280 very bureaucratic, you could say.

In some ways, I do wonder whether we actually need all that for little old Guernsey, but I think perhaps we stick with what we have at the moment. But it did make me think that I do not know if any Members here have any training or any awareness about what the capital approval process is and I think that really would be useful. It certainly might have been useful as part of this debate 2285 here. So, perhaps, when we consider about induction training, that might be one of the things we can consider.

The problem I have with the Sursis is I do not understand why we want to compare models. These are models that we have already rejected. This is pretty meaningless to me. I just think we have had a lot of comparison with hospital modernisation policy letter and whether ours has any more detail than Education's. I did say what we put in our policy letter was what we believed was 2290 necessary for Members to make a reasonable decision based on the evidence in front of them.

But asking Education to compare what they are proposing with three schools, four schools, whether they have selective systems in them or not, is a bit like saying, 'Right now, HSC, we are going to Sursis that because we want to see how you can compare it with building a new hospital 2295 in Torteval, or perhaps a Fontaine Vinery, or perhaps with two hospitals!' That is not what we are looking at, at the moment and those areas, if nothing else, have already been rejected.

But Deputy Meerveld gave it away in his speech, when he said the policy letter was an attempt to, and I quote him here, 'lock in an ideological system'. Now whether or not what Deputy Dudley-Owen is saying is correct and it is nothing about bringing in selection or any new model, it is obvious at least that some want to use this to open the debate if not on selection, then at least the number of buildings. Why else do we need a comparison? Just to say, 'Oh, look, a new school costs more or less than two extensions.' Or, 'Blow me down, it will cost more to run three to four schools than it will two'.

This policy letter is asking us to support two 11-18 schools at the Beaucamps and St Sampson's in accordance with extant Resolutions of this States. Whether the policy letter has the necessary details is another matter, which we may get on to if we debate later amendments. But it is one thing requiring ESC to demonstrate their financial request represents value for money and quite another requiring a comparison with models that have been dismissed by *this* Assembly. I just do not see why we should expect ESC to develop the answers required in the Sursis, delaying 2310 things by two months as a minimum particularly as by the time we hit November we are going to have potentially more critical issues to focus on.

I refer Members to Deputy St Pier's statement yesterday when he spoke about the serious position we now find ourselves with respect to our revenue budgets. We will have *really* important decisions to make in terms of the services we want to provide to the people of the Bailiwick. This is a debate of considerable interest that we are having now, but it is not the most important debate we will have this term. That debate is yet to come. We need to be completely focussed when it comes, and not distracted by work that is neither required or adds anything meaningful.

Therefore, I cannot support the Sursis.

2320 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, sir.

I will be brief because Deputy Soulsby has taken some of my thunder. But I rise to explain why I cannot support this Sursis, whatever the good intentions of the proposers and, much like my

2325 P&R colleague Deputy Stephens, firstly the timeframe that is suggested here, if this Sursis was approved by this Assembly this afternoon, sir, it is doomed to fail. So it is not wise to support it, because if Education were to come back in three weeks' time, effectively to publish something, it would not satisfy us. It would not be done well. It would not have the detail that is being asked for. In which case, quite honestly, sir, it is going to take a lot longer.

2330 That brings me to my second point why I cannot support is. That is, as touched on by Deputy Soulsby, this Sursis asks us to benchmark, which I am not against, but a benchmark against models that this Assembly has already rejected. Now I am all for benchmarking and, believe you and me, when it comes down to P&R in terms of the value for money aspects we will be, and we have, quite a number of questions to ask on the detail of that and that is the procedure that this
2335 Assembly has agreed to and delegated to P&R.

So, sir, the issues there are a matter of how can we proceed with the agreed way forward that this Assembly has instructed so that we can benchmark effectively against that? Obviously there are parameters within that, but it is not a good idea to benchmark against models that are no longer on the table.

2340 The third reason, sir, is more of a personal one and that is I was elected to this Assembly first in 2000 and I sat on the then Education Council. In 2001 we brought Propositions to remove selection. I had entered into this Assembly very pro the *status quo* but having seen the evidence at Education, I changed my mind.

We obviously in 2001 lost that debate and, as Deputy Roffey has said, I have not sought to
2345 bring it back, but it was right and proper that in the last term the then Education Department did bring back proposals. And because of changes in the number of pupils and education itself, in terms of best practice elsewhere, particularly in our part of the world, we end up with where we are today in terms of the direction of travel for one school with two colleges.

I have become convinced that is the right way forward. This Assembly has ratified that not so
2350 long ago. One could say several times it has already chosen that selection is not going to come back. So this is for me a long journey and for those that have mentioned that this is all coming too soon, for me it is certainly not like that at all.

So, I know Deputy Prow quoted a Biblical quote, 'Let he who is without sin cast the first stone', which comes from the story of the woman caught in adultery brought before Jesus, but the final
2355 words of Jesus in that story are, 'Go and sin no more.' I believe it would be a sin to keep on revisiting these things. We need to carry on with the direction of travel and so I urge this Assembly to reject this Sursis.

The Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel.

2360

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I just wanted to pick up on a couple of the points that Deputy Dorey made when he spoke. I fully appreciate that ESC are not the authors of the guidelines in regard to the process. But for me the only level of detail that personally I would be happy with, when it comes down to the
2365 expenditure of hundreds of millions of pounds of taxpayers' money, is the final detail. That is the only level of detail I am interested in.

I was going to say, before Deputy Fallaize very helpfully explored and explained the timeline in regard to the business cases to us this morning, I was going to say that if this Sursis, if the wording of it was roughly half as long, in other words if it ended at the word 'project' without
2370 going into the talk about comparators and three schools and selection, I might have been able to support it. But now Deputy Fallaize has explained actually that this deadline in this Sursis could not be met in regard to business cases, I think the only kind of motion that would work would be one that said something like the business cases, as and when they are ready to be presented, should be presented to the States at the time that they would have been presented to P&R. That
2375 is the sort of motion I think would work.

In theory there would be no delay built into that process because they would not come to the States any later than they would have gone to P&R, as and when they were ready. That is the only other motion that I can think that would work in the way that Deputy Dudley-Owen and others would wish it to work. If those business cases are still going to P&R, under the banner of delegated authority, if they came to the Assembly as and when they were ready –

I give way to Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: I thank the Deputy for giving way.

I am a little confused because obviously they would cause delay, because our business cases going to P&R, will be with P&R and they will debate it in due course at the earliest opportunity at the next Committee meeting that it could be scheduled for, whereas if they came to the States it would have to come via a policy paper which has obviously got a lot longer lead time. So that is the first thing. I just want to counter-argue that point.

The other point I wanted to counter-argue is that does the Deputy not agree with me, sir, that if Scrutiny wish to have access to an outline business case when it becomes known to Policy & Resources, Scrutiny could ask for it and then I would like to believe Scrutiny would be able to see the outline business case and if Scrutiny felt strongly enough then they could obviously do a public hearing, inviting Policy & Resources and in this example Education, Sport & Culture to come before the panel to actually discuss that if necessarily so. I just wanted to put that to the Deputy and I would be interested in his thoughts on that, sir.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: No, sir, that does not tick the box of democracy for me. As far as I am concerned, it is this whole Assembly.

When it comes down to the expenditure of hundreds of millions of pounds, our electorate have not put us in this position so that we can draw a circle around ourselves and say, 'I can go into this area, I can go into that area, but I cannot go beyond it.' They have elected us, as far as I am concerned, it is my understanding, it is my philosophy anyway, to represent the public interest. They have elected us to take an interest in anything that affects the workings of the States, the expenditure of the States and the effect on our community.

This is clearly a project that will have, hopefully for good, but maybe not, a profound effect upon our community, upon our society, upon our economy. We have not been elected to then exclude ourselves from certain processes that are very important to our community and to the States. So I get what Deputy Merrett is saying but it is not something from a philosophical point of view that I agree with.

As I say, I kind of did get her point that if actually the business cases, as and when they are available, came to the States rather than to P&R that would perhaps build some delay into the process. I do not necessarily agree with that. Those business cases will be available, surely, in plenty of time for a policy letter to be put together. They are only going to come one business case at a time, apparently, so a policy letter that would be brought together with perhaps a narrative to accompany that business case. I think that would be quite swiftly achieved, personally.

In any case, it seems to me, if you are talking about this timeline and business cases, if the approval of one business case is critical in regard to keeping everything on schedule, in regard to the transition and the transformation of education, what about if, with the first business case, P&R look at it and say, 'Actually there is something very wrong here. There is a flaw in this business case. We have to give it back to you and you have to do some more work on it'. Surely that would build in delay and that would upset the schedule, surely, in regard to the transition and transformation.

Now I could be wrong. If anybody can stand up –

I give way to Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: I am grateful to Deputy Queripel for that and the scenario he paints must be a possibility, clearly, otherwise the whole exercise would be synthetic; and it is not.

But would he agree with me that if, let's just say for argument's sake, in week one a business case is submitted to the Policy & Resources Committee, or in week one the Policy & Resources Committee advise another Committee that they are unsatisfied with aspects of the business case, those matters are likely to be resolved through further work between the Committees much more quickly than any Committee could resolve something through the States.

The equivalent response of the States at that time would be to say, 'We reject the business case, go away and do some more work.' Then you have to go through the process again of putting together another policy letter and coming back to the States. That would be unprecedented.

I also wonder whether Deputy Queripel, when he says he wants the States to see and debate and vote on the final level of detail, whether he really appreciates just how many pieces of paper, how many pages? We certainly would be talking hundreds and hundreds of pages in final business cases. That would involve the States in levels of detail which the States have never been involved in ever, on any project. Is that really what he suggests is an ideal outcome?

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I get the point that Deputy Fallaize is making but it does not change the fact that this is where for me I cannot marry two things together, because as I say I have been elected to take responsibility, to be a custodian of the public purse, etc. and I am being excluded from the process, because of timings really. It is mainly because of timings, because of schedules. That concerns me.

I get what Deputy Fallaize is saying, but it does make me feel uneasy because that means I cannot be involved in –

I give way to Deputy Fallaize again.

Deputy Fallaize: Just one further time.

I take the point Deputy Queripel is making but this year he and other Members voted for a Budget which has provided my Committee with more than £70 million, and Deputy Soulsby's Committee with well over £100 million. In his day-to-day work as a Member of the States he has no involvement in how that expenditure is committed. Does he think that the States ought to be involved in determining expenditure of all of that money? The logical conclusion of what Deputy Queripel suggests is just not workable, is it?

Deputy Laurie Queripel: No. I think you are dealing with two different things.

For me, when you approve a budget for a Committee you know that is largely for business as usual, as far as I am concerned, things that Committee has done perhaps for a number of years. They might be doing some things slightly differently, but generally speaking it will be for a business-as-usual approach. I think there is something distinct about voting for a large capital sum for a project really – and as Deputy Fallaize knows, we had an exchange of emails following the publication of the Scrutiny Management Committee's letter of comment, and I think that was a cordial and very constructive exchange of emails. For me that was the point.

This to me, when you talk about, for example, the Hospital Modernisation Programme, yes, as Deputy Fallaize pointed out, I was critical of the process then but I think there is quite a material difference between that project, even though it came with a hefty price tag, and the one being put forward by ESC. Not only because it is for many millions of pounds more but because it is a policy, as Deputy Meerveld said this morning – for Guernsey, it is a radical change in regard to the way education will be offered. It could have a profound effect upon our society and our economy and hopefully for the best. But nobody can guarantee that.

So I think there is a difference between business as usual, approval of budgets, and the approval of capital expenditure for a massive, sea change in a way, project like this. But I get where the tensions are and where the mismatches are but I just find it hard to reconcile myself to the fact that I have to take on trust, to some extent, the approval and expenditure of such a massive amount of money. I suppose it is a philosophical point.

2480 Even though Deputy Merrett and others have pointed out the practical and –
I give way to Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Just looking up as you were talking, the full business case for the waste transfer strategy, the Waste Strategy, was 262 pages of very detailed ... That is just not
2485 appropriate to come to a parliament.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: If I remember rightly, sir, that project went from coming in at a cost of £4 million to £30 million in the end, so it rose by £26 million. That is a massive percentage when you think about it. So Members of this Assembly took that on trust, really, at that time, and
2490 then the capital costs were just blown out of the water at a late stage.
I will give way to Deputy Hansmann Rouxel if she wants to? No? Yes?

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Sorry. Just to point out that at the time the Waste Strategy was first envisaged, the business case model that we are using now was not being used.
2495

Deputy Laurie Queripel: That is true because actually elements of the strategy were taken out, that would have made it cost even more if those elements had remained in the strategy. So it might have been £40 million by the end.

Anyway, sir, bearing in mind I appreciate that the sort of amendment or motion I suggested
2500 would present difficult –
I give way to Deputy Le Tocq, sir.

Deputy Le Tocq: I thank Deputy Laurie Queripel for giving way and I am sorry to labour this point but I do think it is of concern if he is suggesting, as a Member of the Scrutiny Management
2505 Committee, that the system needs to change where everything comes to this Assembly in that detail. That is not how we work in terms of a committee system, in terms of trust, exactly the thing that he is talking about.

I accept the proportions are large here but that is not how business would work out there and if that was to happen, and I do not know what system he is thinking of, it would jam things up
2510 completely, we might as well forget the Committees and bring everything to this Assembly and that, in my mind, just would not work.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I think Deputy Le Tocq is misrepresenting the point I am making, sir. I have already said when it comes to budgets for Committees, they come to the States and we
2515 approve those. These capital projects do not come along every week, or every month, or every year. They come along every few years, the ones with this sort of expenditure.

