



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 6th September 2019

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

Volume 8, No. 24

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

St Peter Port South

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

St Peter Port North

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

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, J. P. Le Tocq

The West

Deputies A. H. Brouard, E. A. Yerby,
D. de G. De Lisle,

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

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (H.M. Senior Deputy Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur);
C. N. K. Parkinson (*relevé à 09h 33*), (A. C. Dudley-Owen (*relevé à 09h 37*), Deputy S. L. Langlois
(*relevé à 10h 16*); J. I. Mooney (*indisposé*).

Business transacted

Evocation	1943
Billet d'État XVI.....	1943
V. Transforming Education Programme and Putting into effect the Policy Decisions made by the States in 2018 – Debate continued.....	1943
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.28 p.m. and resumed at 2 p.m.</i>	1980
Transforming Education Programme and Putting into effect the Policy Decisions made by the States in 2018 – Debate continued – Proposition 1, as amended, carried; Propositions 2-7 carried	1980
XII. Schedule for future States' business – Approved.....	2050
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 19.25 p.m.</i>	2051

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. Transforming Education Programme and Putting into effect the Policy Decisions made by the States in 2018 – Debate continued

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson has entered the Chamber. Do you wish to be relevé?

Deputy Parkinson: Yes please, sir.

5 **The Bailiff:** Thank you.
Deputy Parkinson is relevé.

The Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État XVI; Article V. The continuation of the debate.

10 **The Bailiff:** I have just been passed a note to say that, because some Members were not here yesterday, when the Assembly agreed to sit on this evening, I have been asked to remind all Members that the intention is to sit on this evening if we have not concluded this policy letter. So we will move on with Amendment 4 to be proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Trott. Deputy St Pier.

Amendment 4

To delete Proposition 6 c) and replace with:

"c) Pursuant to the Resolution made by the States on 7th June 2018, after consideration of the policy letter entitled 'Optimising the Use of the States Land and Property Portfolio' of the States' Trading Supervisory Board dated 26 April 2018, that "the future operating model for the management and administration of States land and property shall be such that the States' Trading Supervisory Board acts as Landlord (unless there is a good reason for it not to do so) and the Policy & Resources Committee the Tenant, on behalf of itself and other Committees of the States as Occupiers" (Item VIII.1 on Billet d'État No. XVI of 2018 and P.2018/37), to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to:

(i) work with the Committees for Education, Sport & Culture and Health & Social Care to define the space requirements for the proposed range of health, care and community services, commissions and other bodies which provide services on behalf of the States;
(ii) work with the States' Trading Supervisory Board to identify the most suitable site for these services taking into account other requirements for public service provision; and
(iii) return to the States with conclusions and any propositions considered necessary by December 2020."

15 **Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

I will not read the amendment but I will explain its effect because I think the first part would mean little to those outside the Assembly if read in full. But I think the perhaps the starting point with this amendment is to look at the original Propositions presented by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture in their policy letter, 6c), which is:

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 [etc.]

20 Sir, the rationale for this amendment – and my understanding is that it is not opposed by any of those Committees referenced in the original Proposition, for which we are grateful – is really to seek to align this work with the previous directions and decisions of this Assembly and Resolutions of this Assembly, in particular in relation to the policy letter, which was brought by the then President of the States' Trading Supervisory Board, Deputy Parkinson, in June last year, in
25 relation to optimising use of States' land and the property portfolio.

That set out the relationship between the various parties, in particular that the Policy & Resources Committee should be the tenant, acting on behalf of itself and the other Committees of the States, as occupiers, with the STSB acting as landlord. Really what we are seeking to do with this amendment is to ensure that this work is discharged in accordance with that direction.

30 We do understand why this amendment has been presented and I think that probably speaks to the issue which I raised in the Financial Update Statement I gave on Wednesday, and some of the questions that arose out of that, which is a frustration with the way that property matters are currently managed. I think that is a frustration which has been experienced by both the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, and Health & Social Care, and I think the original
35 Proposition was a way to perhaps shortcut that in order to move the issue on.

What we have sought to do in this amendment is to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to work with those Committees to define the space requirements for the proposed range of health care and community services in a community hub to work with the STSB to identify the most suitable site. So it is really P&R, having identified the needs of those two Committees, to
40 work with the STSB as landlord to identify the sites, rather than for individual Committees for themselves to identify vacant sites which they think might be suitable for their needs.

Then we have also imposed a time bound on this, with the intention to return to the States by December 2020, which we believe is eminently achievable in relation to this piece of work. As I say, I think the original Proposition is a response to the frustration which has been experienced in
45 progressing this issue. We all sense and acknowledge that and are seeking to respond to it in this way and I think this will enable us to progress, now, at some pace to determine what the needs of Committees are, to design a solution and to bring it back to the States in a reasonable timeframe, in order that the matter can be progressed.

With that, sir, I encourage Members to support the amendment.

50

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott, do you second it?

Deputy Trott: Yes, I do; and; in rising and reserving my right to speak, wonder whether this is an amendment we can go straight to the vote on?

55 **The Bailiff:** Just before we do that, Deputy Dudley-Owen, do you wish to be relevéed?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes sir, thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize?

60

Deputy Fallaize: I just wanted to make a couple of points very briefly.

I think the amendment is drafted better than the original Proposition in that it is fully aligned with the process for allocating States' property, which was approved by the States last year. The amendment does not just do that. It also leaves out mention of the potential use of Les Varendes, for the purposes identified in the amendment and I think that is unfortunate because I think the position of our Committee and of Health & Social Care, in putting together the original Proposition has been that we feel that Les Varendes is a suitable site and if other bodies in the States can present more suitable sites then that is fine, but the onus should be on them to demonstrate that there *is* a more suitable site. That emphasis has been left out of this amendment.

70

My personal view is that, after these investigations, that site will be identified as the most appropriate site.

Finally in (ii) of the amendment, it does talk about a suitable site, singular. Now can I just ask Deputy St Pier whether that part of the amendment has been drafted like that deliberately? I hope he says yes, because that implies, in fact probably more strongly than implies, that there is an acceptance of the concept that these related health care community services, commissions and other bodies, if possible, should be provided from the same site.

75

I think if that has been accepted then, even though the original Proposition was inelegantly drafted, I think we will have made some progress, because acceptance of that concept I think is a very important step forward. So with that qualification, I and the other Members of our Committee are happy to support it.

80

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

85 **Deputy Inder:** Yes, sir.

I always thought this was one of the strangest of the Propositions in this, because effectively this makes this a joint ESC and HSC policy letter. If you commit to Les Varendes site, you are effectively committing to an amount of undetermined capital expenditure. Personally I would have taken the whole thing out, but I am fairly comfortable to support the Policy & Resources amendment.

90

But it is odd what Deputy Fallaize says. He seems to think he knows what sites are, with the exception of the two 11-18 sites and College of F.E. – he seems to have decided that five people in a room, I take it with some consultation with HSC, have decided that what is effectively an Education site can now be some kind of medical or office facility.

I would just like to remind him that one of the Members of his Committee is on the University Working Group. Now he has decided, on his own or with his Committee, that effectively the Grammar School will be a Health site. But surely, if –

95

Deputy Fallaize: Point of correction, sir.

100

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: The original Proposition asked the States to agree that the Committees

... shall jointly investigate the merits and feasibility of the site at Les Varendes.

So, investigate the merits and feasibility of the site:

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 ...

105 That is quite a long way away from the picture Deputy Inder is trying to paint to the States, that we have already decided that that site will be used for these purposes.

Deputy Inder: Well, sir, with the greatest respect, it is a long way from the original direction. There was no mention, when Members of the States adopted the two-school model, there would
110 be any mention of HSC whatsoever. By having this within a policy, it now becomes an Education and HSC policy letter. That is a fact of the situation and, if you adopt option 6, you are committing not only to the Education expenditure; there is also an indeterminate amount. That was not the direction of this States.

And, in any event, Deputy Fallaize seems to agree that an Education site can now be a medical
115 site. But one of the Members of his Committee is on a University Working Group, if not two of them, I am not entirely sure. I think it is Deputy Roffey. So it will be interesting to see what Deputy Roffey thinks about the university group. Why on earth you would, if the university project ever going to happen, why on earth would you disbar an existing Education facility and not look to utilising it for a university campus or learning area?

120 So in short, I agree with the amendment by Policy & Resources, simply because Deputy Fallaize has got no greater knowledge of the portfolio of property than I have and his opinion has got no greater value than mine has.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

125 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, yes, I hear Deputy Trott's comments but I think I owe it to my Committee and staff to say just more than a few words in regard to this amendment, which might reflect some of the frustration that we have had; and hopefully now also give some context to Deputy Inder in respect of where HSC's involvement originated from in this regard.

130 It has been known for years that many of HSC's child and adult social services are scattered across the Island in ageing and unsuitable properties. For years, successive Committees and successive Assemblies have agreed that these services should be consolidated onto a single site allowing for greater collaboration between teams, easier access for service users and opportunities for efficiencies, combining common services. This would improve experiences for
135 staff and service users and also enable the release of current sites.

When I say years, I mean years, spanning three electoral terms and at least five health boards or Committees. The 2020 vision in 2011 made reference to a number of buildings in HSSD's property portfolio being ill-suited to the delivery of modern Health and Social Care Services, or expensive to maintain. Specific proposals are included in the capital portfolio at the beginning of
140 this term, to co-locate peripatetic services and a further commitment was made through the Partnership of Purpose. It is safe to say that no further commitment is needed, just action.

States of Guernsey has an Estates Plan. It establishes a number of property objectives for estate optimisation. First and foremost are better working locations, providing the right buildings in the right place and condition to meet current and future service delivery needs. Current
145 community provision would fall far short of this standard and it is right that action is taken to address this.

In the context of the Partnership of Purpose, the relocation of community services is vital, not only are some current working environments fundamentally unsuitable, they are creating a very real barrier to realising the values of the Partnership of Purpose and the adoption of new ways of
150 working.

The Partnership of Purpose is about achieving the physical, virtual and financial transformation of the Health and Care system. It is based on an ever-closer integration of care, which places the user at its centre and provides a greater focus on prevention and support and care in the community. The current property portfolio prevents this. Staff are forced to work in physical silos;

155 service users are unable to access multiple services in a single visit; and it is challenging to trial
new ways of working. Multi-disciplinary working is happening, but is having to overcome the
fundamental challenges posed by the infrastructure.

I have to say it has not been for the want of trying, but until now it just felt like we were
banging our heads against a brick wall, and a well-built one at that. I will not bother Members
160 with our own frustrations here but, suffice it to say, we had lost confidence that any solution
would be found. Everything seemed to be wrong, nothing seemed to be right.