I suppose we are talking about a quantum, really, or a quantity, or a scale of expenditure in regard to capital projects. I think this kind of project, this kind of policy, which is a sea change in policy and comes with a massive price tag, let's be honest, I think that would justify all the
2520 Assembly having a role to play in the scrutiny of the later detail. That is just my opinion.

There has been a lot of talk in this debate about ideology, perhaps I am a bit of an idealist as well, a bit of a purist when it comes down to these sorts of things. But I feel that is part of my duty, personally. I am not speaking on behalf of the Scrutiny Management Committee; I am speaking as an individual, sir.
2525

The only motion that would kind of work, even though various Members have raised a problem with it, with what I have suggested, the business cases as and when they are available come back before this Assembly. That is the only one I can think of.

Clearly I have got some concerns and I am being quite critical about the process. But I just wanted to say I am not overly opposed to the model that Education, Sport & Culture are putting
2530 forward. I am glad if selection is dead in the water. I believe all ability is the right way to go for Guernsey, as far as I am concerned. (*Interjections*) Selection, by definition, is divisive.

Deputy Inder: The money is okay.

2535 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I am getting a bit fed up of this argument that people who
supported all ability are lefties, their thinking is based on socialist ideology. Me voting for it, blows
that all out of the water as far as I am concerned. Look at the Members in the last Assembly that
voted for it. Quite a few of those, you would say, are probably moderates or middle ground
Deputies. The idea of all-ability is simply this: we want to give all of our youngsters, all of the
2540 Island's youngsters, their very best chance, and you do not do that when you have system of
sheep and goats. You just do not do that.

We want to give all of our young people their best chance, for the sake of our society, for the
sake of our economy, to prepare them for their work life and their adult life. That is the reason
why I voted for all ability and that is why I am happy that selection is out of the picture. That is the
other reason why I cannot – and it has already been explained by the Members – support this
2545 Sursis as it stands, because Deputy Dudley-Owen is saying this has nothing to do with, via
comparators, bringing a different model back on to the table, or selection.

But I would remind her of the words, and some of the more long-serving Members of the
Assembly would know these words. The former Deputy Graham Gill said something like: 'It's never
about what it is really about'.

2550 And if you bring the word 'selection' back in and different models back in, because this is
politics and nothing is straightforward in politics, there are always undercurrents and things going
on underneath, somebody will try and bring the idea of selection back on the table to be
redebated.

In regard to delegated authority, sir, I get delegated authority. I get it. But as I said before, it is
2555 about scale. Delegated authority for me was always meant to be about quite modest, quite small
amounts of money. It was not meant to be about hundreds of millions of pounds. It was never
meant to be that. I agree with Deputy Dudley-Owen, it is a kind of relinquishing of our
responsibilities and our duties and it is on step further towards executive Government and that
concerns me. Delegated authority was never meant to be about hundreds of millions of pounds. It
2560 was for small amounts of expenditure.

So I find myself in a difficult and unfortunate position that I am having to consider voting
against all the Propositions before us today, because they all come –

2565 **The Bailiff:** Did you mean to just speak on the Sursis at the moment or are you going to –?

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Yes sir, because I am going to vote against this one. I am just going
to give prior warning I am probably going to vote against all of them, basically.

2570 **The Bailiff:** You can address those when we get to them.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Okay. I am going to vote against this one anyway and as I was
saying, I will probably vote against the rest of them. We will see.

But anyway, sir, those are my points. I will leave it there until we get to general debate.
Thank you.

2575 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

2580 I always find it is a bit of a shame for me, really, at times, because I only can look through the
world through my eyes and it would be really useful at times to see it through other people's
eyes. In that same vein, I only remember the world as I remember it. I do not remember it as you
remember it.

I remember the debates we had 18 months ago as to being the first very tentative step of a new concept of could we do one school for 60,000 people on the Island in two separate colleges? I thought, and my view was, we would be at this stage looking to have the detail of how it could work. Could it work as a whole? We have got the concept, it was well-articulated by my fellow colleagues and the States voted for it but, before we would give the final approval for the money to actually make it happen, we would have as this Assembly this chance today to see does it really work. Does it really add up? Is it actually possible?

Unfortunately for me, I do not find I have that warm, cuddly reassurance that it is there, and I am now being seduced or lured to start the process and as soon as I push the start process I am going to be stuck, because once I have built the new extension to the Beaucamps School and we then say the business case for increasing the area at St Sampson's High is not possible. What do we do then?

We cannot get an eraser like they do in school and just rub it off the board. *(Laughter)* We have then got a very large Beaucamps School but the other one is not going to get built because the business case was not up to it.

I am a bit with Deputy Laurie Queripel here, I wanted to see that big picture, not necessarily all the thousands of pages of details, but can the concept work and how will it work and how will it work going forward?

I just think that referring it back to the Hospital is a bit of a red herring because we know where the hospital is. I think we all agree that there are buildings at the Hospital that will need to be improved over time. This is a completely different concept. This is not just renewing the Grammar School roof or building a new toilet block at La Mare. This is actually changing the whole way we do education across the whole Island estate and for that I wanted to have that warm reassurance that it was the right way.

Educationally I am looking for that support. Can it be done? How will this one school improve our results? What are those benchmarks that you are looking for? Who are we going to benchmark against? I am probably one of the old-fashioned reading, writing and arithmetic people, so I want to see people coming out of school with some really good results, everyone pushed to their potential. I am not so concerned about grey, fluffy things. I want fairly hard results.

We have got that dilemma still and it was a real shame the other day that I learned we have still got pupils coming through from primary who cannot access the secondary curriculum. These are the things that we should really be addressing and hopefully how does the new two sites one school address that? *(Interjection)* I will not give way for the moment.

With the buildings, what happens if we do not get planning permission? What happens there? This was the whole idea, to see would we be able to do this. So are we saying that we all just automatically assume that we will get planning permission?

The other concerns, I know it is not necessarily one that is an educational concern, but transport is a big concern. How do we get that many pupils to these particular sites? Does it work? I want a tick from some professional at E&I to say, 'Actually, we have modelled it all, no problem at all, Deputy Brouard.'

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Point of order, sir. Is this about the Sursis?

The Bailiff: It is straying a bit off the subject. *(Interjections)*

Deputy Brouard: This is what I am coming to; and thank you, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, for that.

The Sursis gives for me an ability to perhaps get some of that reassurance that I am looking for. The sorts of things I was expecting to see in the report are not in the report.

So this is my dilemma. If we start to push the buttons now to go ahead, we have got no fallback and I am not in a comfortable position with the concept yet of one school for the Island.

2635 The dates, and I have every sympathy with Deputy Dudley-Owen, but the dates for her to get that information were extremely tight. I do not know how much time the previous team had to put their proposals together for the one-school model, but I am sure that it was slightly more than a day and a half, which is what the people are proposing in the Sursis today.

2640 I do take the point from Deputy Le Tocq and from Deputy Dorey that we are a parliament, we do not get involved in the details, but we are also the executive. We do need to have that level of comfort that the buildings work, that the transport will work, that educationally it will work and that, for me, is missing in this report.

So I will be supporting the Sursis and I hope, if all that work has been done and it is all there, it should just be a matter of sticking a stamp on it and letting me see it on Tuesday.

2645 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: Thank you, sir.

2650 Yes, I think as you could possibly see, I was about to jump out of my seat anyway!

There are some things that Deputy Brouard has said that I would like to address but I am afraid that if I do I will be told off for straying from the Sursis. One of those, though, that I am going to take the risk of addressing is the fact that we have students who are entering our secondary schools not yet able to access the curriculum.

2655 I can promise you now that one of the things that the new system will allow us to change is exactly that because concentrating our efforts into two schools rather than spreading them across four allows us to employ literacy experts and specialists to go into those schools to address that problem. So actually, if you want to stop that being addressed, vote for this Sursis.

2660 I find it really, really, *really* hard to believe any suggestion that this is not an attempt to delay or defer, when the whole point of a Sursis is to delay and defer. If that is not what was intended, then they chose the wrong mechanism to do it. What is more, this is already delayed and deferred, this critical policy letter, because it is now 3.40 p.m. on Thursday and we still have not started debating the actual policy letter we are here to debate. I am really sorry but I have had enough of that.

2665 I have children in the education system that we are looking to improve for them. I have children in States' secondary schools; I have children in States' primary schools. I have kids who are literally caught up in the middle of this transition. I have one that will be, if he chooses to do sixth form – all being well and provided we give this the go-ahead and we get moving – among the first cohort that goes into the new sixth forms in the two schools.

2670 I have one who will be in that left-behind remnant at the Grammar School, who is in that much-truncated school, because of the moves that will happen. I have one who started Year 6 yesterday, who will go to the La Mare site initially and then transfer into what will be de Sausmarez College. I have two who are in year three, one of whom has special needs, who will be directly affected by this system.

2675 Believe me, when Deputy Dudley-Owen says, 'Change comes at such a high price', it does not come at one fraction of the price of not making the changes we need to make.

2680 I am really sorry for anybody who is upset by the passion in my voice but I am passionate about the education we need to give to all our Island's children. I am passionate about the fact that those children who come from families who struggle financially or time-wise to be able to give their children the advantages that are possible from families where there is extra time, extra finance, are held back from being able to have those advantages.

2685 The system that we have at the moment encourages that, not deliberately, but incidentally to the way it operates. The system that we are proposing will remove those differences to a large degree, and every attempt to delay and defer us getting on and discussing the absolute policy letter detail is an attempt to delay and defer improvements for those young people. And I am tired of it.

We are operating under an education system that was conceived in the UK in 1944. Now, if you think that is moving with undue haste, you have got another think coming. (*Laughter*) This Sursis directly asks us to go back and consider these comparable models with a view to bringing those as part of the five-case business stages. Sorry, now my computer has done the turning-off thing. It asks us to specifically consider the selective model that we have been operating up until last week, effectively, and also the model that was proposed by the previous Committee, with tertiary. Incidentally the model that was proposed by the previous Committee, with tertiary, was not a model with tertiary and that is one of the things that caused the delay in getting Deputy Dudley-Owen her information because she had asked for information that had never existed, assuming that it had.

Interestingly –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: The information had existed. The previous Committee did do work looking at that and it is in the records.

Thank you.

Deputy Tooley: Well then, I apologise, but nobody at Education was able to locate it. (*Interjections*)

Interestingly, Deputy Dudley-Owen has asked us to bear in mind and to compare these things along the case of the five-case business model. But Joe Flanagan, former Treasury official, primary originator of the Treasury five-case model and author of the *Guidance on the Better Business Cases Programme*, which is run jointly by the Treasury and the Welsh Government, and Capital Portfolio Investment Adviser to the States of Guernsey, was consulted on the structure of the Transforming Education programme business case, before the team started writing the programme business case, and his advice was, as has been said by Deputy Fallaize, that under no circumstances should we spend any time carrying out detailed side-by-side comparisons with an option that had already been resolutely rejected by the States.

So we should use a model to assess something that the originator of the model says we should not even consider looking at. There is something wrong with that suggestion.

I am going to finish by just asking everybody to think about an analogy to comparing those. Heading up to lunch, fairly recently, I said to a colleague of mine who was waiting behind to do something else, 'What should I order for you?' He said, 'Get me the pizza with ham on it, but no cheese.' And when I arrived, the options were to add two pizza toppings to the pizza and I added the ham and then I thought 'What else should I add? Should I add mushrooms; should I add pineapple?' It was well worth me considering those two options. But if he had come and found I ordered him macaroni cheese, which he had expressly said not to do when he said, 'No cheese', I think he would have had the right to be annoyed. This is asking us to consider things that have been taken off the table.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Sorry, you were going to raise – ?

Deputy Le Clerc: Yes, I was asking to raise a guillotine motion.

The Bailiff: You are asking to raise the guillotine motion. We will try again. Those who have not spoken in the debate and wish to do so, please stand in your places. We have one person standing; two people standing. Do you wish to go ahead? I therefore put to you the motion that debate on the Sursis be terminated.

Deputy Lester Queripel: A recorded vote, please sir.

Several Members: Ooh.

The Bailiff: Debate on the Sursis be terminated, with a recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 22, Contre 15, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	Deputy Brouard	Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Mooney
Deputy Green	Deputy Dudley-Owen	Deputy Tooley	
Deputy Paint	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Dorey	Deputy Prow		
Deputy Le Tocq	Alderney Rep. Snowdon		
Deputy Yerby	Deputy Kuttelwascher		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Trott		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Oliver	Deputy Meerveld		
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy Fallaize		
Deputy Ferbrache	Deputy Inder		
Deputy Tindall	Deputy Lowe		
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Hansmann Rouxel		
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Lester Queripel			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Smithies			

The Bailiff: Members, the voting on Rule 26(1) guillotine motion is 22 in favour, with 15 against and 2 abstentions. I declare it carried. That means that Deputy Dudley-Owen will now reply to the debate, Deputy Fallaize having already spoken.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Sir, to sum up, I will answer relevant questions and also reiterate some key points around this matter. I would like to thank all Members who have contributed and for others who have listened for doing so, so intently. There have been an awful lot of comments and I think that if I dared to go through them all, Deputy Inder would really lose the will to live. There would be lots of head shaking from him across the Chamber at me.

So I think I will confine my comments because they seem to come really a lot of the concerns, in a nutshell, around two particular areas, and that was delay and selection. Now, to address the delay issue, ESC have told us in their letter of comment on the Sursis that the plan relies on planning application submission and tender process being run in parallel from this date, in order to secure the necessary planning permission, as well as complete the selection of the main contractor by Q1, 2020.

This has been mentioned by others in debate, and requesting them to come back to the Assembly with the outline business case does not mean that they cannot continue to apply for planning permission at all. I was reassured this week, by one of the officers in St Sampson's

School, at the drop-in that was held, that they are in a good place with the plans. So I cannot imagine why on earth they would discontinue that progress and not continue with the application.

2770 It is the same with the tender process: the Committee have stated that they want that to run concurrently with a planning application. Well, go ahead. If contractors feel that they can tender on the plans as they stand, they will. Why should submitting the outline business case in the Assembly prevent the tender process from starting? I do not understand that point at all and I think it is actually a very weak one.

2775 The workstream timeline noted on page 15 of the programme business case, shows that the submission of the outline business case is due for delivery in October. So our request – Deputy Prow's request, and I – that fits in with our own timeline. Why would submitting it to the States delay the process if they are already doing the work? If the work is there –

Deputy Fallaize: Point of correction, sir.

2780 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: The Sursis proposes that the outline business case for all projects in the programme should be laid before the States at their Meeting on 6th November and two out of the three – well, there are more than three projects in the programme – largest projects in the
2785 programme, the outline business cases, as has been advised to the States in this debate, will not be ready until at the earliest Quarter 2 of next year.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Fallaize for really making a very strong and relevant point against what he is saying, that they should be allowed to continue, and
2790 that we should be delegating the function down to P&R. Why on earth would I be delegating that function now today, to P&R, if the work has not been done?

If the work is not ready, if the case has not been made, two outline business cases, why would we be seeking to give approval in principle and defer that down to P&R? If the work is not ready we are not in the position to be giving the approval. So if any work is ready, it is in progress, it
2795 should be presented in the outline business case as requested by the Sursis.

The other issue which has been played on large and really concerned people, is the selection issue. I worry here that the fear is the Committee's preferred model, if it is shown to be less efficient, less cost-effective, less value for money, others have said that there is a danger, albeit a small one, that another option may be in the running again as a likely contender, against the
2800 other options available, and that obviously it would make a greater case to either revert to selection or to another model.

But you cannot ever rule out the return of any policy to the States. We cannot bind another States. But I can assure Members it will not be via this motion because there is not the desire in this Assembly to do so. So this particular motion will not inevitably lead to a return of that to this
2805 Assembly.

The Committee have conviction that their preferred policy direction is the best policy direction. The issue of selection is a very emotive one and we have had that evidenced today in this Chamber and it has been very divisive. Deputy Prow and I recognised this in our original Sursis and amended it accordingly. It was perhaps unwise to include that second Proposition and we realised this. We listened to the concern and we acted.
2810

Therefore any thoughts of this Sursis being a reintroduction of selection by the back door is *absolutely* not the case. The inclusion of the selective model with four schools is required, for me at least, because like it or loathe it that model is technically the known quantity and it therefore provides the value-for-money benchmark.

2815 It is known and delivered for years. It is the baseline. We must not flinch every time this model is mentioned. It is the model that was run here for decades. It has only just run its course. Therefore it is the known structure that we have used as our baseline indicator for everything –

the quantities, the costs, the curriculum, the infrastructure, the outcomes are all known and traceable over many years and can be analysed and used. Using an unknown quantity, as has been done by the Education, Sport & Culture Committee, is quite frankly meaningless against which to appraise a preferred model.

Sir, Deputy Prow and I ask the Assembly to support our *Sursis Motivé*, which requires the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to return to the States with the outline business cases. The effect of this is that the delegated authority to Policy & Resources to approve expenditure as outlined in the policy letter Propositions is deferred until the States have approved the associated outline business case. I do apologise, Deputy Tindall, I am not willing to give way at the moment, I am very nearly concluded.

As I have already mentioned, an outline business case provides more detailed technical and financial information in relation to capital and revenue costs of the project and it is yet to be submitted.

This approach should enable Members to scrutinise the evidence they present and to assure themselves that the preferred option is the option which represents the best value in delivering a targeted outcomes as detailed in the Transformation of Education programme business case. The *Sursis Motivé*, if successful, will require any outline business case to include a short list of options available, using the familiar models of education, as I have already outlined for reasons of benchmarking value for money.

Many parents are still uneasy about the policy and its ultimate effect on their children through transition. So are many members of the community and they have told us about their own needs.

The overall aim is to ensure that States' Members remain accountable as custodians of the public purse and the only way that we can do this is by ensuring we demonstrate our research in finding some way which is robust and stands up to scrutiny. I ask Members to vote please for this *Sursis* and ask those who have stated their position already to reconsider.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: We will vote on the *Sursis* and I suspect Deputy Lester Queripel is about to ask for a recorded vote!

Deputy Lester Queripel: I rise to ask for a recorded vote, please, sir.

The Bailiff: There will be a recorded vote, then, on the *Sursis*.
Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Sir, before we vote, I should probably have declared an interest in my speech. The fact that I am a member of the Delisles Methodist Church and this ultimately involves the purchase of land from the Delisles Methodist Church, although I do not personally benefit from that.

The Bailiff: Thank you. You will not personally benefit? No. Thank you.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 13, Contre 26, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR

Deputy Paint
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Prow
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Gollop

CONTRE

Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Yerby
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Mooney

Deputy Leadbeater	Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Trott	Deputy Roffey
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy Oliver
Deputy Meerveld	Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Inder	Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Lowe	Deputy Ferbrache
	Deputy Tindall
	Deputy Brehaut
	Deputy Tooley
	Deputy Parkinson
	Deputy Lester Queripel
	Deputy Le Clerc
	Deputy Merrett
	Deputy St Pier
	Deputy Stephens
	Deputy Fallaize
	Deputy Laurie Queripel
	Deputy Smithies
	Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

2860 **The Bailiff:** Members, the voting on the Sursis proposed by Deputy Dudley-Owen, seconded by Deputy Prow was 13 in favour, 26 against. I declare it lost and debate will therefore continue.

We now have four amendments, as well as general debate. I have to say I am beginning to get a bit concerned that we may run out of time to conclude this before the close of business tomorrow and I think it would be unfortunate if this debate ended up unfinished.

2865 So I am giving advance notice that we will see how we go over the next hour-and-a-half but it may well be that at 5.30 p.m. I will be putting to you a Proposition that we continue to sit later this evening to see what progress can be made, to try to ensure that we do complete business on this policy letter, let alone anything else on the Billet, at this Meeting.

2870 We have had four amendments. In accordance with the normal convention, I propose that we take the furthest-reaching amendment first, which in my judgement is that proposed by Deputy Dudley-Owen, seconded by Deputy Prow, the one that has been identified as amendment 1.

2875 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, sir. I think, with great reluctance, Deputy Prow and I would like to withdraw this amendment. (*Applause*)

2880 **The Bailiff:** So you will not be laying it and we therefore move on to the three amendments proposed by Members of the Policy & Resources Committee. I suggest we take them in the order in which they have been listed – 2, 3 and then 4 – unless Deputy St Pier wishes to suggest that we do otherwise? So we will move to the amendment that has been marked Amendment 2, proposed by Deputy St Pier and seconded by Deputy Trott.

It is rather a long amendment. Rather than read it are you content to just summarise the effect of it, or would you like it to be read, Deputy St Pier? Amendment 2.

2885 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I think, given the importance and public interest in this matter, probably it would be better if it were to be read in full for the benefit of ...

The Bailiff: In that case, I will ask the Greffier to read it, but I understand that you wish to amend one of the figures in the amendment. Is that correct?

2890 **Deputy St Pier:** That is correct ...

The Bailiff: So it is in Proposition 2, there is a figure of £51.1 million and a few lines below, £55.1 million. My understanding is those two figures should be the same and it is the lower figure, is that right?

2895 **Deputy St Pier:** That is correct, sir.

The Bailiff: So you wish it to be £51.1 million?

Deputy Fallaize: I object to that, sir.

2900

The Bailiff: So you object to that? *(Laughter)* Congratulations on trying to enter a bit of humour into this debate!

Greffier, if you can read the amendment, but with that amendment to the amendment.

The Greffier read out the amendment.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

2905 Deputy St Pier.

[Amendment 2.](#)

To amend Propositions 1 and 2, delete and substitute Proposition 3 and delete Proposition 6 b) as follows:

1. Amend Proposition 1 so that it reads: "To note that the capital costs of the policy of organising secondary education in one 11-18 school operating in two colleges, which was agreed by the States on the 19th of January 2018, will be up to a maximum of £77.9 million; and to delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure up to a maximum of £77.9 million charged to the Capital Reserve (in respect of the total project costs comprising building, transformation and transition, and the accommodation of services to children and their families which would benefit from working in closer partnership with the school and colleges) subject to the approval of appropriate business cases submitted by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture which must demonstrate that the financial resources requested for the construction and operation of the preferred option balance cost and outcomes and therefore represent value for money, in the development of the 11-18 school and colleges on the sites of the current Les Beaucamps High School and St Sampson's High School as part of the Transforming Education Programme."

2. Amend Proposition 2 so that it reads: "To note that the capital costs of the policy of organising further and higher education in purpose-built facilities on a single site, which was agreed by the States on the 19th of January 2018, will be up to a maximum of £51.1 million; direct the Policy & Resources Committee to add this project to the capital portfolio 2021 – 2025; and delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure up to a maximum of £51.1 million charged to the Capital Reserve (in respect of the total project costs comprising building; transformation and transition) subject to the approval of appropriate business cases submitted by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture which must demonstrate that the financial resources requested for the construction and operation of the preferred option balance cost and outcomes and therefore represent value for money in the development of The Guernsey Institute at Les Ozouets as part of the Transforming Education Programme."

Delete Proposition 3 and substitute therefor:

"3. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to exercise the authority delegated to it through rigorous review and challenge of the business cases presented and, in particular, an assessment as to whether the final proposals balance costs and benefits and therefore use public resources in a way that creates and maximises public value, including:

a. the full capital costs of the project consisting of transformation, transition and community co-location costs in addition to building costs;

b. a baseline costed staffing structure, appropriately benchmarked, and explaining any deviation from existing policies;

- c. a cost benefit justification for any additional investment required to operate the proposed staffing structure for the preferred model;*
 - d. a cost benefit justification for any increased space requirements above the agreed baseline;*
 - e. a cost benefit justification for any proposed additional space above the baseline to accommodate any further projected increase in student numbers, including a justification as to why additional numbers cannot be accommodated within existing contingencies for student numbers;*
 - f. a cost benefit justification for any repurposing and refurbishment works proposed at the Les Beaucamps High School and St Sampson's High School sites;*
 - g. detail as to how the savings on revenue costs of operating the new model contribute to the "Balance of Budget Reduction" of £2.3million expected to be remaining for the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture after 2021;*
 - h. how the integration of SEN provision within the schools has impacted the space requirements in the new schools and the special school."*
4. Delete Proposition 6b.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir, mindful of your expression of concern about the time in relation to this debate I think I can open this part of the proceedings relatively quickly.

I wanted to start by speaking a moment about the process by which business cases are approved and this was a matter which was addressed a little bit during the debate a moment ago on the Sursis, in particular Deputy Laurie Queripel's concerns and comments about the approval of the full business case.

This week the Policy & Resources Committee considered the full business case for the Future Digital Services project. That was some 575 pages, it was submitted to us with considerable additional time to allow us to give it due scrutiny. We had a considerable number of officers present in our meeting to allow us to quiz and question them and indeed we did so for considerably longer than the allocated time.

What emerged from that, I think, was a sense that actually, to be honest, they would far rather not have to come in front of the Policy & Resources Committee to be quizzed on the business case and actually it might have been an easier option for them to present something else to this Assembly, rather than go through that process.

A number of things emerged from that process, including some changes by us and also a requirement that there is significant communication, particularly to Members of this Assembly, and I referred to that in my statement yesterday, sir, beginning with a presentation in October. We see that as part of the process by which Members of this Assembly can hold *us* to account for the decisions that we are responsible for under our delegated authority in relation to that project. We see that as being the model in which we can discharge our delegated authority, whilst allowing Members to hold us to account.

In relation to this amendment, we have sought to keep the structure of the Propositions in the way that the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture had originally set them out and have simply inserted text, principally into new Propositions 1 and 2, to address the issues which were of concern to the Policy & Resources Committee.

What we are seeking to do with this amendment, broadly, is address concerns in this Assembly and indeed in the wider community that there will be appropriate scrutiny given to the business cases for these various projects in the programme. I have said it before and I think I said it during the debate in relation to the hospital modernisation, I do not think anybody has ever regarded the Policy & Resources Committee as a pushover in relation to that process – indeed, quite the contrary, which I think is normally a cause of frustration and indeed Deputy Soulsby expressed that already during this sitting of the States.

I think the scepticism of a couple of the Members of the Policy & Resources Committee has indeed already been expressed through the Sursis debate and vote. So I think Members should

rest assured that the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture cannot expect an easy ride in relation to the discharge of delegated authority.

In particular, what we are seeking to do is to ensure that there is a shared acknowledgement by this Assembly, by the Policy & Resources Committee, by the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, that it is their responsibility to put in front of us, through the outline business case, evidence-based proposals which do clearly demonstrate value for money.

We are looking to retain the overall cost envelope provided by the Committee and, in doing so, of course an 'up-to' figure. That does not mean it will be that figure and we will obviously be looking to ensure that it is as low as possible within that envelope. But we have sought to allocate all the associated costs to the 11-18 or Institute projects as set out in the table on page 3 of the amendment in the explanatory note.

We felt that inserting those numbers into the text of the amendment and also by helping to identify the source of funding for that expenditure actually was a more logical way to present and seek approvals from this Assembly.