However, hopefully the stars are now aligned and I was pleased to hear the P&R President's
commitment to the co-location of a number of services at Delancey. This provides a real
opportunity to improve working environments and pilot new ways of working across current team
165 boundaries. It is considered that there will be opportunity to co-locate staff and children, family
community services, Youth Justice Team, Youth Commission, and others. It has a potential to
enable the vacation of Lukis House and Swissville and other sites.

I would ask Members to consider this. Under the survey undertaken by Peter Marsh
Consulting, set out in section 3.1 of the policy letter, none of the buildings at Delancey were rated
170 as good. But it is a sad indictment of our current property management that they are a
considerable improvement on those currently occupied by community services. Indeed all the
work undertaken to date has indicated that it will fully meet the needs of community services.

The development of Delancey for Health and Care purposes is considered as a vital, albeit
interim milestone in the Partnership of Purpose, as we work towards a long-term community hub.
175 It will in the short-term improve working environments, enable a number of States' buildings to
be vacated and enable new ways of working to be piloted.

That is why we want Members to support Proposition 6a).

However, that is only an interim solution. It is a good next step that will help transformation
and free-up States' property and enable us to start to make real changes. However, it is not a
180 long-term solution because, whilst the proximity to service-users is beneficial, the site is not
centrally located on the Island. Accessibility to the site is less than perfect, with no bus route,
minimal parking – and being on top of a hill is not the easiest for those with mobility issues.

Delancey will host a range of services to pilot collaborative working between statutory and
charitable sectors. However, the size limits the number of services that can be located there and
185 the ability to incorporate private providers. The extent and scope of the long-term ambition
require a larger, more flexible space to host Community Café and other facilities, which Delancey
will not be able to accommodate.

As opposed to just housing children and family services, the long-term community hub will
accommodate a range of services throughout the life course of our people, which will need a
190 range of in-reach and outreach providers. The long-term community hub will strengthen our
approach to meeting the needs of all our service users, supporting the Disability and Inclusion
Strategy.

In short, the site is temporarily sustainable for services relocating there, represents a better
quality of environment for our staff and will ask as a test bed for transformational changes, but
195 not for the longer term aspiration of a principal Community Hub. I think I need to go into more
detail about what we mean here. A key aspect of the new model of health and care is the physical
co-location of services through a number of easily accessible sites, called community hubs.
Through these hubs, individuals will be able to access a range of face-to-face and virtual services
provided by public, private and third sector organisations.

200 By consolidating services, which are currently scattered across the Island, the community hubs
will seek to improve access to care and enable Islanders to deal with multiple health and care
needs in a single visit. This approach will be of particular value to those individuals with long-term
conditions and will facilitate direct access to services, which currently require a referral.

While it is envisaged that there will be a network of community hubs throughout the Island
205 and some of which may be developed around existing GP practices or community centres, and
something we are actively in discussion with various interested parties at the moment, it is

considered that it would be necessary to develop a principal community hub. What makes this different is an additional to support public facing services it would also provide a base for shared back office support for the public and third sectors.

210 To achieve these ambitions, a number of site requirements have been identified, which indicates that there are few available which would readily allow the envisaged co-location of the full breadth of services. The vocation of schools, through the Transforming Education programme, is likely to be one of the few opportunities available to the States for the repurpose of an existing building as a principal community hub, thereby avoiding the significant capital cost associated with a build.

215 The Committee's officers have undertaken extensive work already to scope current provision and opportunities for the future but we have had to pause the progression of a business case, based on growing uncertainty in respect of site availability. Without the progression of this work and the associated development of the infrastructure underpinning community care, the Committee's ability to realise the Partnership of Purpose is stymied. Without shared spaces, the ability to adopt new ways of working is limited. The development of working practices across organisation boundaries is restricted and we cannot improve convenience for service users.

220 I am not especially we cannot pin down today where the new hub will be and I understand the process we have signed up to but have yet to be convinced that all parties are quite aware of the roles that they are there to undertake. Inaction appears to have been the order of the day. Decisions do need to be made. That is why I am pleased there is a deadline set, although I would hope matters can now be resolved in a more timely manner, given the work that has already been done by HSC officers. This has been going on too long. The will is there politically, I believe, but process has got in the way. It needs this Assembly to make things happen and I ask Members to support this amendment.

230 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

235 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you sir. I do not want to prolong this too much because I do not think actually anybody in this Assembly is going to vote against this amendment. I would say that it is not quite as black and white as it seems. It is true, not only did we approve a property strategy brought forward by Deputy Parkinson, but actually since time immemorial, the process has been that when a Committee was finished with the site and no longer needed it, it got handed back to the centre to decide what would happen with that site, rather than them having any particular grandfather rights to decide where it should go.

240 What makes this a slightly grey area is that, from our point of view, we had not quite finished with the site because a community hub is not just about HSC facilities. It is about the Youth Commission, which we are the landlords of at the moment and which we are deeply involved in everything we do. It is about the Sports Commission, which provides all sorts of services to our Committee. It is about the Arts Commission. It is about all of these organisations that do things for the States. So we felt we still had a peg in the ground.

245 Having said that, having reflected on it, we were trying to actually be not living in a silo, to actually work with HSC to try and jointly solve a problem, which as Deputy Soulsby has said has been going on for many years and badly needed resolving. However, having reflected on it, this is probably such a key site in the centre of the Island that if an equally good site can be found for these facilities, then I understand it.

250 The possibilities are legion here. I think about the emergency services and co-locating them, for instance, in a fit-for-purpose thing right in the middle of the Island. So I think it probably is right, on a time-limited basis – and this has gone on for far too long and so I too am pleased that this is a time-limited basis – that we should be the corporate player and make sure that the centre is able to take a helicopter view across all of the possible demands and all the possible places where the community hub should go.

In closing, sir, I would just say I think the media have been a bit mealy mouthed in not congratulating this Assembly, or some Members of this Assembly, for the sacrifice that was announced on Wednesday morning. I am delighted that Lukis House is going to be sold off and it is going to be moved, temporarily at least, the services that were there, up to Delancey. I am not one of them so I can say this: I congratulate all of the car drivers in this Assembly for very willingly giving up their reserved parking spaces for the greater good of the Island!

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

I actually resonate with most of what Deputy Inder was saying. First of all I will thank Deputy Soulsby for giving me what I think was really an update on the Partnership of Purpose and some of the next steps there. I am thankful for that. But I am confused, sir, and I will tell you why and I will speak to this now, rather than in the main debate, because Deputy Soulsby did pick up Proposition 6a) in her speech.

If the amended Proposition included 6a) I would probably have more understanding of why that is. Because in 6a) it is:

To note that the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture consider 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

I will try and abbreviate it now, rather than read it completely. But basically it says the Committee for Health and Social Care and STSB will work on the feasibility of using Delancey campus. The *feasibility* – whereas Deputy Soulsby says it *will* host. So I am bit confused whether or not there is actually discussion still taking place about the feasibility or if that, as Deputy Inder alluded to ... Is somebody making decisions already? Because if Deputy Soulsby is saying it *will* host that, that seems a little bit of an oddity.

Maybe, sir, it is because the Delancey campus, and Deputy Roffey said this, hand back to the centre. Of course, Delancey campus cannot be handed back to the centre because my understanding – this is why I rose to ask the question to Deputy St Pier – is that the Douzaine, the Parish of St Sampson's, in partnership or in contract, or will have a covenant with Education, Sport & Culture, that that campus can be used for educational purposes only. That is my understanding, sir, and that is why I rose to ask the question.

It is all well and good this amendment, that we are going to get P&R parachuting on top and working with STSB, HSC and ESC. Brilliant; fantastic. But under 6a) I do not understand why P&R would not want to have the same level of overarching considerations to this campus and then, if it is, sir – and I am quite happy to be corrected by Deputy St Pier – in fact that the Douzaine or the Parish of St Sampson's actually do have a contracted arrangement with Education, Sport & Culture at Delancey, then why are not the Douzaine mentioned in here or the Parish of St Sampson's?

Obviously, I was going to ask in the main debate, but I can ask now and I am quite willing to give way to Deputy Soulsby or Deputy Matt Fallaize. Have they discussed this with the Parish of St Sampson's?

That is really why I am rising to my feet. I could have done it in the main debate, I appreciate that, but if we are going to amend 6c), I would like to understand why 6a) has not been amended, and I would really like to know if it has been discussed with the Parish of St Sampson's, and if actually it is even feasible that the contract – I have not seen the contract – my understanding is that campus is only to be used for educational purposes.

I will finish by saying I am concerned, and this is where I can resonate with Deputy Inder, that it says here we are going to look at the feasibility of something, but when the President of the Committee stands and says it will do this, it will host this, there is disparity, isn't there? Either we are looking at it with due consideration; or have these decisions already been made? If they have

already been made then I think it is rather discourteous to come to the Assembly to ask us to agree an amendment when, actually, if this is a done deal I would prefer to know.

Thank you, sir.

310 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: Thank you, sir.

 I am going to start by addressing Deputy Merrett's point, if that is okay? That is that my understanding is that the covenant on the land applies to a part of the site and not to all of the
315 site and the presence onsite of school nurses and the Youth Commission and so on fulfils that part of the covenant. That is my understanding of at least part of that.

 What I wanted to say, though, and I agree with Deputy Trott that I think this hopefully will not be a long debate, because I think we have got bigger things that we need to debate. As Deputy Soulsby said, we have already agreed in principle the notion that we should have a community
320 hub. When Deputy Soulsby says that this will host these facilities, the community hub will host these facilities. It is our belief, our understanding that it is likely that the most suitable place for that will be identified as Les Varendes, but wherever that site is that is identified will then host these facilities.

 I obviously have a foot in both camps, here. I am a Member of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, and Vice-President of Health & Social Care. One of the things we are told continually is that there is a need for less silo working, that there is a need for cross-Committee working; that there is a need to look at our population as a whole and see not what we can do for them in our field, but what we can do for them if we were to get together and work collaboratively on projects which could improve things for our community.

330 I think that is what we have got here. What we have is a proposal that brings together services for children and young people and their wider families. Because outcomes for children and young people are not affected only by what you do for them, but they are affected by the way in which you treat the family around them, which is their support network, which is what enables them to get to school and to learn in the first place.

335 There are huge advantages or disadvantages that we present our children and young people with, which are based on the way that their family are treated and the way that their family find it possible to access services that are offered to them as community and so on. That is the aim of what has been named 'a community hub'. I really hope before it is up and running we find a better name for it. I am not keen on that as a name because actually I think what this needs to be
340 is a place that brings together the third sector, that brings together services we provide and is somewhere that people feel comfortable to come to find support.