In Proposition 2, the Policy & Resources Committee is proposing that the Guernsey Institute project, which of course is not due to commence until 2021, be added as a project for the next capital portfolio which of course is due to commence in that period. We feel it is sensible to get that on the record now, rather than leaving that hanging as a loose end and a loose thread, which otherwise would be a bit of a mismatch between our current capital portfolio and the next one.

Proposition 3 seeks to clearly direct us to exercise our authority to challenge the various different cost-drivers making up the capital costs. Now, a number of Members have said to us, 'Well, you would be doing that anyway'. That is absolutely right. The matters set out in sub-paragraphs 'a' to 'h' of new Proposition 3 are absolutely the issues that we would be considering.

However, we felt it was essential to put it on the record that these are some, and I emphasise the word 'including' in that amendment, there may well be other things that we wish to consider and which will emerge through the process. But we wish to draw attention, particularly to the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, that these are the things that we, at this stage, are particularly concerned about, and I think some of these issues were the issues which the Scrutiny Management Committee also identified in their letter of comment.

We feel it is helpful to refer to these so, for example, ensuring that we do have a baseline costed staffing structure, appropriate benchmarked, a subject of significant interest in the last debate; and explaining any deviation from existing policies, for example; in relation to pupil/teacher ratios that we look at the operating costs for the proposed staffing structure. Logically, if we are merging four schools to one school over two sites, we would expect there to be a significantly different management structure. We want to see that as part of the cost-benefit justification, which is to be provided by Education, Sport & Culture.

We have an agreed process in 2018, sir, between my Committee and that of Education, Sport & Culture, which works with an external consultant to establish a baseline space requirement, which looked at the space in the two current high schools, and we are now seeking through sub-paragraph d and indeed e of Proposition 3 to ensure that the Committee justify any deviation away from that, which of course they are seeking to do through the policy letter.

There are explanations given but we think there would be further work required to justify and explain that to us; and indeed the repurposing and refurbishment of the sites as well.

Finally, in sub-paragraph g, dealing with the commitment, which is baked into the Medium-Term Financial Plan, which the Committee are signed up to, delivering £2.3 million of savings. We wish to see how those are going to be delivered in the timeframe that we would expect.

The reason that we felt not only would it help provide reassurance to this Committee and to this Assembly and the community to set those issues is, what we do not want to do is to have a gun held to our heads at any point by the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, who rock up with their business case and say, 'Ah, but the States have approved this, you have no choice but to sign-off on these business cases; the questions you are asking are inappropriate, get on and give us our blank cheque'.

So this is very much a shot across their bows that these are the issues that we will be very much focused on in order to discharge our delegated authority. Indeed, as I say, along with no doubt a number of other issues that will emerge as well. And if we are not satisfied, Policy & Resources Committee will have no hesitation whatsoever in refusing to exercise its delegated authority. I have done that already during this term of the States and we will have no hesitation in doing so again.

In that case, the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture will have two choices, to continue to engage the Policy & Resources Committee to get to a point where we are agreed on a position. Or of course they will have to bring that direct to this Assembly for a decision of this Assembly. That is the right process and we believe that that establishes a clear line of authority and indeed accountability. This was emphasised by a number of speakers in the debate on the Sursis, including Deputy Stephens, but it is worth emphasising that this approach is consistent with that adopted for the Committee *for* Health & Social Care in seeking approvals for the hospital modernisation project.

I think the two final points to make, sir, in relation to the deletion of Proposition 6b), what we are seeking to do, as is explained in the final paragraph of the explanatory note, is incorporate the sums within the amended Proposition 1 in reference to the community co-location.

Sir, the final point I wish to make is in relation to the involvement of the Scrutiny Management Committee in this. This is an issue which Deputy Merrett raised in speaking on the Sursis and indeed is an issue which Deputy Green has raised in correspondence with myself in the last few days and I think it is worth me just spending a few moments to speak to that, to help give reassurance to the Scrutiny Management Committee in view of their letter of comment, in relation to the Policy & Resources Committee's anticipated opportunity for the Scrutiny Management Committee to get involved in this process.

I think what I should refer to is two things. In last year's Budget Resolutions, there was Resolution 36(c), which was:

To agree that projects led by the Policy & Resources Committee and funded through a special Fund within the General Reserve should benefit from independent challenge and scrutiny in the same way as those led by other Committees and States' bodies and that this is the role of the Scrutiny Management Committee under the system of Government adopted in 2016 following approval of the States Review Committee's recommendations.

What that Resolution was about was concern that P&R was getting a free pass in relation to the approval process for matters which it was seeking to approve for itself, if you like. Then similarly we had similar language in paragraph 12.18 of the Future Digital Services policy letter, again a project which was led by P&R but naturally over which others had concerns as to how we would discharge our responsibilities.

Again we made the point really using the same language, that in addition:

... these projects would also benefit from independent challenge and scrutiny in the same way as those led by other Committees and States' bodies ...

– as is the role of the Scrutiny Management Committee under the system of Government, etc.

So, sir, we absolutely would welcome – and indeed I think that was the language I used during the Future Digital Services debate – the scrutiny of the Scrutiny Management Committee in exactly the way that Deputy Merrett set out when she spoke in the Sursis. That is a matter which no doubt the President of that Committee will engage with us directly, if that is a matter which that Committee wishes to pick up and deal with. We see that very much as part of the scrutiny process and the Scrutiny Management Committee is the Committee to be watching over the exercise of our delegated authority and exercising that responsibility on behalf of the Assembly if there are concerns in relation to that matter.

So, sir, I hope that explains not only the content of the amendment but also the rationale and purpose and helps offer some assurance that the Policy & Resources Committee does not see the Education, Sport & Culture Committee and this policy letter in any way as being any different

from any other. I think Deputy Stephens spoke to that earlier. We seek to apply without fear or favour, whether it is our own projects, whether it is projects coming from Health & Social Care or indeed anywhere else, the same processes, procedures and standards and we have concerns in relation to this project, as we would with any project of this scale, that we will need to satisfy ourselves of before we exercise our delegated authority, failing which the matter will end up back on the floor of this Assembly, as indeed it should.

With that I do encourage Members to support this amendment as an improvement to the original Proposition.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott, do you second the amendment?

Deputy Trott: I do sir and intend to speak later.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize, do you wish to speak now?

Deputy Fallaize: Briefly, sir, if I may. I think this would not be an education debate worthy of the name without an amendment from Policy & Resources which more or less tries to delete all of the Committee's Propositions and put some more of their own in its place. So I am grateful for their expected move.

I was slightly concerned by Deputy St Pier's rather foreboding remarks. I do not think he was trying to pre-empt the possibility of the two Committees being unable to agree or my Committee being unable to persuade his Committee of the merit of our detailed business cases when he said it would end up back on the floor of Assembly; although obviously it would, if the two Committees were unable to reach agreement, because that is the way the process works. But we will try to avoid that.

I think that the amendment probably is going to provide some, at least clarity and perhaps reassurance to some Members about what it is the Policy & Resources Committee will be seeking to scrutinise in detail, when subsequent phases of the business case are produced. And I can understand why the amendment has been laid. I suppose it is going to make it slightly more onerous for our Committee than it might have been otherwise, but I think that is probably a small price to pay if it provides Members with the additional reassurance which some of them seek.

For that reason, sir, my Committee cannot see any good reason to oppose the amendment. I have not spoken to Members of the Committee in sufficient detail to know whether they will vote in favour of the amendment, but I know that the Committee does not oppose the amendment and I personally will vote in favour of it and hope, bearing in mind your words of not very long ago about the debate that is inevitably left and the time we are at now, that we can dispose of this amendment quite quickly and accept it.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Sir, I want to really oppose the amendment as a protest, because it is almost a summary of the difficulties this States has had. We have over-complicated business cases for what are political and administrative and public sector issues and a four-page amendment – I was told off when I was drafting them at more than three or four paragraphs long.

Extreme complexity that is not a little bit at odds with Education, Sport & Culture thinking, although I think the President has been gracious in conceding it, it is certainly rather at odds with much of the thrust of the Scrutiny Management Committee Report. From the point of view of an individual Scrutiny Member, Deputy Laurie Queripel, who spoke quite eloquently and persuasively earlier, effectively unless there is a significant disagreement behind the scenes it takes away from this Assembly or its successor any real ability, with the exception of primary education, which we will come to in a later amendment, to comment or contribute further.

3090 That, I think, is very regrettable because you are seeing what amounts to not exactly a cabinet,
but a process whereby everything from a Treasury and expenditure point of view is second-
guessed beyond the ability, really, of not only most Members of the States but the wider public.
And although we have had some assurances already from Deputy Fallaize and others, that we will
not return to the bad old days when Members of the former Treasury & Resources Committee
would say, 'Your corridors are too wide, narrow them and make the dining room smaller ...' and all
3095 that sort of thing. I do think that we need to balance the contending issues here.

Deputy Trott said something earlier which disturbed me a bit because he said, probably
representing a substantial number of electors, value for money is the most important political
priority. But I would say, conflicting with that is the quality and fit-for-purpose of the facilities that
we provide and of course the political art of alchemy is somehow finding the formula in between.
3100 I do think a lot of this is awkward.

Perhaps the one area of the amendment that I am quite supportive of, though, is the remarks
about looking at staff efficiencies and economies and reorganisation of education on that level,
because there certainly are two questions that are never satisfactorily answered about our system.
The first is that we do not have particularly generous classroom-size ratios and, as Deputy Fallaize
3105 has pointed out earlier, one of his motivations for the change is to improve the quality of
education we offer for everyone, and we perhaps punch below our weight in terms of statistical
comparisons with some of the more affluent areas of southern England.

Despite that our cost *per capita* in terms of cost-per-pupil in the Guernsey public sector, is
relatively high, even allowing for the Alderney situation. To that extent we need a root-and-branch
3110 reconsideration.

But of course it is interesting too that the NASUWT have perhaps expressed reservations which
go beyond just the idea of half-heartedly supporting the former Sursis. They very much were
concerned about promises made to staff about a much wider selection of issues and, to quote
from what they said, the National Association of Schoolmasters and Union of Women Teachers –
3115 an odd phrase because 'schoolmaster' is a rather a Victorian phrase, but never mind:

The NASUWT is disappointed around the lack of details in key areas ...

That is in the report that we are coming to probably tomorrow, now.

... particularly around the staffing models and structures for the two colleges, and safeguarding arrangements for
other teachers who may be displaced from management positions.

The Union is [also] disappointed, that the delays to the publication [of the *Policy Letter*] means it has been released
with [only two weeks] of the school term remaining.

Of course, Proposition 3 in this amendment, does cover some of that ground but it does seem
to me a rather curious way of doing it that Policy & Resources, effectively, begins to have a veto
on issues that the whole States, and particularly Education, Sport & Culture, should be resolving
3120 themselves.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: This is probably not going to be a very good speech –
3125

Deputy Gollop: I have ended my speech.

Deputy Inder: Oh, you have? No, I was not referring to your speech; I was referring to my
speech! (*Laughter*) I am just going to pick up on a couple of things.

3130 I see Deputy Fallaize and his Committee have agreed the amendment, but it seems a bit of an
oddity really, because elements in here, if I read Proposition 1 to be amended, it states here that
ESC effectively:

... must demonstrate that the financial resources requested for the construction and operation of the preferred option balance cost and outcomes and therefore represent value for money, in the development of the 11-18 school and colleges ...

Now, I can understand how Policy & Resources would want to look at the construction because the reality is, and everyone has heard me before, I just do not trust any figures which come out of this Government when it comes to construction. I was not particularly comfortable with the previous Committee's costs. I remember, strangely, looking at the Grammar School and being told the redevelopment of the Grammar School was going to be at £20 million to £25 million and it seemed to be windows, heating and roofs. If I remember correctly, a lot of these roofs have been replaced. It seemed a hell of a lot of money for what is a fairly modern building to make those kinds of changes to it.

I am not picking a fight with anyone in particular here, I just generally do not trust costs that emanate out of it. The always seem to go in values of £1 million, £5 million, £10 million, £20 million and £50 million, and there is never anything in between.

What I remember about La Mare primary school, well it was exactly the same as Houquette in terms of its build. I think Houquette had its problems with its swimming pool. If I remember correctly the primary school pool was closed I think at La Mare primary, I believe that to be the case, or it had some problems with it. But the only difference from the two schools was, basically, La Mare de Carteret Primary School had never been maintained and Houquette looked very nice.

That was the difference and I could never understand the arguments where, effectively ... And there is an element within Government and again, please, I am not trying to make this personal in any way, it is almost like there is a lack of duty and care over our assets and we almost allow them to dive into nothing, with I would not say necessarily the purpose, that someone is going to get a big bill cheque at the end of it.

So when I read this amendment I kind of understand the construction bit, the value engineering. It might be the case ... And that was the other thing in my ex-life, I never really quite understood why Education had, I suppose, almost its own project management team. After 18 months, I would have thought by now what Policy & Resources are asking to do should have been done through the process, unless Education just decided in the last six months that that is how the layout of the two schools are going to be and they just have not had time. It is not clear to me why we have got two very different portions of what is, again, a small Island, we are not talking a large country, somewhere up in Sheffield or somewhere down in Kent, we should be able to do these things a lot more efficiently, a lot more cheaply.

I will save it for general debate but I am surprised, if nothing else, and this is picking up that which Deputy Brouard said, why the costs have not been hammered out already in the last 18 months. That was the expectancy. So that is the construction bit, sort of out of the way. I can see why there needs to be some oversight.