 I did prepare a note, which I am going to read about this, because there have been questions asked, but I do not think the answers have necessarily been listened to. Deputy Soulsby gave an excellent speech and there was some talking going on in the Chamber, possibly about an aspect
345 that she mentioned early in her speech, that may have distracted from what she was trying to say, so I am going to repeat some of that possibly in some slightly different wording.

 Both Committees believe that there will be considerable merit in developing a community hub to bring together a wide range of complementary services in the fields of health, care, wellbeing – sorry, I am just pausing because the same people seem to be talking again, thank you – health,
350 care, wellbeing, sports and the arts. This could include spaces for organisations in the charitable and private sectors, support groups, social networks and other community uses, as well as services providing housing support, healthy lifestyle, weight management courses, community gyms, art therapy and complementary services.

 It will reduce the number of different contacts for a person who uses such services. It will
355 reduce the need for that person to tell their story over and over again. There will be more opportunities to provide high quality, joined-up support, including for the most vulnerable living in our community. If the funding for this new model is approved, our feeling is that the site of the

current Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre would be ideal and that will be located by 2020, but I am content with the assurances that have been given, to work alongside P&R and STSB. Because, honest to goodness if there is a better site, let us have a better site.

But it is important that we remember that this will only work to bring together these services that will support young people and their families if we bring them together. It will not work if what is offered is a set of disparate buildings located around the Island. So what this needs to be, when the proposal comes back with a specific space for this, is somewhere that allows those services to work together.

I am happy not to oppose the amendment. I am happy to go with the amendment, because of the assurances that we have had. I look forward to that working together of the two Committees that has gone on thus far, to become a working together of the four Committees which are mentioned in this amendment and, obviously, also the third sector who offer so much support to our community.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir.

Yes, I entirely endorse what Deputy Tooley has said about how Education and Health overlap in terms of education, practically, for life. Indeed, maybe I could benefit from the weight management and healthy lifestyles that Deputy Tooley refers to, especially as I begin a new year on my birthday!

Members will know three things about me. The first is I always support my mentor, Deputy Neil Inder, in virtually everything he says. (*Interjection*) Secondly, I support almost every nice little sursis going, as I did yesterday, for reasons I will not go into now. And thirdly, I have been a consistent supporter of cabinet and executive-type Government. But I am going to disagree with all of those today because I think the proposal in the main line Education, Sport & Culture report was actually pretty sensible.

If we are going to agree with the two-school model today it is probably, if not a certainty – well, it is a certainty – that the former Grammar School site, Les Varendes, will not be needed under that model, directly, for entire education needs. If you read the Proposition on page two, 6c), it agrees that the Committee for ESC, HSC and STSB

... shall jointly investigate the merits and feasibility of the site at Les Varendes, which currently accommodates the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre, or other sites ...

It did not actually give a direction, despite what some Members have intimated, that that site would be used as a certainty, and it does seem to me that I would wish to oppose the amendment today because it is a form of executive overlay. If we did have a more cabinet-type structure, it would actually, rightly or wrongly, emulate the Policy Council more than it would the current Policy & Resources Committee, because the Policy Council, despite its flaws, had permanently on board a representative from Education, Sport and also Culture and Leisure in those days and also from Health & Social Care.

Now, to get that kind of direction, what we are beginning to see is Policy & Resources trying to block, because effectively this amendment, although I can see why politicians have agreed to it to move the story on, is a blocking amendment. It is a delaying amendment. It is a form of a sursis because it actually waters down the idea of using Les Varendes.

The strength of Les Varendes, of course it could be used for many other uses, from a university college to a hub for Home Affairs, but the strength of it is on a main road, it is on a bus route, it is near sporting facilities and other leisure facilities and clubs. It is in the dead centre of the Island, where the escarpment meets the flat lands, as Deputy de Lisle taught me in geography once. It is not up awkward hills or peculiar roads like, for example, the KGV site.

I give way.

Deputy Merrett: I thank Deputy Gollop for giving way. I just want to pick up on one point. He said about this delaying scenario. The one thing that attracts me to this amendment, really, is I know the States are not great, I appreciate this, embarrassingly so, I believe. We are not great at actually bringing a States' Resolution to the States by the time we say we will. I understand that and that frustrates me, as many Deputies know.

But I just wanted to highlight what Deputy Gollop said, that at least this amendment does say the *intention* is to return by December 2020. I am sure when Deputy St Pier stands up, he will reassure us that is a perfectly acceptable and achievable date, that he has discussed this amendment with STSB, ESC and HSC, and they have all agreed this is a perfectly amenable and potential date to return to the Assembly. With those assurances I would then counter-argue Deputy Gollop's point that this is indeed a delaying amendment.

Deputy Gollop: By definition, December 2020 takes us beyond the election of a new cast of characters and maybe a new sort of Government, to a certain extent. Deputy Tooley referred to the fact that four Committees will be involved and I was thinking: which Members will they be?

Of course it is the States' Trading Supervisory Board, the property lead; Policy & Resources, Health & Social Care and Education, Sport & Culture. Hang on a minute, there is a fifth, and that must be at some level the Development & Planning Authority because it is right in the centre of the main road, traffic lights, almost Environment & Infrastructure.

Any shift in scope has to bear in mind planning and other consequences. If we did not support the amendment today and voted in the raw on Proposition 6, we would at least have a road map that we could follow Deputy Merrett's arguments and come back. Here we are actually walking around in a traffic jam.

I give way to Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Deputy Gollop, your microphone was off.

Deputy Gollop: Maybe that is a sign I should stop speaking! (*Laughter*) I do not support the amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

I shall be exceedingly brief. Can I ask the Assembly to return and think about the excellent speech from Deputy Soulsby earlier in this debate? I feel I should stand and support that speech on two grounds. One, how important the community hub is to the Partnership of Purpose project, which I think all of this Assembly is signed up to; and secondly the frustration in finding a suitable premises and a suitable way forward. I would hope that Deputy St Pier, when he sums up, hopefully will recognise the speech made by Deputy Soulsby.

Also, sir, I would ask that you consider at the appropriate time whether we can vote on all the elements of Proposition 6, if they are amended or even if they are not amended, i.e. if we can vote separately on a) b) and c).

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: When we get to the final vote?

Deputy Prow: Yes sir.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Yes, I would just briefly like to mention something that was raised by Deputy Gollop, which was in the Assembly, maybe not out in the bigger wide world. It is just to confirm that the Development & Planning Authority did take advice before this debate as to whether or not we could participate. Indeed, we were advised that, as there is no planning application in and as a result of the fact that these are policy decisions, we are perfectly able to participate as long as we do not show any predisposition.

So from that perspective I can confirm to the Assembly that in all respects this is exactly the situation. I also, as a Member of HSC, wish to also add my absolute pleasure, in a way, at hearing Deputy St Pier's reassurance, because I also echo all the frustrations that have already been mentioned. I have to say that, last night, I was intending to vote against this but have been reassured by colleagues of the intent of this amendment and wholeheartedly look forward to the community hub taking place.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier will reply.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, Deputy Fallaize described this amendment as an improvement on the original Proposition. I think that is a first and we should take that as high praise indeed, from the author of many amendments. His question was whether the reference in (ii) to a singular site was acknowledgement that all these services should be provided from a single site, rather than possible more than one site.

I think implicitly, the use of the singular is indeed that. But I think probably what I should say is that neither the Policy & Resources Committee, nor the States' Trading Supervisory Board should have a view on that question. It really is a matter for the respective provider of the services, namely the Committees for Health & Social Care and Education, Sport & Culture, to define their needs and then for the STSB and P&R to work together to provide for the delivery of a suitable premises for the delivery of their services.

That is exactly the set of relationships which Deputy Parkinson defined in the policy letter, which he was responsible for when he was President of the STSB. So I hope that gives him the reassurance that I do not regard it as a matter in which P&R or the STSB should embroil themselves. It is for the other two Committees to determine what their needs are.

I do endorse, as Deputy Prow asked me to do, and acknowledge the speech by Deputy Soulsby, and indeed as Deputy Tindall did as well, and look forward to finding HSC's need for a community hub and I think Deputy Soulsby did that very well in the context of the partnership. The one observation I would make is in relation to the Peter Marsh report, which described Delancey as not being good.

Of course, for accuracy, it should be said that he was making that observation in relation to its purpose, the use of that building as a further education site, rather than more generally. I would not wish that to be lost.

Deputy Merrett asked in relation to why we are not dealing with 6a) and it is a very valid question and I think we could equally have presented an amendment which sought to deal with 6a). I think to some extent Policy & Resources Committee regard 6a) as having been succeeded really by the statement which I made on Wednesday, that it is intended to move the services. So I am relatively indifferent as to whether 6a) stands or falls. That would be a matter for Deputy Fallaize, perhaps, to respond to in general debate, as to whether he still feels it is important that it should indeed pass in view of the announcement that was made

I should emphasise, I did say in that statement that it was subject to agreements on change of use and that was indeed intended to be a reference to the covenant issue. That is acknowledged that there is a covenant issue. It is an issue on which the Law Officers are engaged, and my understanding is that I am advised it is an issue on which they have already engaged with the Douzaine. Deputy Tooley spoke to that issue as well and she had more information on that point than I did.

510 Deputy Gollop described this as a blocking amendment. It is absolutely not. It is quite the reverse and I think in particular the intention, as Deputy Merrett said in her intervention, of giving it a timeframe was precisely to provide this with the energy, which all the Committees involved are seeking in order to finally deliver this project over the line.

So with that, sir, I do ask Members to endorse this amendment.

515 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Langlois, you wish to be relevéd? You have been present for some time.

Deputy Langlois: I wish to be relevéd.

Thank you, sir.

520 **The Bailiff:** So we vote on Amendment 4, proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Trott. With a recorded vote, requested by Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Yes please, sir.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 1

POUR

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

CONTRE

Deputy Gollop

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Meerveld

ABSENT

Deputy Mooney

525 **The Bailiff:** That has clearly carried. The voting on Amendment 4 was 36 in favour, with one against and two abstentions. I can declare that carried.

We have one more amendment, the amendment that was circulated just at the close of play yesterday and that is to be proposed by Deputy Hansmann Rouxel. Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Fallaize: Have paper copies been circulated?

The Bailiff: Paper copies were available yesterday evening.

Deputy Fallaize: What does available mean, sir?

The Bailiff: I do not know whether they were circulated or not.

Deputy Fallaize: I do not think I have one. It would be an advantage to see it.

The Bailiff: Some people, I think, have them. Some people do not. Does everyone who wants a copy, now have one? I see nobody saying otherwise.

Amendment 5

1. To substitute for Proposition 3h (inserted by the Amendment proposed by Deputy St Pier and seconded by Deputy Trott):

"h. the adequacy of SEND provision within the new schools, together with Le Murier and Les Voies, and whether the proposals are sufficiently flexible to accommodate a range of possible outcomes arising from the scheduled review of SEND provision taking place as part of the work to update the Education Law.";

and

2. To insert the following Proposition immediately after proposition 6:

"In regard to Special Educational Needs & Disabilities and Inclusion, and the scheduled review of SEND provision, to note that:

a) The States has agreed to comply with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) and the review of SEND provision shall take place in accordance with these principles;

b) Article 24 of the UNCRPD sets out the progressive realisation of the rights of people with disabilities to inclusive education;

c) Article 4.3 of the UNCRPD states that: 'States Parties shall closely consult with and actively involve persons with disabilities, including children with disabilities, through their representative organizations' in the development of legislation and policies;

d) The reform of the Education Law will rely on recommendations made from the forthcoming review of SEND provision (as set out on page 67 of the 'Transforming Education Programme – The Programme Business Case' published on 19 August 2019) and it is vital that this work should progress, and should not be subject to further delay; and

e) Consistent with the recommendations of the UNCRPD, the provision of Special Educational Needs within the secondary sector and post-16 sector shall be reviewed in line with a 'whole systems approach' which includes effective transitions into and from secondary and post-16 education."

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: As I see, everyone has their paper copy. I do apologise. I did only lay it once the amendment yesterday was carried and paper copies were printed out but clearly not given to everybody. But I did email, so an email copy should be available to Members. I thank the Assembly for their understanding in the laying of this amendment and I realise, at first glance, some may be taken aback by how long it is. But it is not complicated.

The first part of the amendment seeks to replace the now substantive Proposition 3h), which was voted on yesterday. Members will remember from the debate yesterday that Proposition 3 is

about P&R's delegated authority and how they plan to use it and highlights areas that should be laid out in more detail, through their rigorous review.

550 Proposition 3h refers to SEND education and the analysis of space requirements.
Now, this new Proposition reads as follows:

h. the adequacy of SEND provision within the new schools, together with Le Murier and Les Voies, and whether the proposals are sufficiently flexible to accommodate a range of possible outcomes arising from the scheduled review of SEND provision taking place as part of the work to update the Education Law.

Whilst it may not have been the intention of P&R's Proposition 'h', through the interpretation of the wording, there was a potential to delay the SEND review; and, importantly, a very real danger of disassociation between the need for a review, to review the provision holistically and
555 the space requirements. The space requirements should be driven by the Committee's assessment of the appropriate provision for learners with SEND, which will come through the review and not before.

The new Proposition still requires that the space be analysed. Now, Members will note that sensitivity analysis has taken place. This is mentioned in the programme business case on page 68,
560 where it reads:

The potential change in the proportion of learners within special and mainstream provision has been included within sensitivity analysis to ensure that the development of the 11-18 school can accommodate possible variation in student numbers should this option be found to be the preferred way forward.

Now, there may be Members perhaps who think it unnecessary that the process set out by P&R could take place and not end up as described previously, but SEND provision is space-hungry and we need to learn from previous rebuilds of the educational estate and I would like to quote a member of the public who has a lot of experience in this, who says: 'I have seen this
565 happen before, where any flexibility to provide better inclusion gets squeezed out of the final plans in an attempt to reduce costs. The current St Sampson's High School communication, Autism and Sensory Base is one example of this. The end result was significantly different to the original plans and ended up being unfit for purpose'.

SEND provision is space and resource-hungry as it requires provision for quiet spaces, small
570 groups and one-to-one interventions. That cautionary tale from other rebuilds is something to look at. We need to look at it holistically and that is not just for members of SEND but all the pupils.

The second part of the amendment simply makes explicit that the SEND review will take place without further delay and according to the principles of the CRPD. I will read it for those who need
575 to hear. It is simply:

To insert the following Proposition immediately after Proposition 6

And it reads:

In regard to Special Educational Needs & Disabilities and Inclusion, and the scheduled review of SEND provision, to note that:

a) The States has agreed to comply with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) and the review of SEND provision shall take place in accordance with these principles;

b) Article 24 of the UNCRPD sets out the progressive realisation of the rights of people with disabilities to inclusive education;

c) Article 4.3 of the UNCRPD states that: 'States Parties shall closely consult with and actively involve persons with disabilities, including children with disabilities, through their representative organizations' in the development of legislation and policies;

d) The reform of the Education Law will rely on recommendations made from the forthcoming review of SEND provision (as set out on page 67 of the 'Transforming Education Programme – The Programme Business Case' published on 19 August 2019) and it is vital that this work should progress, and should not be subject to further delay; and

e) Consistent with the recommendations of the UNCRPD, the provision of Special Educational Needs within the secondary sector and post-16 sector shall be reviewed in line with a 'whole systems approach' which includes effective

transitions into and from secondary and post-16 education.

I know that was a mouthful but these are all principles that we are already signed up to and it is just asking Members will note that the Proposition is *to note*. Because of course this is already going to take place.

The reason to make it explicit is two-fold. The first is outlined in the explanatory note, which reads:

In view of the possible alarm caused by the original wording of Proposition 3h to those who are directly affected by decisions on the future of SEND provision, this amendment also inserts an additional Proposition, 7, which clearly reaffirms the States' commitment to a review of SEND provision and inclusion in education, based on thoughtful and respectful consultation with, among others, learners with SEND and their families, consistent with the States' international obligations.

The second reason is to try and avoid the pitfalls of the past. After feeling ignored when the first consultation took place in 2015 and then again when the previous Committee brought back their plans to the States and it was pointed out that they had not included the special schools, and after the debate in 2018, when we decided the 11-18 school model mentioned a review, but it took the Education lead of the GDA reaching out to voice concerns that this was not taking place and they were not being consulted. It is easy to criticise the Committees that they have not actively reached out and sought consultation, which is a requirement of the CRPD, but it is an explanation of the very real concerns that this will get put off again.

Having had many meetings with officers and Deputy Fallaize, and other Members of the Committee around SEND education, I can perhaps understand that, in order to really review SEND holistically, it needs to be done in conjunction with the Law. This is set out in the policy letter, 24.1.1 which reads:

The provision of education for learners with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) is governed by the Education (Amendment) (Guernsey) Law, 1987. This legislation sets out the responsibilities of the Committee and the procedures to be followed for assessing a learner's special educational needs and for determining how those needs can best be met. These have been codified into a Code of Practice which governs the operation of special educational needs within the education system.

So it is understandable that a holistic review of SEND needs to take place in conjunction with the reform of the Law.

There has been, through the whole process of redesigning the secondary and post-16 landscape, an omission. It is there by design and it is not out of malice but more a desire to protect the vulnerable students. There are sensitive questions that need to be asked and there are very real, lived experiences with the current system that need to be aired; and there is a pressing need to review and scrutinise the whole provision and have an honest appraisal on how to best achieve the very best outcomes for all the students of the Island.

This conversation is not ready for debate in this Assembly and, to be frank, we have not shown ourselves capable of debating education with the sensitivity required to ensure that undue concern is not passed on to pupils and parents. Where SEND provision is concerned, this is compounded by the vulnerability of those involved.

In summing up, I would just like to finish by explaining why the word 'integration' sends hares running. It is in the explanatory note, and I quote from the general comments set out about inclusion and what inclusion is not. Inclusion is not exclusion, segregation or integration.

The UNCRPD General Comment No. 4 (2016) on the right to inclusive education outlines that, 'integration is the process of placing persons with disabilities in existing mainstream educational institutions with the understanding that they can adjust to the standardized requirements of such institutions. Inclusion involves a process of systemic reform embodying changes and modifications in content, teaching methods, approaches, structures and strategies in education to overcome barriers with a vision serving to provide all students of the relevant age range with an equitable and participatory learning experience and the environment that best corresponds to their requirements and preferences.'

610 I think that last part is very important for everyone to understand – an environment that best corresponds to their requirements and preferences.

I hope Members will support me in this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Yerby, you second the amendment?

615 **Deputy Yerby:** Yes, sir.

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

620 **Deputy Fallaize:** Not at this stage, sir, no.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stephens.

Oh, you have switched it off!

625 **Deputy Stephens:** Apologies.

I rise to express what I hope is the P&R view of this amendment and, to a certain extent I would say that my Committee is agnostic about this. But there are one or two issues that I really do want to raise. I apologise to Deputy Yerby, who I think I have now had two conversations with about this matter and to whom I gave a very incoherent response at the end of play yesterday; but there was a lot going on at the time.

630 I know I am personally a little concerned about this amendment and I could not articulate it yesterday without further thought. I may be being over-pedantic and in which case I apologise in advance, and I will be grateful for any assistance from Deputy Fallaize if I misinterpret what ESC are planning to do.

635 If we go to the substantive Proposition h, it is about the physical building and when we are talking about physical space, there needs here to be consideration of at least two issues. The first is how the expansion of SEN education in the mainstream schools might impact on the space requirements on the baseline for the repurposing of the 11-18 and post-16 sites. So 'h' is definitely, really about the use of space in all schools, that might lessen or increase the baseline needed in the future of proposed buildings.

640 The information that we need to be able to project the future of SEN education is unavailable, in the sense that ESC have not completed their review of SEN; nor is the law, which will underpin many shifts in special provision, actually written. But I want to use an example and say, for instance, if there were a decision in the future – and I do not want to set any hares running out there in the community – for full inclusion of all children with special needs in mainstream schools and the decision was to have no special schools at all then the space that is going to be allocated in the St Sampson's School, and which is currently used for Le Murier School, might be repurposed in different way.

645 There are dangers, I think as Deputy Hansmann Rouxel has referred to as either over-provision or under-provision of space, and we need to be aware of that. But at the moment there are no real assumptions that we can rely on in deciding what that space should be. So I just really, then, want to bring out three points, or even four.

655 The first one is: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel raises the use of the word 'integration' in the P&R Proposition, the P&R amendment. I have no worry with that because we are talking about integration in the sense of a space standard and a footprint, really, of a building. For me, it is perfectly reasonable to talk about space being integrated within other spaces. So that is not an issue for me.

660 Another issue that is raised is that the amount of space available should not dictate the provision of a certain range of education within that site but I would say, to be absolutely practical and realistic, space will always to a certain extent dictate what activity happens within that site. So there is an issue here about this being a rather open-ended aspiration.