But on the operation bit, the operation part of it is key to the whole of the 11-18 model. You could find problems in construction and you can change the size of buildings, you can move them around, you can reconfigure them, you can make them out of log cabins. I am sorry; been there, done that.

The explanatory note says:

... Policy & Resources [*Committee*] is supportive of implementing the policy changes agreed by the States in 2018

So, in effect they are saying that they agree with the 11-18 model. Yet, if they go through a value-for-money exercise and find that the operation bit, i.e. the people and the running of it, does not work, you are back into the States and it will not be this Policy & Resources – well, it might be, it may be Deputy St Pier – I am not expecting this to happen in *this* States and even if it does it is probably going to be a week or two before we dissolve this States, we have got a brand new Policy & Resources council. This is effectively being taken into the next election.

Now it is fairly clear, I have told everyone who will listen, that I will not be supporting the two-school model. I have told Deputy Fallaize before, that I was never going to brief against it, but it

3180 will not get my support. But, if it is successful, and it is likely to be, over the next two days, I would be careful of this because ultimately, Deputy Fallaize, through you, sir, is that you could find another Policy & Resources decides that the operating figures do not work and you do not have the two 11-18 schools. In fact you are likely to have, which I think is rather sensible, basically a sixth form on a single site.

3185 So I would be careful what you wish for here, because I do not think it may end up being what you think it is in this bubble over the last four years and going through another election cycle. You might find something, a completely different outcome, which would actually suit me because I am not a great believer in the two-school system. The operation costs alone, I understand the construction. I do not trust any figures that come out of Government at all, without much more oversight, but as soon as the operation, you have a problem with the value-for-money part of the operational costs, you have not got two 11-18 schools any more.

Deputy Tindall: Sir, can I invoke Rule 26(1), please?

3195 **The Bailiff:** Rule 26(1)? Will those who have not yet spoken but wish to do so, please stand in their places. I see five people standing. Do you wish to go ahead?

Deputy Tindall: Yes, please, sir.

3200 **The Bailiff:** I put to you therefore the motion that debate be terminated. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I think even Deputy Lester Queripel would not call for a recorded vote on that one! It was clearly lost.

Deputy Green.

3205

Deputy Green: Sir, thank you very much. I can be mercifully brief.

I think this amendment, sir, is helpful and I think it does begin to address some of the reservations that the Scrutiny Management Committee expressed in its letter of comment, specifically in relation to price estimates used by the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture and also in relation to value-for-money aspects.

3210

It does begin to address some of those concerns and anxieties that we had put on the record in that letter of comment. I think I am probably minded to support it, although it is subject to a slight reservation, which I will go into in a moment. But certainly hitherto, sir, my Committee has expressed concerns about financial and other practical aspects of the proposals to date. As I referred to previously, I think in the ordinary course of events it would be the expectation from the Scrutiny Management Committee that the outline business cases would be complete, the individual components would be then subject to another parliamentary hurdle.

3215

But because that is not on the table now – there are no concrete proposals for that – I think in such circumstances, and a perfectly valid alternative course of action to address the concerns that we have might be for the usual scrutiny function to be exercised by P&R but on top of that for there to be an element of either SMC or commissioned independent actor to provide an additional oversight and appraisal of further business cases to ensure a greater level of financial rigour. Of course, my Committee always has the option of calling a public hearing on top of that.

3220

So there is scope there and Deputy St Pier referred to the two instances where this has been amplified before. It was not actually in the Resolutions as such, in relation to the Future Digital Services policy letter, but there was that extract that he read out from paragraph 12.18 about how a system of Government should work and how we would be able to undertake additional scrutiny. So that is something that we can and will do in the event.

3225

3230 But I do think, though, there is one point that I need to make. I think that is absolutely fine in relation to Proposition 1 and Proposition 3, in terms of the amendment. I think it is perhaps the case that our position in the letter of comment and generally as the Scrutiny Management Committee, is that we did form the view that there were perhaps other more unanswered questions in relation to the subject matter of Proposition 2, which is something that I will again refer to in general debate.

3235 Nonetheless, in the broadest possible terms, sir, I think these Propositions as embodied in amendment 2 would be preferable to the Propositions that we have from the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture. So subject to that qualification and, as I say sir, subject to the opening comment which I made, which I think this begins to address some of the concerns. On that basis, I will support this amendment.

3240 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle. Sorry, Deputy Trott, as the seconder.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir.

Thank you for calling me. I appreciate that.

3245 Deputy St Pier did a typically excellent job in managing expectations and it was the primary reason why I voted for the Sursis because in Deputy Dudley-Owen's opening remarks this morning there was absolutely nothing she said that I could disagree with – although I think that the explanations that followed from Members of ESC explained in some detail why the Sursis was far from perfect.

3250 Interestingly, though, I think in any other Assembly that I have served in the Sursis brought by Deputies Dudley-Owen and Prow would have been successful. The only reason it was not, in my view, is because Policy & Resources has made a very strong case as to the robustness of the process it will undertake.

3255 Now, I always enjoy listening to Deputy Laurie Queripel, he is a highly principled Member of the States, and again I completely understood his conundrum. He is, as an elected Member of this Assembly, a custodian of the public purse and it was quite a considerable leap of faith for him, assuming of course he does support this amendment, to delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee in the manner in which it is intended.

3260 I need to give him an unequivocal assurance that I will not hesitate in insisting that the Policy & Resources Committee brings matters back to this Assembly if, at any stage, the difference between the opinion of P&R and that of ESC is material enough to justify it. I would hope that Members will take what I have just said at face value and in the manner in which it is delivered.

3265 I once worked in the City and I worked with a cockney trader. He was a particularly good one, and he had a saying that he repeated regularly. He used to say, 'These fings ain't door numbers.' What he meant by that was that some of the numbers that we were trading were huge. This construction project and the costs associated with it are huge. In fact that has been a trend over the course of the last couple of years, because some of the contracts we have been considering have been enormous by any relative or comparable standard.

3270 So now a little bit of detail. In the amendment which is seeking to delete Proposition 3 and substituting the words that the Greffier read out, there are five subsections that I want to particularly concentrate on and that is 'a' to 'e', and 'a' says that there will be a:

... rigorous review and challenge of the business cases presented and, in particular, an assessment as to whether the final proposals balance cost and benefits and therefore use public resources in a way that creates and maximises public value, including: a. the full capital cost of the project ...

3275 – which includes transition costs. Now, why do I say that? Because a significant element of the transition costs are a provision for cover staff to cover those teachers who will be undertaking and attending additional professional development and training before the new schools open. Now, one could argue that is normal course of business. I am not, particularly, but it is an example of where there might be a specific challenge.

Where I think the issue is more material is 'b', a baseline-costed staffing structure. Why is that so important? Well, 80% of the cost of providing education services is the cost of staff; primarily or course their salaries and States' insurance contributions. So it is very material indeed. Why is it material, in particular? Well, if we look at 'c':

... a cost benefit justification for any additional investment required to operate the proposed staffing structure ...

We know from work that has already been done that Guernsey-based teachers earn, on a like-for-like basis, at least 30% more than their UK cousins. Now, much of the argument for that over the years has been, 'Well, they are coming here to work in a system that they do not understand.' But of course this moves us to something that is much more similar to a UK model, much larger schools in a non-selective system. So it should follow, that notwithstanding there is a small premium, taking the UK as a whole, for living here in Guernsey. The cost of living here in Guernsey is lower than living in central London, for instance, and many of the teachers that are benchmarked live in or around our metropolis.

So that is an example of where there has to be some focus. Now, the unions may not like that but I have said this before, it is a fact, the evidence is there, they earn a premium working within our existing system:

d. a cost benefit justification for any increased space requirements above the agreed baseline;

Every Treasury Minister since the first one – which was me actually in 2004 – will tell you that the issues around space standards have been an issue. There were an issue during Deputy Parkinson's tenure and they were certainly an issue during Deputy St Pier's. Space standards are a very important point, a very important factor when determining how a school should look.

That leads me neatly, no there is one other point in 'e': the cost-benefit justification for any proposed additional space must take into account whether there are any existing contingencies for student numbers. Well, some people will look at me no doubt as if I am a heretic, but the private colleges who currently, as you know, educate about one third of our secondary pupils, play a part in that; and there are number of initiatives that have taken place that will see not only a considerably larger footprint for one of the colleges in particular, but also the introduction of a bursary system to help those less-advantaged students to have an education within that facility if they so wish. So that needs to be taken into account, and so on.

So, now to the programme business case. The programme business case tells us that the outline business case will be submitted during October 2019. There is much debate on this and that is, of course, next month. The launch of the main contractor procurement tendering process will occur in the same month, leading to the award of a contract by March of next year and for the first spades to go into the ground in June 2020. That is, by everyone's admission, an incredibly optimistic schedule.

The balance of probabilities is that it will not be met. Now, that is not me standing here and adopting a defeatist attitude. I am standing here giving the benefit of a reasonable amount of experience with contracts of this type over a career that has seen me not only in this place, but also I worked for a number of years as the finance director of the largest firm of chartered architects and chartered surveyors in the Channel Islands. I know how these things happen in the private sector, as well as with us.

That is incredibly ambitious and there are a very significant number of hurdles for the Education, Sport & Culture Committee to jump through. But what they can be assured of is that Policy & Resources Committee will do its best. But one of the things I have learned over the last couple of decades here is that you have got to manage expectations. In fact, Deputy Roffey taught me something years ago when we were doing corporate tax reform. He said we should have explained a certain element of corporate tax report reform with slightly more detail. I had assumed that the community had a greater understanding of that than they did.

I do not want anyone pointing the finger at Policy & Resources and saying that we did not make it clear that if this timetable is going to be met, all hands are going to be needed on deck

3325 from the onset. I do not want anyone under any illusions. However, as I said, we will do our very best.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

3330 **Deputy de Lisle:** Sir, Deputy Trott has spoken about the enormity of this particular Transformation Education Programme in terms of its cost – £157 million when we came in here, initially. Now, with these amendments, everything has gone up, again. Just in a few minutes things have gone up, first of all in terms of by almost £20 million, let's put that way. We are not talking about £157 million; we are talking about £167 million, £177 million, perhaps £180 million.
3335 *(Interjections)* Just looking at organising secondary education –

Deputy Trott: On a point of correction, if I may?

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Trott.

3340

Deputy Trott: We are talking about just under £80 million; that is what we are talking about today.

Deputy de Lisle: Just under £80 million in terms of Proposition 1. But I have here £69 million
3345 and now it is just under £80 million.

In terms of Proposition 2, what I had originally was £47.5 million. Now I am looking at either £51.1 million or £55.1 million, an increase of another £8 million. So things have gone up.

What is going on? Please tell me. *(Laughter)*

3350 **Deputy Fallaize:** Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Deputy de Lisle is claiming that things and total costs have gone up because
3355 there have been changes between original Proposition 1 and the Proposition 1 in the amendment, and original Proposition 2 and Proposition 2 in the amendment. But if he looks at original Proposition 3 and Proposition 3 in the amendment, he will find that original Proposition 3 includes £8.6 million of costs and amended Proposition 3 includes no costs at all. So what has happened in this amendment is that Deputy St Pier has proposed wrapping up the transition and
3360 transformation costs within the total capital costs of, in the first instance, the 11-18 school project and secondly in the Guernsey Institute Project.

So there is no overall increase in the total cost envelope. It is a redistribution of the cost between different Propositions. I can assure Deputy de Lisle there is no increase in cost beyond what is proposed in the Committee's Propositions.

3365

Deputy de Lisle: Sir, it seems to me that Deputy Fallaize and Deputy St Pier have been speaking together before this Meeting, *(Laughter)* because this is elementary mathematics – £69 million to £77 million is plus £9 million and, as far as I am concerned £47 million to £55 million is another plus eight. All right, you want to take a few off Proposition 3 but we are still
3370 looking at more money on a programme that I feel is way above, sir –

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction Deputy Fallaize.

3375 **Deputy Fallaize:** I thought that by running through what had happened, Deputy de Lisle would, with the greatest respect, get the idea. But if he carries on going through that process, if he looks through the amendment he will also find that there is a Proposition to delete 6b from our Propositions, which is the cost related to the Health and Care and Education co-located facilities at the 11-18 colleges, which has been wrapped up in Proposition 1 in the amendment.

3380 That is how you get from the costs as they were originally expressed to the costs as they are expressed in the amendment. That goes through it item by item.

There is definitely no increase in costs beyond that which was proposed by my Committee and that is set out in the table in the explanatory note. Deputy St Pier did inadvertently put £55 million in one of the Propositions and it was meant to be £51 million but fortunately somebody pointed that out to him, so that has now been corrected. But there is no increase in the aggregate cost. I can assure Deputy de Lisle of that and I am sure he can see that if he refers to the table.

3385

Deputy de Lisle: I thank you for the explanations.

I just go back to the enormity of this particular transformation and the fact is that even at £157 million, without all these amendments and so on, it is an awful lot of money and I think I will be looking at these amendments as we go down the road to the third and fourth to perhaps strike a little more off this enormity.

3390

Thank you, sir.

3395 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you sir.

On reading this amendment, it initially struck me as something that should have been happening already but P&R felt the need to make explicit for Members who felt slightly uneasy with the idea of passing the amendment. However, on getting on to the proposed Proposition 3h I have some concerns. Now the current proposition 'h' reads:

3400

h. how the integration of SEN provision within the schools has impacted the space requirements in the new schools and the special school.

The word 'integration' in terms of SEN provision does send alarm bells. Now, I understand from communications that I have had from Members of P&R that that was not the intention, to propose a change in direction away from inclusion towards integration, but rather about space requirements. However, I still would feel better knowing that the very clear possibility of looking at space, before looking at the individual educational requirements of all of those children with special educational needs and disabilities, and all of the inclusion is looked at before you start playing around with space.

3405

So, as a result of that, if this amendment passes and Proposition 3 is therefore replaced with the substantive Proposition, I intend to lay an amendment which seeks to replace Proposition 'h' and just make explicitly clear that the review on SEN education will happen without delay, because there has been 18 months of going backwards and forwards, and even longer than that, and it is well overdue and we need to have it done in a sensitive environment and not debated on the floor of the Assembly, or have parts of the provision looked at before a proper review is done.

3410

So I apologise for the lateness of that, but everything is ready to go. I did not want to lay it if there was no need to lay it, essentially. But if this does pass, I will be laying it to remove Proposition 'h' and replace it with a suitable alternative.

3415

The Bailiff: Just before I call Deputy Kuttelwascher, I understand Deputy Trott wishes to correct something that he said earlier.

3420

Deputy Trott: Yes, sir.

I knew what I meant but it would be easy for others to misinterpret it.

Deputy de Lisle rose immediately after I had spoken and I had spoken almost exclusively on the 11-18 school construction costs and the transition costs that are associated with it. That is broken down between £69 million-worth of capital costs and £8.6 million-worth of transition costs, which comes to just under £78 million, or the under £80 million I was referring to. We were talking at cross-purposes and therefore what Deputy de Lisle was saying was correct, what I was referring to was the items that I had focussed on in my speech. I just wanted to make that clear and I am grateful to you sir for the opportunity.

Deputy de Lisle: I thank Deputy Trott for the correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

I just want to focus on one point and that is the issue of value for money. I am going to ask rather a simple question of P&R which is: what do they understand by the term value for money? How do they propose to assess it or indeed measure it? And what would the minimum value be, such that is acceptable for this to go ahead?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

It is the value-for-money area that I wanted to speak about as well. Deputy Trott has been very consistent in his value for money on this and that was his vote last time and if it was not going to be value for money he would actually reject it when it came back to the States. Well, as we have said before, this is now not going to come back to the States it is going to P&R, which I am disappointed with.

Nevertheless, he has said just now in his speech, that he will insist it comes back if it is not value for money, which is a comfort. But will that come back if he is in a minority of one, or if a majority of P&R actually believe that it is value for money that it will not actually come back to the States. So I would like clarification when, perhaps, Deputy St Pier sums up on this amendment, unless Deputy Trott wanted to actually say something else. He is welcome to do so. That is key for me because he has been consistent with that.

I think there is so much about this value for money, which Deputy Kuttelwascher has just mentioned, and Deputy Laurie Queripel has been fighting this corner for quite some time as well, and I think with such a large amount of money we do need to make sure that it is value for money. And regardless of whether we support the whole thing or not it is important that it is value for money.

On this amendment it has actually got to note the capital costs, that is at number 2, it is on record that 2021 will be in situ for number 2, which is fine. Actually, number 2, I would prefer that was more of a priority than the one-school two sites, but they have gone ahead with leaving this one for a later date which is a bit disappointing really. Nevertheless that is Education's wish.

Again, this will be on record, will it not? Because the States, if they approve this amendment, that it will commence 2021. But of course June 2020 will be a different States, so there is still no guarantee what is before us today or what the States approve today will still go ahead later on, further down the line, even though it is in the Statute Books – because we know the States can change anything any time they like.

We also get to number 3, this is the staffing structure, so it is 3b and P&R said just before that they want to see a reduction in the staff because that has been promoted some time previously and Deputy St Pier said today that he expects to see that. There have also been messages coming out from Education that there will be no staff redundancies. The two do not sit together, there, so again I think there may be difficulties there, I do not know, they might be just talking about

teaching staff where Deputy St Pier might be talking about management structure. But again this is an area where there may be mixed messages coming out, but who will make that final decision when they are talking about finances and value for money?

3480 Then I move down to 3e and this was the projected increase in the student numbers. Again, Deputy Trott picked this one up just now because he would be fully aware that we have been in this situation before where a school was designed, take St Sampson's School, that was sent back to the drawing board because the plans that were before the States could have accommodated an awful lot more students than the final school that was actually approved by the States. And that again was because it came back to this States' Assembly and there was a debate at that time
3485 on it.

If it had not come back we would have had a school, which might suit now because I think it was 919 – Deputy Trott, looking at you nodding there? But it was something like that, it was an awful lot bigger school than we have currently got, because there was a reduction in size. Again there are projections, or I would expect projections have taken place for several years, really,
3490 because the schools we have got in place have been there for some considerable time and we have not necessarily had that situation where this sort of data has not taken part when you are designing the school. I am talking about St Sampson's School again, there.

So for me there are still quite a few questions here which I would like answered. Some of those cannot be answered today, because if this goes through the delegation will go to P&R, and I will
3495 make my decision how I vote on the final amended Propositions if this amendment goes through, but I wish to put on record the queries that I have got.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier will reply.

3500

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Gollop, in opening debate after I had spoken, was going to object but of course did not really have any alternative in the absence of these amendments, in terms of being able to improve upon the issue which he objected to, which was namely the delegation of authority. I
3505 think his objection is really a bit empty. It does not achieve anything other than just a statement.

Deputy Inder raised the question about the fact that, from his experience on serving on the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, he was surprised that it had its own project management team. He is not the only one to have expressed that surprise. It is a good point. It is, of course, an historical legacy, from the EDP programme stretching right back to – I look to
3510 longer-sitting Members of the Assembly – 2001, and all that followed from that before the various iterations and reform of Government.

I think the Policy & Resources Committee and indeed the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture are themselves agreed that it makes little sense to retain that structure and I think it is certainly one of the issues which we would look to address: how that is sensibly integrated during
3515 the course of this delivery of this programme.

Deputy Green, I am grateful for his support. I understand his reservations but, in light of the letter of comment from the Scrutiny Management Committee, I am glad he does feel that this does begin, to use his phrase, to address these concerns. Of course there is additional independent oversight. He referred to that being one of the issues which his Committee could
3520 commission. The projection assurance review process of course is part of an ongoing commitment to the process anyway, so anything else would of course be additional to that if his Committee felt that was appropriate.

Sir, I hope Deputy Trott and Deputy Fallaize managed to reassure Deputy de Lisle that the numbers in this amendment are no different from the original Propositions. I think the table, if
3525 Deputy de Lisle still has any concerns, on pages 3 and 4 of the amendment, in the explanatory note – and it is probably unhelpful that it is split over the two pages as opposed to being on a single page. He will notice the grand total at the top of page 4 on that table, £157.2 million, is the

one that ties in with the original Propositions. It is simply a reallocation and, there is no increase, as I think others have already said.

3530 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, I am grateful to her for giving prior notice, both through the debate and before that she does intend to amend further in relation to 3h, I think it is. Clearly from P&R's perspective we obviously need to see the exact wording of that but the intention, as she acknowledged, I do not think there is any clash necessarily of intentions and if it would help to have further clarity from her perspective, I cannot imagine there will be great objection.

3535 Deputy Kuttelwascher asked about value for money. He of course would be very familiar with this argument. It went around and round during his term, with me on the Treasury & Resources Department, in considering proposals from a previous Education Department in relation to La Mare. Of course he will know from those discussions that we were absolutely adamant that it does not mean the cheapest by any means.

3540 It means looking at things like the whole-life cost for an asset, in terms of not just its build cost but what it is going to cost to actually run that asset over the course of its life. It means looking at the operating costs, for example, of the system, whatever it is that you are seeking to assess, against the benefits that you are looking to get out of that expenditure. So I think it is important to emphasise that it does not mean the cheapest.

3545 Deputy Lowe's question in relation to Deputy Trott perhaps being a lonely minority figure of one on Policy & Resources, in relation to the issue of value for money, she will know and she is the first to remind us, that we are a committee system of Government and we operate within that. However, she will also know, having served with Deputy Trott for many years that he is a pretty persuasive character. He is not a shy wallflower, embarrassed to express his opinion, and I am sure
3550 he will do so forcefully within Committee if he does have concerns.

But I think more importantly and I am perhaps more seriously emphasising the point, that he is not an outlier in Policy & Resources Committee in relation to his concern on the issue of achieving value for money through this process on this project, and indeed on any other projects that come before us.

3555 In relation to staff numbers that Deputy Lowe questioned and suggesting there was an inconsistency. I do not think there is necessarily an inconsistency in the undertaking that the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture have given in relation to no redundancies, because there may still be an opportunity to reduce numbers as a result of natural wastage or actual turnover, as people retire and so on, or otherwise choose to leave. Also there is an opportunity to
3560 save costs, for example, by examining closely management allowances, which are significant across the four schools and which one expects to come under very close scrutiny as you combine into a single management structure under a single school.

Again hopefully that gives some reassurance to Deputy Lowe of how those two positions can be reconciled and that is exactly the kind of thing that we do need to be giving very close to
3565 scrutiny to, sir. And with that, sir, I do ask Members to support the amendment.

The Bailiff: We go to the vote, then, on amendment 2, proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Trott. And Deputy Lester Queripel is about to request a recorded vote.

3570 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** A recorded vote, please, sir.

The Bailiff: A recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 29, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR

Deputy Graham
Deputy Green

CONTRE

Deputy Paint
Deputy Dudley-Owen

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Mooney

Deputy Dorey	Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Prow
Deputy Brouard	Deputy Gollop
Deputy Yerby	Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Merrett
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Oliver	
Alderney Rep. Roberts	
Alderney Rep. Snowdon	
Deputy Ferbrache	
Deputy Kuttelwascher	
Deputy Tindall	
Deputy Brehaut	
Deputy Tooley	
Deputy Parkinson	
Deputy Le Clerc	
Deputy Trott	
Deputy St Pier	
Deputy Stephens	
Deputy Fallaize	
Deputy Inder	
Deputy Lowe	
Deputy Laurie Queripel	
Deputy Smithies	
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel	

The Bailiff: The voting on amendment 2, proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Trott, was 29 in favour and 10 against, I declare it carried.

3575 We will move onto amendment 3, to be proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Trott again.

[Amendment 3.](#)

To delete Proposition 4 and replace with:

4. To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to complete the reviews required as a result of the extant Resolutions with regard to the future of primary education (Billet d'État XX 2013) before submitting proposals for the rebuilding of La Mare de Carteret Primary School.

3580 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, again I think I will read this for the benefit of those listening outside who may not be familiar with what we are seeking to do. We are seeking to delete Proposition 4, which deals with the approval and the granting of various delegated authorities in the motion to La Mare de Carteret Primary School and to replace it with the following:

To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to complete the reviews required as a result of the extant Resolutions with regard to the future of primary education (Billet d'État XX 2013) before submitting proposals for the rebuilding of La Mare de Carteret Primary School.

I refer Members to the explanatory note on the amendment and at the end of that explanatory note is a copy of the Resolutions from 2013 that are referenced in the new proposed Proposition.

3585 Sir, when the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture came to see us during the process of preparing their policy letter, they indicated their intent to address this and indeed some other issues, which are perhaps dealt with on the next amendment.

3590 We strongly encouraged them not to seek to do that, we would have discouraged them, I suppose would be a better way around, from expanding their policy letter to do too much, In other words, we felt it was more appropriate to focus simply on the question of 11-18 secondary and post-16 education rather than seeking to drag many other issues into the policy letter and the debate. I think the expression used is, 'Don't attempt to boil the ocean in your policy letter'.

They heard that view and advice but chose not to follow it and have prepared their policy letter on that basis. The Policy & Resources Committee's view has not changed. We remain of the view that actually it is appropriate that the States should have an opportunity to understand what the wider picture is in relation to primary education, before proceeding further with the La Mare de Carteret primary school rebuild.

We are not, for the avoidance of doubt, putting a stake in the ground that we are any way opposed to that. But we simply feel that at this stage that we do not have enough information as a Policy & Resources Committee, to be able to support that until we understand what the big picture is.

Now, in many ways there is a bit of an irony as to how we have got to this point, sir, with Deputy Fallaize now as the President of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture. He will recall the fairly bruising debates in the last term when former Deputy Robert Sillars was the Education Minister and he and I sat I think where Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Le Clerc are now, through several rather uncomfortable debates.

The essence of that was in relation to the La Mare de Carteret secondary school rebuild and the Treasury & Resources Committee, on which as was previously referenced, Deputy Kuttelwascher sat at the time, made a case, which of course we did eventually win, that it was not appropriate for the States to be asked to approve the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret secondary school until such time as the then Education Department considered the impact of selection.

They had made it clear they were going to look at selection, but they said, 'We have not got time to do it now. We need to crack on with the secondary rebuild. It will make no difference, there will always be a school at La Mare secondary site. We are absolutely certain of that; there is no reason to undertake to delay any further.'

We felt that at that time that made no sense whatsoever. Deputy Fallaize at that time agreed and felt that it made no sense whatsoever and of course that led to the train of events which has brought us here through various debates, to the point that we have been debating the one school on two sites.

So that is a very good comparison or analogy to what we are now being asked to do in relation to the current Proposition 4 in the policy letter, which is to approve the rebuild of the primary school without having that full picture. It is with that that we do encourage that work is done. Again, we do understand it will not be easy, it will not be necessarily a particularly comfortable piece of work to do. But we do think it should be done before the States is asked to commit the £22.4 million which is set out in the table of the previous amendment, which is perhaps the figure that Deputy de Lisle was referring to in that debate.