The other point that I want to make is that there is a danger in the use of the word 'inclusion' and the use of the word 'integration' and them being applied inappropriately, either to activity that happens to provide education and the use of a space. If we start talking about space as being inclusive, then we are in danger of losing the real and important issue of what inclusion is.

I did say I was going to be pedantic. I do think that P&R are going to accept this amendment but I just wanted to raise those as issues that concern me.

So it is a rather open-ended, it is rather unrealistic, I think, and I would suggest to anyone else in the community who is concerned about the use of integration, there was no intention at all to use that word to substitute it for inclusion in education. It is talking about the integration of spaces and I am perfectly happy with that.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

I just want to say a few things on this amendment. The first one is to reassure Deputy Hansmann Rouxel and other Members that the need to build in flexibility into the new 11-18 schools to accommodate any change of approach in future to special needs education has absolutely been at the centre of our thoughts from day one. We have had long discussions about it, right from the time of site selection but certainly we have gone on to the size requirements.

In fact it goes far further in many ways than what is highlighted in this amendment because the amendment relates to the flexibility to accommodate a range of possible outcomes arising from the scheduled review of SEND provision taking place as part of the work to update the Education Law. That work is going on of course, but these buildings hopefully are going to be there for half a century and this will not be the last review of special needs education in the lifetime of these buildings. So even if we tailored it perfectly to the outcome of the review that is coming up that is not the end of the matter.

What we have to do is build in the flexibility to make sure that, whatever direction we go with special needs education, the buildings can reasonably be adapted to them. Of course you cannot foresee everything and get everything perfect – that is from any building that is going to last half a century. But we have to do our best to ensure that.

As Deputy Stephens has said, there is a certain flexibility on one of the sites built in, in the sense that if there is increased integration in the sense – and I know these word mean different things to different people – of more children who would currently go to a special school going to what is colloquially called a mainstream school, then it reduces the amount of space required for the special needs school and therefore there is flexibility in that site, although that is less true, obviously, at the de Sausmarez College site and therefore we have to bear that in mind.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel said we have not had the sensitivity to debate this properly. Maybe she is right but I give a warning to this Assembly that if we think that debate about mainstream education is sensitive and gives rise to strong emotions, and different polarised views, exactly the same in spades is going to be true when we come to a special needs education.

We cannot think the families of children that have special needs will all be of one view about the direction we should go. They would be polar opposites. There will be many families who think that their children should not access to mainstream schools and should not go to special needs schools. There will be equally strong families who feel that the special needs schools provide a protective environment and that their children have a right to have that provided. This will not be straightforward but we do need to do is build in the flexibility.

If, at the heart of Deputy Hansmann Rouxel's amendment is a little trip wire for P&R, saying that in your value engineering, in your trying to strip out any costs when you are analysing our model at the next stage, please do not take it to the point where you remove the flexibility that is required for future possible changes in special needs education then I certainly back her fully in that respect.

The Bailiff: Deputy Smithies.

715

Deputy Smithies: Thank you, sir.

My speech is customarily short. It is even shorter now because of Deputy Stephens' expert view, ably expressed in her very measured speech.

720 I would just like to start by saying on behalf of the Baubigny Schools committee and the staff and maintenance team at the school, I am slightly sensitive to the criticism the sensory space facility at St Sampson's School was seen as unfit for purpose. The staff and committee did their very best with limited funds and space to correct the omission of such a facility at the design and build stage and, through no fault of their own, they tried to remedy that and did their very best on that.

725 Just touching on 2b) of the amendment, I would just like to seek some reassurance, sir, that this will not inadvertently have an adverse effect on the important work being carried out by Le Murier and Le Voies through, for example, diversion of funding and/or staff.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

730

Deputy Gollop: Sir, sometimes when I get taken out for the day with my colleagues to meet working groups they say, 'Be careful what you say, John, that you do not make matters even worse,' because I do not always do the sensitive Deputy as much as I could do perhaps – and I am not even putting my microphone on as well! But I do, of course, support this amendment and should it be passed with real commitment it would strengthen the possibility of me voting for much of this package, even though I have severe reservations about both the site development elements and the two-school model in some regards.

735

The thing is that I used to sit on the Scrutiny Committee when, amongst others, Deputy Brehaut was the President, and we did a review of special educational needs then. We would not do the same review today because I think our whole education and enlightenment has increased significantly, because we would not mix it up with excluded children, because the two categories are not the same.

740

But we were aware, even then, that there were things not going according to plan. Of course, since then, we have seen the Link School transformed and be very successful as Les Voies. And we have seen progress on many fronts as well as of course the amazing work of the Employment & Social Security Committee, in conjunction with others, in getting a fully pledged strategy at consultation stage which is still very much engaging with the public.

745

This amendment of course is not particularly easy to grasp just like that, but it is written by two people with expertise and commitment in the field and I very much support it. Of course one can – as Deputy Stephens, with her highly educated professional background in special needs – draw attention to where one word, inclusivity, ends and another one begins and what it all means. I do take note of some of my colleagues who are concerned about the space provisions.

750

I do think that even if this means a degree of, not delay, but of reconsideration of some elements of the site plan it is essential because one of the interest groups – they might not speak with one voice, but they have certainly been a coherent voice, or voices – who have questioned the wisdom of the two-school model have been some representatives from people representing children with special educational needs.

755

They have been concerned on a number of levels, from the size of the campuses and the opportunities for bullying; from the lack of safe spaces, potentially; from the reduction, potentially, of library, catering and sports spaces; and also, of course, the sheer size of the schools. A compensatory response from Education, Sport & Culture at different levels has been, 'We are listening to you and we will not only revamp everything we are doing in this but we will increase the resource'.

760

Presumably that increase is both in terms of training and location and logistics and I am sure Deputy Meerveld and others will speak about the constraints of the sites later. But I think this

765

amendment at least gives the States underpinning of commitment to the entire community, as well as agreeing, which of course I would agree with, being from the ESS, the compliance with the United Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

770 We have, I will not say let down, children with special needs, but there have been many strategies and well-meaning presentations over the past six or seven years and they have not always been backed up by resources in terms of professional staff, money and the right sites and we really do need to get this right.

775 Perhaps Deputy Smithies is right and we are being a bit harsh on the current provision of base, which I have seen and have had an invitation to see again at some point, at St Sampson's, the Baubigny campus. But that is just the point, we Members on behalf of the community need to know everything for the next decade, for the future, for the brand new model – if it happens and it will happen in one form or another – is right, and right on the nail for people of all abilities and kinds across the community.

780 We should not, either, believe that children and people with special needs are necessarily at a disadvantage to others. Many of them have extraordinary capabilities, talents and gifts that they can give all of us. So we really do need to support this amendment and add a bit of weight to the work the Committees are doing.

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

785

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

I just want to refer to something Deputy Roffey said. I think what Deputy Hansmann Rouxel quite clearly meant, or certainly in my mind, is the language used by us as parliamentarians in this Assembly, sir. I could very easily get a headline if I wanted to, I am absolutely sure I could say 790 something quite appropriate or inappropriate, to do so. I have no intention of doing so as it is not my way.

But I am absolutely convinced that is what Deputy Hansmann Rouxel said although I absolutely concur with Deputy Roffey that there will be divisive views in our community. It is how we vocalise those concerns as parliamentarians, as Members of the Assembly, which I believe Deputy 795 Hansmann Rouxel was referring to – she is nodding at me, sir, so I will take that as affirmation.

I, sir, will be supporting this amendment and I am very grateful to the Deputies for laying it. Grateful for many reasons: first of all, because I think it does put the focus back where it should be; but secondly because I have heard from Deputy Stephens, and what Deputy Stephens said to me today slightly concerned me, I have to be honest. I think the words, when we talk about 800 'inclusion', if it is purely just an aspiration and is unrealistic then I have some real concerns there.

So I will most definitely support this –

Deputy Stephens: Point of correction, sir.

805 **The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Stephens.

Deputy Stephens: At no point did I say inclusion was an unrealistic aspiration. What I suggested was unrealistic was the idea that every range of every sort of provision for children with special needs might be accommodated.

810

Deputy Merrett: And again, another good reason for this amendment because I am really pleased to have got Deputy Stephens to her feet again. So I thank Deputy Stephens very much for that.

815 I heard someone, I cannot remember where it is, it is almost a little mantra that undermines some Deputies and it is in 'the community where no-one gets left behind'. Now I have read that somewhere. I have certainly heard it on so many occasions that I cannot for one moment believe that Members cannot recall that statement. But if we really do want a community where no-one

gets left behind, then we do need to show due consideration to this sort of provision within our community.

820 So I will certainly support this amendment and I am most grateful for the Deputies for bringing it to us today and I am most grateful for Deputy Stephens for speaking up on this issue.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

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

I too am really grateful for Deputy Hansmann Rouxel for bringing this amendment. It makes total sense. Deputy Roffey covered quite a few of the points that I was going to make.

830 One thing I will say about inclusion, when it comes to special educational needs and potential for integration with the mainstream is it is not black and white. There is a tiny bit of black there and a tiny bit of white there, but a massive sea of grey in the middle.

835 It is something I have had conversations with many SEN professionals about over the years. Nobody has got the answer, everybody has got different opinions. But we need to ensure that when we find the right direction, or the better direction than we are actually heading – I am not necessarily saying we are heading in a bad direction – we need to make sure we have got provision for that and I think this is what this amendment seeks to do.

There were a couple of other things that come to mind and it has completely gone and I will sit down and remember a couple of points I was about to make. I would urge all Members to support this amendment.

840 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you.

845 If Deputy Leadbeater's points come to mind, please, I will give way.

850 I just wanted to say, I thank Deputy Hansmann Rouxel for bringing this amendment. I am so pleased we are talking about something other than autism. Because what there has been within education more recently is an awareness and a provision for autism and that has translated broadly into the community as great, and it is great we are dealing with autism by the way, but it is seen as it is the main need and the principal consideration, when actually of course it is one of many and children vary in so many different ways.

855 Where there will be tension, I think, which will impact on the future provision, is what is known currently as the 'determination process'. I know with the emerging legislation from Social Security they are saying that within the emerging Discrimination Law that that process, as long as it has integrity, can remain and people may not be intentionally discriminated against. But I think most parents in the light of that legislation will push harder, quite rightly I think, at the door that they see as already being ajar.

860 From a parent's perspective, you have very little awareness of your child's difference in relation to other children of the same age. We all advocate for our children, very strongly, and if schools are being adapted and provision is being made for children, not with necessarily physical disability by the way, but for children with learning difficulties, you raise the expectation of the community but then you would have still this determination process that separates children out. I think that would be an emerging tension that could potentially put more stress or put more demand for what we call, I suppose, mainstream education.

865 Special needs education is still clunky, it is not perfect. It does not work in a number of regards. We acknowledge that children are different. They are unconventional. They are in a setting that acknowledges that yet still conventional remedies for what might be described as bad behaviour, they have the same sanction sometimes as children who can fully comprehend exactly what their digression has been. There is some confused thinking, in my view, still with regard to external

870 seclusion, separating children out, when they are experiencing the world in a subtly different way to other children who fully understand they have crossed a line.

As children move on from the more nurturing setting of Le Murier, children find themselves with a college setting at Delancey campus, and I have to say it still feels like an annex to mainstream education. I was heartbroken and my family were, I have to say, we were extremely
875 upset that within a couple of days of our child being placed in that setting, very derogatory language was being used in relation to the annex by the children who shared the school with other children.

I know it is human nature but it is just to underscore Deputy Roffey's point, and the points raised by other people, that society has a *long* way to go if we believe we can take the community
880 with us. There is still, I am afraid, a great deal of deep-rooted, unsettling prejudice towards children and you do not have to be that different to be different and that is not always appreciated.

Thank you, sir.

885 **The Bailiff:** I see no one else. Deputy Fallaize, do you wish to make what would be the penultimate speech?

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, thank you, sir.

I think that there are two issues really in this amendment, as I read it. One is to recognise the
890 relationship between the necessary and very important review of SEND provision and the work on developing the replacement Education Law and the planning, in particular, of space standards in the 11-18 colleges.

Now there is some risk, I think, of the States in relation to all of these three things falling into the trap the States often fall into, which is not to do anything until you can do everything. We
895 have tried to avoid that by not so much the timetable but the sequence in which we have tried to set out the planning of the space for the schools, for the colleges, the SEN review and the review of the Education Law.

But this amendment emphasises the need for those three areas of work to be aligned and for one to take into account the other, and I think there is some value in that. I think that Deputy
900 Merrett is right, that the other purpose of the amendment, as I read it, is to try to discourage the Policy & Resources Committee from wanting to cut down on space too much by imploring them to recognise that there needs to be not just adequate but more than satisfactory space provision for SEN in the new colleges.

That is perhaps particularly true at the St Sampson's site where it is possible, from a slightly
905 uninitiated position, if I can put it that way, to look at the space at Le Murier – I will give way in a moment – to identify that it looks very generous and therefore why cannot a whole load of it be used for the new 11-18 college? For that reason as well, I think the amendment has some value.

I am happy to give way to Deputy Leadbeater.

910 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Sir I thank Deputy Fallaize for giving way.

I have just remembered a stat; that is what I wanted to come up with, a stat. I was in a conversation Wednesday lunchtime with one of the managers from one of the outreach services from our disability provision and they gave me a statistic that, in the UK, if you take a geographical area of about 65,000 people in the UK, you will get on average 1,000 people with
915 learning disabilities. We have got 250 in Guernsey. We recognise 250 at the moment. This is not just isolated to learning disabilities; Deputy Brehaut mentioned autism, because that seems to be a buzzword when you are talking about special educational needs. But, again, trying to get a diagnosis for autism is trying to locate rocking-horse droppings; it is not that easy.

So I just wanted to mention those couple of things. I am not saying that as soon as we start
920 diagnosing people and recognising people need more assistance we are going to need more space, but it is a possibility that that is going to be a factor.

Thank you.

Deputy Fallaize: Yes I think that is a very good point and we also must not believe that all children with special educational needs are in what we call special schools because, of course, there are a very large proportion of children with special educational needs who are in what we, as Deputy Roffey said slightly clunkily, call mainstream schools.

For those two reasons I think the amendment has some value.

The SEN review is of the highest importance. It is long overdue but it is in an extraordinarily sensitive area. Much more sensitive than reviewing whether there should be selection at 11 or how many schools there should be. Those things are publicly more controversial because of the numbers of children and people involved, but in terms of the sensitivities of the debate the SEN review is much more sensitive and the views are just as polarised as they are in relation to the provision of mainstream education.

On the one hand there are not just parents, but professionals involved in this area that take, if you like, a completely integrationist view and say that there should not be special schools, there should be complete integration of all children in the same setting. And there are professionals and parents who take the view right at the other end of the scale and believe that, if anything, there has been too much of an effort to bring about integration or at least inclusion now, and everything in between. As Deputy Leadbeater said, there is a bit of black and white and a lot of grey.

So the SEN review has to take into account all of those views and give people who hold them a full opportunity to express them before reaching conclusions, which have to be reasonable and sustainable for a community of our size and have to be capable of carrying the community with us, so finding some kind of community consensus, and have to be practical on a space basis and affordable. This is a very difficult area of work but it is essential that it is done and it will be done in this States' term.

Now, Deputy Gollop said that he had concerns about the experience of SEND students in the 11-18 colleges, proposed, and he said the response from us is that we are looking at that. In fairness, I think the response has gone slightly beyond that and I referred in my opening speech to considerably improved provision for SEND, which is included in the proposals set out in the policy letter for the 11-18 schools. That includes a base at both colleges for students who have difficulties with communication, language and social interaction. It includes significant space within the main part of the colleges to provide support for those students. It includes better use of the resources, because they will be pooled on fewer sites than they are at present. I just make that point because I think that we have provided more answers in detail than Deputy Gollop suggested.

I will give way to Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you for giving way, Deputy Fallaize. I know you are on a bit of a roll there but I want to pull you back to the SEN review itself.

What we discovered while we were there, and everyone goes on a path, and Deputy Brehaut has mentioned on numerous occasions the difference, I suppose the levels of SEN. The problem with the word might actually be 'special educational needs' and some of the titles that are attached to that.

On the old La Mare site there was what was always referred to, at officer level, as 'the autism centre' – that is where *they* went. As lay politicians when that is what is spoken about the most that is what you think in the biggest issue. I had never heard of dyspraxia before I walked into the States of Guernsey. It is only through being immersed in the process do we start learning a little bit more about, I suppose, the various levels as Deputy Roffey referred to in SEN.

The question is, in your review I do wonder, there is a likelihood, if the autism base is in the old La Mare site it is because you started, I believe, at the triangle and those people who were the most vociferous, not necessarily having children with educational needs, they just happen to be

the lobbyists, the charities, the chairs of the group, that is where you started. In your review, maybe you should tip the triangle upside down, actually take the charities and lobby groups and actually talk to the parents.

I think you might end up with a slightly different outcome than what happened at La Mare, because it got us to the point where on the old La Mare site, that was the autism centre, that is where the autistic kids went, and when we walked into the schools ourselves the idea of having an autism base came from the autism leads. They were saying, 'We never wanted an autism building in La Mare.'

I think my question to you –

The Bailiff: Is this a short interjection or a long speech? *(Laughter)*

Deputy Inder: I am sorry, sir. I think I have got to my point. My advice is to be careful of the type of advice you are going to get in any SEN review.

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, I think I understand the point that Deputy Inder is making.

Deputy Inder: I am glad you do!

Deputy Fallaize: I cannot explain, because I was not party to it, how come there ended up being that proposal for an autism base at La Mare de Carteret, which subsequently a lot of the professionals involved in that area appeared not to consider a very desirable or at least a sub-optimal solution.

Clearly it did not just arise out of thin air. There was some influence from somebody on those people who put forward that proposal. There is no question that that concept was developed with the very best of intentions, with the objective of trying to get more resources and the best possible resources to children who needed those resources.

The current thinking is a long way away from having a single autism base and one of the advantages – I would say this would I not? – but I think one of the advantages of operating from fewer sites is that you can have better and more equal provision on each site, because it is less costly to provide it from fewer sites than to try and replicate it on more sites. That is another way in which I think the model of two colleges will improve things.

I take Deputy Inder's point and yes, speaking to parents is critically important. In fairness to the third sector representative bodies, I think they do their best to represent the users of the services, but they are trying to represent such an incredibly diverse range of views and such an incredibly diverse range of challenges that they cannot speak with one united voice any more than if you had a group of parents who got together and said, 'We represent the opinions of all parents about how secondary education should be organised in the future.' They might try to speak with one voice but if they did they would be disingenuous about it because there is such a diverse range of views.

But, anyway, there will be an opportunity for Members of the States, there will be an opportunity for parents, there will be an opportunity for professionals to influence the SEN review. It is of the highest importance. It is something that we will be able to get on with and apply more resources to once we have moved beyond the policy letter and we are able to focus on some other work. So we look forward to doing that and I do not see any reason for the States to reject this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel will reply to the debate.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

1025 I will try and be brief and I thank the Members who have spoken for their support. Concerns raised by Deputy Stephens and the reason why I chose to put in specifically and emphasise the comment from the UNCRPD general comment, which lays out the environment that best corresponds to the requirements and preferences.

1030 Deputy Stephens did mention not to set hares running, that there is some idea of full inclusion. Full inclusion could very well be that there needs to be an understanding that every child is in the best environment that is for them and how we design that, in Guernsey, as Deputy Leadbeater mentioned, with the range that we have in Guernsey and the schools that we have. That is why we need the review. I do not necessarily think that answers Deputy Stephens' query in full but I am sure we can have some discussions on the general comment.

1035 It is just also to remind Members that, by placing the rights of the children – it is not about the parents, it is about the rights of the children, what is best for them – at the centre of the review, through all these conventions ... Yes, have lots of words, but actually they are built out of experience and at the centre of that is what is actually needed and what is best for the child.

1040 Deputy Smithies also had a slight concern and he mentioned about my comments on the Baubigny Schools, which was something that it is something that comes up. It is not a criticism on the provision that is provided there by the excellent team of staff, it is more on how that interpretation came to the end and cost was the end factor, not what would actually be the best way of provided SEND in the school.

I give way to Deputy Fallaize.

1045

Deputy Fallaize: I am very grateful to Deputy Hansmann Rouxel and I completely forgot when I was speaking, and this is on the point that she is making, to provide some reassurance on this point that Deputy Smithies made. He asked about the potential for the diversion of resources away from special schools and I do not think that is implied, at all, in the amendment, and it is certainly not something that is part of the plans of the Committee.

1050 I am sorry that I did not provide that reassurance when I spoke, but that was an opportunity to do it.

Thank you, sir.

1055 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** I thank Deputy Fallaize for his intervention and that is good to have covered on that point.

Just in terms of the intervention from Deputy Inder, I think Deputy Fallaize did cover that off quite well. But again, it is about centring on the needs of the children and I am sure the review will be able to do that.