Indeed, we have made it clear in our explanatory note and are happy to do so through this debate and indeed in subsequent correspondence with the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, that if they do not have the resources to crack on and do that piece of work, and they do regard it is essential that they do so, then we will need to have a look at how we enable that with resources because it is clearly critical before we start making further capital decisions in relation to the primary estate. That is the rationale for this amendment and we do strongly encourage Members to support it before proceeding any further in this debate.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott, do you second the amendment?

Deputy Trott: Yes, sir, with pleasure, and I reserve my right to speak later.

Deputy Yerby: Rule 24(4), please, sir.

The Bailiff: Sorry?

Deputy Yerby: Rule 24(4), please.

The Bailiff: Okay, Rule 24(4) is the one that requires those who support the amendment to stand in their places. It is not one that we often refer to. Let me just read to you Rule 24(4):

Immediately after an amendment or sursis has been proposed and formally seconded (i.e. before any speech by its seconder or further debate) any Member may request the Presiding Officer to invite Members who support debate on the amendment or sursis to stand in their places; neither the Member making that request nor any other may address the Meeting about it; and if fewer than seven Members stand when so invited the amendment or sursis shall not be debated, and no vote thereon shall be taken.

3645 So I invite Members who support debate on this amendment to stand in their places. Sixteen people are standing, so that is more than seven. Debate will continue.
Deputy Fallaize, do you wish to speak?

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, is it your intention to ask the States to sit beyond 5.30 p.m?

3650 **The Bailiff:** How long are you likely to be in your opening?

Deputy Fallaize: That depends how long the States sit for.

3655 **The Bailiff:** The Committee are opposing this amendment, I suppose? (**Deputy Fallaize:** Yes.) Ah, yes, the Committee are opposing this amendment.

Can I have an indication of how many Members might wish to speak on the amendment? Again, that is 10 people speaking. That clearly will take some time but equally if we do not complete it this evening I think we are in danger of running out of time tomorrow. So I will put to you the Proposition that we continue to sit this evening. Obviously if you do not want to do that, vote against.

3660 I put to you the Proposition that we continue to sit this evening to deal with this amendment. Those in favour; those against?

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

Deputy Lester Queripel: A recorded vote, please sir. (*Laughter*)

3665 **The Bailiff:** A recorded vote, then, on whether we continue to sit to deal with this amendment.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 23, Contre 16, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	Deputy Green	None	Deputy Mooney
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Paint		
Deputy Yerby	Deputy Dorey		
Deputy de Lisle	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Prow		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Oliver		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Ferbrache		
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy Kuttelwascher		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon	Deputy Gollop		
Deputy Tindall	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Leadbeater		
Deputy Tooley	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy Meerveld		
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Inder		
Deputy Trott	Deputy Smithies		
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy St Pier			

Deputy Stephens
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

The Bailiff: There are 23 in favour, with 16 against. That motion is carried. So we will continue to sit.

3670 But I wonder if we do end up with a lot of people leaving, and I appreciate people may have other commitments, it might make sense, perhaps, to hold the vote tomorrow morning so that those who do have – (*Interjections*) otherwise, because if end – (*Interjections*)

Deputy Tooley: Sir, can I ask how we can hold the vote until after the debate if people have not been here for the debate?

3675 **The Bailiff:** Because they may be listening to it on their radios.

Deputy Tooley: But they could do that any day.

3680 **The Bailiff:** Well we will see how we go. Let's see how we go. It depends. There are 10 people to speak. I think if we get to 6.30 p.m. and we have not finished then I suspect we will have to rise anyway.

3685 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, can I raise two matters? Firstly, it is likely that we may be in this position tomorrow, so could that decision be taken now, because people have got commitments? It is very difficult to change a commitment at the last minute, whereas if you have got 24 hours' notice it is much easier. I will not be here beyond 6.10 p.m. even though I am interested in the debate, so if it offends Deputy Tooley and I cannot vote because I have another thing on, that is life. But tomorrow I could be if I got advance notice. I am sure I am not the only States' Member accordingly.

3690 Secondly, sir, can I take it that it is more likely than not that the Requête I am proposing is more likely to be coming up at the next sitting? (*Interjection*)

3695 **The Bailiff:** Your guess is as good as mine but the way things are going, it looks to me if we complete debate on this policy letter we will have done well, given the speed of progress we have made over the last two days. (*Interjection*) It was just the wheelchair.

In the light of what Deputy Ferbrache has said, I will put to you the Proposition that tomorrow we continue to sit to a conclusion, even if that means sitting beyond 5.30 p.m. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

3700 **The Bailiff:** Right, so people who need to rearrange their commitments tomorrow evening know now they may need to remain here beyond 5.30 p.m.

Deputy Lowe: Sir, I was going to propose that maybe we started at 9 a.m. tomorrow, bearing in mind how much we have got to discuss. (*Interjections*)

3705 **The Bailiff:** Well, let us see where we get to.

Deputy Lowe: Or make it half past eight or eight o'clock, I do not mind. There is a lot to discuss.

3710 **Deputy Merrett:** Sir, I am just very concerned that if, as a parliament, we are sat and we are quorate and we have a debate, you are not willing to take a vote if the Assembly is quorate. That is to me unprecedented. I find that quite concerning, sir.

3715 **The Bailiff:** We will see how we go. It is a controversial item and if we end up so that we are barely quorate, I am not sure whether it is a good idea. But anyway, let's see how we go.

Deputy Oliver: We did that on the Requête, sir. (*Interjections*)

3720 **The Bailiff:** Okay, we will take a vote. If people want to, we will take vote. If they wish to call to suspend the vote, we will suspend the vote. Let's not get into that argument now (*Laughter*) or we will spend the next hour arguing about what we are going to do. Let's just get on and do something. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Deputy Fallaize, do you wish to speak now?

3725 **Deputy Fallaize:** Actually, no, I do not think I do.

The Bailiff: Okay. Who does, then?

Deputy Ferbrache.

3730 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, when I initially saw this item and before I saw the amendment, I agreed with the view put forward by Deputy St Pier, because I thought we should be looking at primary education separate to secondary education and this debate is largely about capital funding for the two high schools.

3735 Frankly, there was all the debate all those years ago about the Forest School, which is an excellent school, and I am not suggesting that I would be in favour of closing it, but it should never have been rebuilt, really. I was concerned that if La Mare Primary School was rebuilt we could end up with a position whereby, in five years' time, a bit like the example that Deputy St Pier gave, that it is unnecessary.

3740 Frankly, looking where it is and hearing the very clear assurance in his opening by Deputy Fallaize that they have looked at it as a Committee and they believe that, for the foreseeable future, and by that I assume they mean the next 20-30 years, if we are going to rebuild the school, that there will be a need for a school in that part of the Island, then the case is made for me.

3745 I can remember when there were no schools there because I used to go and play with my friend Ray..., who lived in that area and it was all marshy. I thought later on, as an adult, what a dopey decision the States made to build schools there. I still think at the time it was a dopey decision to build schools there, but thankfully we are not dealing with La Mare secondary school which was really marshy and we used to sink up to our ankles in relation to that when we used to play in that area.

3750 The public think that we are not the best States the world has ever seen. That may or may not be right; it probably is right. But when we look at some of the decisions made by the previous States, why on earth do you build schools that are only going to last 20 or 30 years? Who on earth approved and allowed the building of school that now in 2019 is not fit for purpose?

3755 This school needs rebuilding. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It needs rebuilding now. It should be rebuilt now. The only issue, as I say, that I had was whether or not it could be superfluous to requirements and you were going to build the proverbial white elephant. With the content of the Committee and the people that sit on the Committee *for* Education, if they tell me, as the Committee responsible for the educational needs of the children of this Island, that we need to rebuild La Mare Primary School now and it will be fit for purpose for the next – it should be fit for purpose, it should be built for the next 40 or 50 years because Deputy Pier makes the point that building the cheapest is not always the best.

3760 That is why I always charge lots of fees, because I was not the cheapest but I thought I was one of the best. (*Laughter*)

In relation to that, this is to me such an issue that the people of that district need to have security to know that their children are going to have a good school to go to and it will be good in relation to teaching anyway, we know that – the teaching staff. It will be a good school with good facilities and we should get on with it.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

3770 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy St Pier drew a comparison with the secondary school at La Mare and said, quite rightly, that there had been debates in the past where Committees have said that for the foreseeable future there will be a need for a secondary school at La Mare de Carteret and that has proven not to be the case.

I think the difference is that even at the very beginning of those debates when that was being said, there was a counter-analysis available. It was possible to look at space in other schools and identify ways in which a new secondary school at La Mare de Carteret could be avoided. In this case, with the primary school, it is not. There is no credible counter-analysis which demonstrates that a school will not be needed there.

So there were three reasons, essentially, why the Committee is asking the States to give the States' approval, at least, for the redevelopment of the primary school. The first is that the school is in a very poor state of repair, having significantly exceeded its original lifespan. Deputy Ferbrache makes a perfectly good point, asking why a school was built with a relatively short lifespan. I suspect the reason is because the States at the time were in a very different financial position from their successors and there was expected to be an increase in the school age population, which would later decrease. Nevertheless the school has long ago reached the end of its intended lifespan and is in a poor state of repair.

I will give way to Deputy Trott.

3790 **Deputy Trott:** I am grateful.

The answer to the question that Deputy Ferbrache poses is no more complex than in those days the conventional wisdom was to build properties of that type with a life expectancy and a whole-life costing of 25 years. More modern understanding of structures and the like have changed that conventional wisdom accordingly.

3800 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, but nevertheless I think that La Mare and La Houquette were indeed examples *par excellence* of prefab type schools, which differed somewhat from others that were put up in the same era. Nevertheless that is a reasonable point. So first of all the school is in a poor state of repair and therefore is becoming increasingly costly to maintain, including last summer when the Committee invested £200,000 or thereabouts in scratching the surface, really, of work that needed to be done.

Secondly, as Deputy Ferbrache has alluded to, the Committee can see no circumstances in which a primary school at La Mare de Carteret would not be necessary. That has been the subject of quite considerable analysis, alternative options have been examined of whether there is space in other schools which geographically are neighbours of La Mare de Carteret, if you like, and there are no credible options for closing La Mare de Carteret Primary School. If it is in a very poor state of repair and we need to have a primary school there, we think we need to get on with it.

3810 Third, although, as Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy St Pier said, the meat of this debate is about capital requests for the 11-18 school and the Guernsey Institute, it makes no sense if we know that there needs to be a capital development in the primary sector, to detach that from the other

capital projects which the Committee is having to undertake over the next few years. It makes more sense to run them as part of a single programme, albeit phased over the next few years.

3815 La Mare de Carteret educates some of the most disadvantaged children in Guernsey and the Committee thinks that that is a factor because those children, at the moment, are in the poorest facilities in the primary sector, which can only have the effect of compounding disadvantage, and the Committee is not prepared to put up with that without asking the States to do something about it.

3820 I think the consistency with which Education Committees over the years have supported and proposed to the States the rebuild of the primary school is another relevant factor. There have clearly been very substantial disagreements between successive Education Committees, going back over many years, about things like how to organise secondary education, how to organise further education, how many schools there should be, where the secondary schools should be, etc., etc.

3825 But there has been one consistent thread between, it says in the policy letter the last three, but I think it is really the last four, Education Committees have all concluded that there needs to be a primary school at La Mare de Carteret; and if there needs to be, given its very poor state of repair, we should get on and commit to doing it.

3830 Now, the crux of the amendment refers to the review of primary education which needs to take place, which is broader than La Mare de Carteret Primary School. There is no disagreement between the Policy & Resources Committee and the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture on this point: there does need to be a review of primary provision across the Island.

3835 I say, however, if you look at the amendment from Deputy St Pier it requires the review in the context of the Resolution of the States made in 2013, which actually is not for a whole-Island review of primary provision. The Resolution of 2013 was for a review of primary provision only in the south-west of the Island covering the La Houquette and Forest catchment areas, and of the catholic schools. There is no requirement in that 2013 Resolution to carry out a whole-Island review.

3840 Our Proposition 4, on the other hand, if the States leave it unamended, does require a review of capacity in the primary sector across the whole Island. So our Proposition 4 actually gets us to where our Committee and the Policy & Resources Committee believes we need to be, which is a review of primary provision across the whole Island. But their amendment does not. Certainly in terms of the obligation that there would be on the Committee, or probably the successor Committee, it obliges them only to review primary provision in the La Houquette and Forest catchment areas and in the Catholic primary schools.

3845 Deputy de Lisle will no doubt be particularly interested in that problematic qualification in the amendment, given what he said when he spoke not very long ago.

3850 It is true that there is at the moment some surplus capacity in the primary sector. Not a great deal, but probably enough to lose one form of entry across the Island. In addition the places in the schools are not in every case terribly well-matched to the geographical distribution of the students across the Island. So that is why there is a case for an Islandwide review of provision.

3855 But there is no possible way, not in a cost-effective way at least, in which the States could close La Mare de Carteret Primary School and redistribute those children to other schools. There is just not space in neighbouring schools. There may be other solutions for rationalising provision in the primary sector across the Island, but that is not going to be one of them.

So there are significant social advantages in having a school at La Mare de Carteret. It is necessary, given the geographical distribution of students across the Island and the existing school building is in a very poor state of repair, and the need for the redevelopment has been identified by the last three or four Education Committees.