1060 So I commend the amendment to the States and hope you all vote for it.

The Bailiff: We vote, then, on the amendment proposed by Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, seconded by Deputy Yerby.

1065 **Deputy Tooley:** Sir, I have just come back.

I suspect it is not necessary, but to say that I am a parent of a child of school age with a determination of special educational needs.

The Bailiff: Do we have to have a recorded vote?

1070

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

The Bailiff: I suspect nobody will be voting against, do you still wish to have one?

1075 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** That is fine. That would be perfect. Then we would have it all on record. I would like a recorded vote, please.

The Bailiff: It is just these are taking up rather a lot of time, but you are entitled to ask for a recorded vote so you will have a recorded vote.

1080 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 39, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	None	None	Deputy Mooney
Deputy Green			
Deputy Paint			
Deputy Dorey			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Yerby			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy Langlois			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Roffey			
Deputy Prow			
Deputy Oliver			
Alderney Rep. Roberts			
Alderney Rep. Snowdon			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Kuttelwascher			
Deputy Tindall			
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Lester Queripel			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Le Pelley			
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Lowe			
Deputy Laurie Queripel			
Deputy Smithies			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			

The Bailiff: Thank you. There were 39 votes in favour, no-one against. It was carried unanimously.

We can now start general debate and I can just say that there will be a set of revised Propositions incorporating the amendments that will be available to be circulated fairly shortly.

1085 Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

1090 In general debate I would like to make a few points. I certainly do not want to lose the Sixth Form Centre at the Grammar School. It provides for a wide range of options for sixth formers currently, a full range of A-level and IB subjects. And of course the potential there, on site, for providing services to the colleges as well, where of course they cannot provide the full range, if

you like, of A-level and IB subjects. So it is doing quite a worthy, Island wide function. Of course, it has a record of excellent results and that is current and we know it. We are not projecting into the future in terms of an unknown with a new system or two new schools.

1095 The second point I want to make is that I do not want money spent on La Mare Primary School at this time. This is a review that we are dealing with today, of secondary and post-secondary education. It is not primary education that we are reviewing. That is another whole major issue for the future.

1100 It is very important that we concentrate – and the resources that the Department has, and the five Deputies that are looking after this particular area ... It is very important that they get the secondary and post-secondary transformation right, and that is going to be no mean feat as we understand. A full review of primary education is for the future and it must take place before any rebuilding of facilities in the primary education sector takes place.

1105 I want to also express the fact that I am not against in any way the rebuild, in the future, of La Mare de Carteret Primary. In fact I support the rebuilding – and have for a number of years, in fact since I have been in the States – of the secondary school at La Mare de Carteret and continue to.

1110 But I do not want further closures of our primary community schools either, because the children are close to their community schools. There are a lot of positives in terms of keeping those primary schools that we have operating in Guernsey. I hear all the time from Deputy Fallaize 'operating from fewer sites'. I worry about that. Those words conjure up the whole image of rationalisation of the primary sector and I just worry about that. But he knows how I feel about that particular angle.

1115 I want to also make the point here that La Houquette School in the west is a two-form entry school, right through every year. I find that article 5.1.10 on page 21 is a bit derogatory to La Houquette, if you read it my way! (*Laughter*) Derogatory in that it makes statements like the fact it is past its intended lifespan. (*Laughter*) That is an unfortunate line that you have in that particular area and it obviously supports the point of derogatory that I am making. That is a school, it is progressive, it is turning out wonderful people and it is also achieving excellent results; and long may it continue to serve the western parishes.

1120 I would like to make on further point, too, and that is with regard to the Forest School, another school in the west and I maintain that is a two-form entry school as well now because it is one school on two sites, if you look at the Forest and Le Rondin, and it is totally integrated by one head teacher. One head teacher is looking after the whole breadth, really, of primary education, in a very different way from what other head teachers are looking after within the primary sector.

1125 So Le Rondin, I see as one school on two sites, although of course the two sites are right together, one on one side of the road and the other on the other side of the road. The head teacher is obviously travelling between the two, conducting the school business on both sides and integrating the two schools. So there we have another two-form entry school.

1130 In terms of my review of the Propositions, I will not be supporting the first Proposition which I feel is actually disintegrating, or taking away that very popular and very worthwhile Sixth Form Centre at the Grammar School currently, that as I say is serving the Island as a whole very widely.

1135 I do support the second Proposition, which is organising higher education in purpose-built facilities at the former St Peter Port School, but that alone is a big fit. I worry about that because I think there is room for spillover and there is need for spillover and the spillover, as I always saw it, goes onto the Grammar School and the utilisation of part of that site for higher education purposes.

I take it that the third Proposition has been taken away, or integrated somewhere else, as we found out yesterday; suspended.

1140 In terms of the fourth, of course, I would not support the redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Primary at this time because, as I say, we are not into primary education through this debate and that has to be looked at holistically, right across the *piste*, Islandwide, before starting building here and there. The job is big enough at the moment for the Education Committee to concentrate on secondary and post-secondary.

Proposition 5, to spend £5.8 million more on digital, it seems to me that in that we have gone for Agilysys and the £200 million programme there, of transformation for IT and digital services, education surely could link into that. We are spending another £4 million a year over 10 years on digital and IT. I think Education could link up and, of course, there is also a budget in Education for IT services; and I was always a bit critical when I was working in Education that they were spending £5 million some years on IT and other years it was £3 million or £4 million. It was a lot of money being spent every year on IT services, so I do not see a need for another £5.8 million there. Link into the Agilysys programme, please.

In terms of the sixth Proposition, I would agree to the first, 6a); 6b), I do not see quite the necessity there of an extra £4 million and I supported the amendment, which moves away – I hope that was the intention – from the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre and moving that into Health, which I would prefer of course remains with –

Deputy Dorey: Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Proposition 6b) was deleted by Amendment 2, so it no longer exists.

Deputy de Lisle: Thanks very much. Good on that!

The only problem was that it built up money into Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 and I was not too keen on that particular aspect as I indicated yesterday.

In all, sir, I think we have further debate in the future, with respect to this particular issue. I think it will carry over into the next session, after the election, and I look forward to further examination of these Propositions at that time.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, thank you very much, and I should declare an interest before I start, in accordance with my declaration of interests which is available on my website, bearing in mind that I think that to a fairly minimal degree but to some extent the schools' music service are affected by some of these proposals, I remind Members of the fact that I am married to a member of the staff of the schools' music service.

The first thing to say is that these amended Propositions are, in my view, better than the original ones. My Committee, however, does stand entirely by its letter of comment that was issued before this debate. I remind the Assembly that the letter of comment did make it expressly clear that we did not want to overturn any of the policy decisions that had already been made in respect of secondary education, but we wanted to make some objective points about aspects of the financial impact of the case for these Propositions.

As far as I am concerned, my colleagues and I would say that we called it as we saw it. Deputy Fallaize was correct, I think, to call the comments unprecedented. I think that was probably a fair characterisation and in a way that was exactly what we were trying to do. We were trying to set a precedent because in future, I believe I have the support of my Committee colleagues on this, every significant and major capital programme that comes to the States for debate should be subject, in my view, to a Scrutiny Management Committee letter of comment in advance. That would certainly be my advice to the next Scrutiny Management Committee. There is the intention to have this process of handover notes to the next States, I think that is something we would definitely make a point of including.

I am still giving thought to these amended proposals. I think objectively the case for the 11-18 elements are, in my view, evidently stronger than the further education or primary school elements, for some of the reasons that have been discussed already. My Committee – and perhaps I can single out my colleague Advocate Peter Harwood, who was particularly strong on

this – does and has had reservations about the evidence base in respect of the Guernsey Institute concept.

If I could briefly refer back to the letter of comment, I think on page 6 of the letter of comment, helpfully under the title 'The Guernsey Institute'; and I quote:

This Committee believes that the information provided does not have sufficient detail to enable a full understanding of how the proposed Guernsey Institute will work in practice, nor does it clearly identify and evidence how student figures will be increased. No evidence or research is referenced regarding how the proposed Guernsey Institute can start to address the local skills gap. In addition, no evidence is presented to justify the assertion that the new organisation can realistically attract overseas paying students.

1200 Now, given that the majority of the cost element, as I understand it, appears to be generated
from the creation of the Guernsey Institute and not from the new 11-18 model that was an issue
for our Committee. I would be grateful, when Deputy Fallaize comes to sum up the debate at the
end of this process that he gives some particular reassurance on that and addresses that matter
head on really in terms of the evidence base. Fundamentally I do not want to vote against that
1205 Proposition but I think the SMC have made a valid point and I would like him to address that.

I do not want to say too much about the primary school project being included in this policy
letter, but my Committee did have reservations about mixing that up with secondary
transformation, a point that Deputy de Lisle just made. But for me personally, in all conscience, as
somebody has championed the rebuilding of both the primary school and secondary school at La
1210 Mare and sat on both the management committees in the last political term, I am not personally
minded to block that Proposition, even if I did vote for the amendment number 3 from Deputies
St Pier and Trott yesterday, because of the apparent lack of strategic finesse, if you like, of that
particular part of the Propositions.

I will turn to some more general comments about the programme business case in a moment,
1215 sir, but I just have few other questions for Deputy Fallaize again for when he sums up. My
recollection is that when this States agreed in principle to go down the road for the direction of
travel on a two-school model, or the one school two sites model, there was a talk in the
amendment in the document that Deputy Fallaize and his colleagues produced at that time about
the importance of reforms to the Education Law and also – just waiting for the alarm to stop
1220 ringing – the importance of the move to the local management of schools, the delegation of
authority to individual schools.

I am not sure there is much material in this document about the need for the Education Law to
be changed and the importance of the need for a greater delegation of powers, local
management of schools. I think it would be quite important for me and for other people to have
1225 some sense of where that is right now and how that fits in with this. I anticipate the answer would
be, and it would be probably something along the lines of, 'This is the capital step. We need the
money to construct the additional buildings, etc.'

I think it is quite important that there are real steps towards the delegation of authority and
the local management of schools because I think that is his Committee's position. I just wondered
1230 why that perhaps has not been emphasised in this debate, when it was emphasised quite a lot in
the last debate.

Turning to the programme business case: the programme business case that has been
produced was, of necessity, quite a high-level document with a promise of a lot of further details
to be included in the individual outline business case for each of the constituent parts. But the
1235 intention is not, now, clearly to bring any of that back to the States. It is certainly not the intention
to bring each of those further outline business cases back to the States, so it will be P&R,
therefore. And P&R will, therefore, not only be the final arbiter on cost but also on a range of
other factors that may or may not be included in the detailed outline business case stage.