3860 That is why we do not feel that this amendment is a sensible or a justified amendment. There is in our Proposition 4 a significant cost envelope between £13.4 million and £22.4 million for the redevelopment of the school. That is because the review of primary provision across the Island will result in the need either for a three-form entry school at La Mare de Carteret, or a two-form entry

3865 school at La Mare de Carteret. It is not possible that the review will identify there does not need to
be a school at La Mare or that it would need to be one form of entry or four forms of entry – none
of our primary schools these days have four forms of entry. But it is conceivable that it could be
two or it could be three forms of entry. In addition to that, there needs to be a review of
swimming provision carried out and, as far as possible we want to reach a position of equality of
3870 opportunity, and that may result in the need for a swimming pool at La Mare de Carteret or it may
result in the need for no swimming pool at La Mare de Carteret.

So those eventualities are covered in this cost envelope of £13.4 million to £22.4 million in
Proposition 4, with delegated authority to the Policy & Resources Committee in the same way as
for the other Propositions.

I understand the principle of Deputy St Pier's amendment but in practice the effect of the
3875 amendment would simply delay, for much longer than necessary, the inevitable redevelopment of
a school which is well past its lifespan, which is in a very poor state of repair and which already
serves some of the most disadvantaged children in the Island; and for that reason I ask the States
to vote against the amendment and in favour of the original Proposition 4.

Thank you, sir.

3880 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Graham.

Deputy Graham: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

3885 **The Bailiff:** Your microphone?

Deputy Graham: I would merely add one or two observations to what Deputy Fallaize has
said, speaking as a Castel Deputy and also as the Committee's political representative on the
committees of the two schools at La Mare de Carteret. I do acknowledge that they are not parish
3890 schools, in the sense that their catchment does extend beyond the parish, but there is an
interesting social dynamic or community dynamic there which needs to be narrated with some
sensitivity really. A number of senior, former teachers at La Mare de Carteret High School have
come to me and said, 'Look, the best thing you can do from the social point of view for some of
the teenagers from the immediate area, is to get them away from their back yard for their
3895 secondary education'.

Conversely, the current head teacher at the primary school, and others, would say, 'Look, if you
want the parents of the children at the primary school from the local area to engage crucially with
their children at that early stage of their education, don't make it any more difficult for them than
is necessary'.

3900 In other words, there is a very strong social and community drive, really, for having a primary
school there which does not actually apply, certainly in the same way, to the high school. That is
the view of many residents around there, it is the view of former teachers from the high school
and I can understand the logic to it.

Deputy Ferbrache says, 'Come on, we need to build that primary school now.' I think actually,
3905 in a perfect world, we would as a Committee almost do that as a priority. Practically it makes best
sense, we are told, and we can see the logic of it, that the optimum site for the new primary
school at La Mare de Carteret will be on the site vacated once the high school is demolished.

Deputy Fallaize does make the point that we have looked at this and we find it very difficult to
see an outcome to any review which does not actually make good sense to rebuild the primary
3910 school at La Mare de Carteret. In my view, both as a Castel Deputy and also as a Member of the
Committee, the sooner we can do that, the better.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

3915 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, sir.

Yes, years ago, I have been on both the secondary school and primary school at La Mare committees. Back 18 years ago, the conditions at the school were probably worse than they are today, but they were certainly terrible then and we wanted to see them rebuilt. Ironically, perhaps, the primary school has been better maintained than the secondary school.

3920 Sir, I am absolutely convinced, personally, that there needs to be a primary school there. I am not supporting this amendment because I do not think it needs to go ahead, I just think, for two reasons, that Education have not helped themselves by including this in this discrete policy letter, because certainly people out there in our community have not understood some of the logic of that and they have conflated the costs of the whole thing. So that was not helpful. In some ways, if
3925 it had just been a separate policy letter, it would have been easier to deal with in that way.

The second reason is that I do think there needs to be – it is not just *whether* we build at La Mare, it is what it looks like and what size it looks like. Really I do not think we should be discussing that in the mix of everything else that we were dealing with today. I would not want to see a long delay, but I do think we need to have the proper assessment of primary needs that
3930 Deputy Ferbrache referred to.

When I joined Education in 2000 they were just reeling, effectively, from having to rebuild the Forest School and the costs at the time, which seem very cheap now, of I think under £3 million or something like that. Then we were faced with trying to make something out of it and ended up putting Le Rondin nearby in order to make the best of that choice.

3935 Now, I do not really think this Assembly should be considering doing that again. Whilst I am certain about the La Mare site, for the social need that Deputy Graham has mentioned, which makes absolute sense to me, I do think we need a proper review of school sizes, of the school intake, the number of forms per year and all those sorts of things. So in my mind this is not the moment to be doing that.

3940 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

I just would like to take a few quotes from the programme business case to illustrate what I
3945 believe. First of all it starts with:

... there are no circumstances which would no longer require a primary school in this location ...

... sufficient modelling has taken place to decide that, whatever change to the pattern of provision may result from a full review, there will be a need to provide either a two or three form entry school at La Mare de Carteret.

When it comes to the Risk section it says, affordability being a risk:

... capital allocation, and supply side capacity ... rated as amber due to the known challenges in securing sufficient materials and skills to rebuild on the Island.

But it then says that, to include La Mare de Carteret as part of this:

... to ensure that this risk is mitigated by connecting procurement and building activities as necessary.

Then further, it says:

Where more pupils walk to school, school transport costs and traffic congestion are reduced.

3950 This is the reason for building it where it is and this, of course, also supports the climate change element, which when we debated it had not been included in this policy letter but of course needs to be part of amendment 2 and also taken into account. That is part of the reasoning.

So with those reasons articulated in the policy letter, I happen to agree that there is sufficient to say subject to a proper review, which is in the original Proposition anyway, that actually there is

3955 no evidence to say there is insufficient evidence. I think Deputy Fallaize says there is no counter-analysis and for me, it is time to deal with it.

But I lead to the most important element of the drafting of the amendment. I do not think it is the review point, personally, because that is in the original, albeit the Billet d'État of 2013 may be an issue. But it says:

... before submitting proposals for the rebuilding of La Mare de Carteret Primary School.

3960 To whom?

There is no question of whether it should be submitted to the States or submitted to P&R for delegated authority. So, for me again, I go back to the original, it is there, we have got everything we need, I am happy to support the original and reject this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

3965

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

3970 P&R says that some of the extant Resolutions about primary education is the reason for putting their amendment. They are listed on the back of the amendment. There are three of them.

The first one is:

To agree to move towards a policy of two and three-form entry States primary schools ...

The Proposition there is that there will either be a two or a three-form entry school. So it absolutely sits in with the existing policy that has been approved by the States.

3975 The second one is about discussions between the Diocesan Authorities about how the Catholic primary provision can be reorganised. Well, to be honest, I do not think that really engages with La Mare de Carteret,

But the third one potentially does, at the margins, and that is that the States decided some years ago that, in the next 5-10 years, which means now it is getting very close that we have to do it, we need to look at provision in the south-west of the Island.

3980 As has rightly been said, actually logically we should now be expanding that to the whole of the Island because our town schools are bursting at the seams and in some other areas there is plenty of space. So we do need to do that.

3985 So I certainly understand the logic as far as that last point is concerned, of what P&R are saying, to a degree. When I joined the Committee I wanted to not just boil one ocean but the seven seas and I actually wanted us to be doing this at the same time, concurrently, looking at primary provision and was rightly told that we did not have the capacity and that we had to focus on the more immediate areas. But we did get a very senior educationalist to look at, in outline, how we might be going with primary education and, whichever way you cut that cake, absolutely without doubt, one of the principal components of the new provision was going to be a two or three-form entry school at La Mare de Carteret.

3990 Sometimes I think P&R are great at logic and logic is important, I believe it, but sometimes their touchy-feely side needs a little bit of buffing up! (*Laughter*) I want to put forward a couple of touchy-feely reasons why we should commit to rebuilding La Mare de Carteret Primary School today, rather than putting it off. Do not forget, as Deputy Tindall has rightly said, we will carry out this review before the final business case is put forward. So if, against all expectation, it comes out and shows that there is no case, although I do not think anybody is saying that, nobody here is expecting it not to come out that we need to build a school. The question is do we commit now or do with commit a bit later on?

4000 I want to build on what Deputy Graham said. Actually the superb leadership team that we have in La Mare de Carteret Primary School now have absolutely changed the concept of what is happening there. In a way, as well as being a primary school, it doubles up as what the old Children Board used to call as a family centre. The engagement in the community around there –

and there is no politically correct way to say this – but it is a community that probably needs those services more than many others around the Island.

4005 Even if an illogical carving up of where the pupils were – actually a logical carving up does show there should be a school there – even if it did not, the strong social reasons for actually having a school there I think would trump anything else.

4010 Lastly, I know this is not that logical, but actually La Mare de Carteret community, primary and secondary, have had a bruising over the last few years, haven't they? They keep having their expectations raised and then dashed to the ground. I actually think it is right that we are not rebuilding a secondary school at La Mare de Carteret. I actually do not think that was the right way to go. But on more than one occasion they have been led to believe that that is in the pipeline, ready to go and it has been removed.

4015 I think today, if we passed an amendment, even if we all think it is going to happen in the end, that actually takes us out of the programme and says, 'No, we are not going to commit at this stage', that is just going to be one more kick to that community down there, and it is unnecessary because we all know we are going to do it.

4020 Deputy Le Tocq is quite right in some ways. We could have given ourselves an easier time, because the headlines in the *Press* have not been that it has been £16 million to provide two 11-18 colleges, it has been £157 million. We could have actually had an awful lot smaller sum if we had not included this project. But we thought it was right, knowing that we wanted to do it, that the States saw the whole of our known capital programme together, where nothing was hidden and they could see the way it was going to go.

4025 I think whether we vote for this amendment or not, we are going to end up building a two or three-form entry school at La Mare. From that logical reason, I do not have a great fear of this amendment. But I think it sends out all the wrong signals and for no good reason, because we are going to end up with that school.

4030 So I really hope that we reject it and send out the positive message to the people doing that incredible work down at La Mare de Carteret and the community they serve. Yes, this Assembly is supporting that new school at La Mare de Carteret and, as soon as it is practical – it is true we will probably have to wait for the secondary to be demolished – we are going to crack on to it. We have made that undertaking as an Assembly. Successive Education Committees have asked this Assembly to make commitments as far as La Mare is concerned, and they have always been turned down. Let us make this an exception.

4035

Deputy Yerby: Rule 26(1), please sir.

4040 **The Bailiff:** Rule 26(1). Will those who have not yet spoken in debate please stand in their places. Five standing, do you wish to proceed? I put to you that debate on this amendment be terminated. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I believe that is carried. So, Deputy St Pier will reply.

4045 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, thank you for those that have participated in a shortened debate. I think Policy & Resources' position has been set out in my opening speech that, really, we feel there is insufficient information in the policy letter and the information currently available to support the Proposition as it is currently set out in the policy letter.

4050 I think all of those who had a high-principled objection to the purported lack of detail in relation to Propositions 1 and 2 presumably will have no difficulty whatsoever supporting this amendment on the same basis. However, I suspect that will not necessarily be reflected in voting patterns, perhaps really reflecting the underlying policy and politics around secondary education. That is kind of by the by, I guess.

Deputy Graham would have us commit to £22.4 million. He has had a conversation with a teacher who has told him this is the right thing to do. *(Interjections)* Deputy Roffey would have us do so because we need to be a bit more touchy-feely and the community have had a bit of a hard time and we should commit to that £22.4 million.

Clearly P&R are never regularly accused of being touchy-feely and that is probably right and proper. It was not a serious comment in relation to Deputy Graham, I just make it as an observation. The point I am seeking to make is a reiteration that we do not feel that there is sufficient information to support this at the moment and that is the reason why feel it would be better to carve it out of this policy letter and these Propositions in the way that Deputy Le Tocq described when he spoke. There is nothing further to add and I suspect Members have made their minds up, which is why they were happy to agree to the guillotine, sir.

The Bailiff: We will vote then on amendment 3, proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Trott, with a recorded vote requested by Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: A recorded vote, please sir.

The Bailiff: Can I remind Members, I am told that some Members' votes are not being heard by those listening elsewhere, so can you please make sure you turn your microphone on before you vote?

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 9, Contre 24, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 5

POUR

Deputy Green
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Trott
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Inder

CONTRE

Deputy Graham
Deputy Paint
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Yerby
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

NE VOTE PAS

Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

ABSENT

Deputy Oliver
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Meerveld

The Bailiff: I should perhaps explain that whereas I had indicated earlier I might suggest delaying the debate, because very few people had actually left the Chamber I had feared that we were going to be barely quorate by the time we finished this debate. But in fact only five people left the Chamber between 5.30 p.m. and the end of debate.

The voting on amendment 3 was 9 in favour, with 24 against and two abstaining. I declare it lost.

I was going to propose that we rise now but I am told that, unless anybody wishes me to suggest otherwise, I am going to propose that we rise now and resume tomorrow morning at 9.30 a.m. as usual. Nobody is requesting anything else. So we will do that.

Can I just say that there is another amendment, the Deputy Hansmann Rouxel amendment that she has already referred to, that is available to be distributed, so if people wish to see that in hard copy the Greffier has a copy available to distribute it.

Deputy Inder?

Deputy Inder: I beg your pardon, sir.

I wonder if Deputy Hansmann Rouxel's amendment could be dealt with now, because it is just one out of the way. I think she has explained the motivation for it and we could probably get it out of the way.

The Bailiff: I think people need to read it and have a chance. If it is going to be unopposed we can deal with it quickly in the morning. I think there is a suggestion that amendment 4 may not attract much opposition either, so it may well be that we can get through the remaining amendments very quickly in the morning and then get on to general debate quite early. In which case, hopefully we will conclude tomorrow. So we have made some good progress in the last hour or so.

We will rise and resume at 9.30 a.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 6.06 p.m.