For example, the final governance models to be adopted, which I have just referred to; issues
1240 relating to bus transportation; the final educational model itself ; and the assessment of the
criteria for excellence. All of those things are actually listed in the programme business case. These

proposals, arguably, go beyond the normal concept of delegation of authority to P&R in our view, when those kinds of things are factored in.

1245 Page 2 of the letter comment is probably the final point that I will make on this – no, I will leave that there.

The next point I just wanted to raise was about the risks involved with the contracts, because the programme business case rightly identifies the risks associated with embarking upon such a major construction phase within a short time period, that is to say four major construction projects for Education alone. That is two secondary school sites, a new further education institute
1250 site and a new primary school, all to be started within two years and that is even before allowing for other States' construction projects, like obviously the hospital modernisation.

The programme business case, having identified the problem in that regard does not make any attempt to assess the problem. So the question really is have Education, or indeed Policy & Resources, carried out to date any process to determine the ability of the construction market to
1255 be able to respond to that level of demand, particularly given the desire on the part of Education, Sport & Culture to place the contracts with local contractors? I certainly support that decision, but there are practical issues that flow from that.

Another issue with regard to project management which has sprung from the programme business case and the question is: has either Education or Policy & Resources made any independent assessment of the capability or capacity of the States itself to manage such multiple
1260 projects? There are references in the programme business case and on page 18 it talks about programme organisation and governance; and page 19 makes reference to contract management, with a rather bland statement, quote:

The Estates team will manage the delivery of the construction projects ...

The PIR on the construction of Les Beaucamps was actually very critical of the ability of the
1265 States to manage a *single* construction project. So the obvious question is: if the Post-Implementation Review (PIR) for Les Beaucamps was critical of the States' ability to manage one project, then where can the confidence be for managing multiple projects?

The next point is about the contracts themselves, because the programme business case does not in itself identify whether it is proposed that there is a single contract, and the tendering
1270 process ... It does not clearly identify whether it is proposed that there is a single contract tendering process for the construction of both the secondary school sites, or whether it is proposed that there be separate contracts for each site. I think some clarity on that may be helpful.

Just to come back to the alleged savings, in terms of the savings that I think would be attributed to the 11-18 element of this, it relates to transport. And the question is, basically: does
1275 the estimated annual saving of £800,000 or so, put forward by Education, make any allowance for the potential additional costs associated with the new school bus service that may be required to accommodate the three extra one-hour days? I think some answers on that would be helpful.

In the final analysis I think the amended Propositions do begin to address some of my
1280 Committee's concerns. I think I still need persuading on the Guernsey Institute dimension. The delegated authority does entrust P&R to do a large degree of oversight and scrutiny here and I think that can, potentially, be supplemented by the Scrutiny Management Committee, or an independent body commissioned by ourselves, in addition possibly a public hearing. So that does give me some assurance.

Of course, if there are ongoing concerns about value for money, then Policy & Resources does
1285 have the ability to bring this back, and I would absolutely expect that to happen if there were genuine concerns on that Committee about value for money. But ultimately, sir, certainly in terms of the 11-18 aspects of these proposals I do think, after a great deal of thought, that it is probably now time to just get on with that and I will be voting for those Propositions and I will certainly
1290 continue to consider the position in relation to the Guernsey Institute.

Thank you very much.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

1295 My voting against several of these Propositions will make no difference whatsoever to the eventual outcome. On that note, I predict that two thirds of this Assembly will vote in favour of the vast majority of these Propositions. At least my voting against several of them will ease my conscience because I am not convinced the one school two college model is going to be the best way forward for our children, their parents or our teachers, or for our community.

1300 As my colleagues will recall, I spoke against and voted against the one school two college model back in 2018 and having said that, I said in the media I saw no point in continuing to oppose the introduction of the model, since it was in play. However, a lot has happened since my making that announcement. I have done a lot of soul searching and I have undertaken a lot of my own research. Of course the results of my research simply mirror the dozens of emails my
1305 colleagues and I have been receiving these last few weeks. There are some teachers who are in favour of the Propositions and there are some teachers who oppose the Propositions. There are some parents who are in favour of the Propositions and there are some parents who oppose the Propositions. We have also received emails from educational experts whose opinions differ. Some are all in favour and some are opposed.

1310 Oddly enough, I stand to be corrected on this sir, but I do not recall receiving a single email from a student, nor a child, which intrigues me somewhat seeing as this whole issue is about their education. I would have thought we would have received several hundred emails from youngsters by now.

1315 This is the first time I have spoken in this debate. Although I prepared a couple of speeches, I did not need to make them, because what I was going to say in those speeches had already been said by my colleagues when they spoke. So that was a genuine attempt on my part to avoid tedious repetition. (**Deputy Green:** Hear, hear,) I am sure my colleagues appreciate that. At least Deputy Green does. (**Deputy Ferbrache:** I do!) And Deputy Ferbrache, by the sound of it.

1320 So as usual we have received opinions from Islanders in favour and opinions from Islanders against and it is us, the politicians, who now have to make a judgement call. We make that judgement call knowing that we are going to upset thousands of our fellow Islanders, at the same time as pleasing thousands of other fellow Islanders.

1325 We are asked to make that judgement call on the evidence that has been provided to us. Not because we want to please our fellow Islanders and not because we are afraid of upsetting our fellow Islanders, because we want to do what we sincerely believe is right for the community, based on the evidence we have been provided.

1330 We have all been elected to make that judgement call. We have been elected to govern and to speak out if we are not convinced by the evidence that has been provided. Well, sir, I am not convinced by the evidence we have been provided with. I do not believe it is the best model for our children, for our teachers, for the parents or for our community.

1335 In all honesty, I have lost faith somewhat in the Committee. I will expand on that later. Not only have I lost faith in the Committee but I have also lost faith in many of my colleagues over this whole education issue. I say that because the vast majority of this Assembly voted against a Proposition put forward by the Scrutiny Management Committee, to undertake an independent tribunal of inquiry into the sequence of events that have happened in our Education Department recently.

1340 If any of my colleagues think I am confusing and conflating two separate issues, I am not, because both are founded in faith or, to be precise, lack of faith. As my brother, Deputy Laurie Queripel, said when he spoke, it was a sad day for the Assembly and a sad day for Scrutiny when that Proposition was rejected. I say all of that with an extremely heavy heart.

Just in case any of my colleagues are wondering why I did not pursue a vote of no confidence in the Committee, sir, there is a simple answer to that. I know full well it would not have been

supported and therefore would have been a complete waste of taxpayers' money, a complete waste of Law Officers' time and a complete waste of the Assembly's time.

1345 I can only hope, sir, that my colleagues on the Committee and my colleagues in the Assembly – if there are any who take issue with what I am saying here – they can accept and appreciate that I am saying this on a completely professional basis. None of what I am saying here is meant on a personal basis. If any colleagues take what I am saying on a personal basis, then that is their misinterpretation of what I am saying and it is their choice.

1350 When the majority of my colleagues voted in favour of the one school two college model, I am sure they did so believing that the Committee would eventually come back to the Assembly with a policy letter that covered absolutely everything, dotted every 'i' and crossed every 't'. The reality is, sadly, they have not done that.

1355 This is a massive project. It will cost well over £150 million and we are being asked to support it when we still have not been provided with all the details. So I am not prepared to support it. I think it would be irresponsible of me to support it when I do not feel fully informed. How many times have we heard Deputies say in their speeches in this Chamber that we need to be fully informed in order to be able to reach a decision? The answer to that question is, sir, of course we have heard that dozens of times.

1360 Surely there are too many unknowns here for any of us to say we do feel fully informed? For example, the school bus issue is listed in the policy letter as an issue that still needs to be resolved in relation to lengthening of the school day. But there is another option which I did mention in a debate quite some time ago, and that other option is to reduce the length of the school holidays.

1365 The whole point is to ensure that children spend more time in school. Have the Committee had those discussions with CT Plus and other transport providers, if they could provide the transport if the school holidays were reduced as opposed to lengthening the school day? Have the Committee had those discussions with CT Plus or other transport providers? If they have not then a supplementary question is why have they not had those discussions?

1370 Road traffic congestion is listed as being a medium probability and the Committee say they will mitigate as much as possible, by making improvements to junctions, making improvements to walking and cycling routes, improving the bus service and providing incentives for active travel options. All well intended, sir, I am sure, but how are they going to do all that? We do not have that detail. How are they going to mitigate against traffic congestion around schools where traffic is already causing a problem?

1375 I give way to Deputy Tindall, sir.

Deputy Tindall: I thank Deputy Lester Queripel for giving way.

1380 Would Deputy Lester Queripel agree with me that we will actually, on the Development & Planning Authority, see the traffic impact assessment when it comes through at the planning application stage?

1385 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** I am sure we will, but I would still like an answer to the question that I have asked of Deputy Fallaize, please, when he responds. How are they going to mitigate against traffic congestion around schools where traffic is already causing a problem and how are they going to going to improve walking and cycling routes? Baubigny and Beaucamps already have walking and cycling routes in place, so how are they going to be improved?

All the traffic that used to travel to the other schools as well, in other words the ones that will be closed, will now be converging on the roads leading to and from just two sites. Is that not the case? I stand to be corrected, but if that is the case that really concerns me.

1390 I give way to Deputy Inder, sir.

Deputy Inder: Thank you very much for giving way, Deputy Queripel.

I am always intrigued about this. The President of the DPA is always quick to get up and say, 'We will look at this later.' If we look at the development area of Baubigny and that sort of area,

1395 there are potentially hundreds of houses going up in that area. Do the DPA take every traffic impact assessment in isolation? Do they ignore what is likely to come in the future?

Have they been made aware that in all likelihood ... Or do they even put that into consideration? Or do they take everything in isolation? Effectively are things built up – so Pointues Rocques gets approved, St Sampson's may or may not get approved and then we look at it later?

1400 Do they ever look at the global transport infrastructure? I do not think that they do.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, Deputy Inder makes a valid point. Currently we look at things in isolation, but part of the DPA action plan is going to be looking at that issue – one of the many issues that the action plan seeks to address.

1405 I give way to Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: I thank Deputy Lester Queripel for giving way. Is my microphone on? Yes it is.

1410 We must remember that the staff at traffic and highways work very closely with the staff in Education. That is the operational bit, the doing bit. So the two Committees are talking to each other at staff level.

With regard to the existing level of traffic, I think Deputy Lindsay de Sausmarez has raised this before, as has Deputy John Gollop, is that there is more of an awareness of the cumulative effect of the traffic because, historically, when the development has taken place, it has not had full regard for the additional increase in traffic volume. Now there is an acute awareness of that so mitigation is considered, if you like, further on up the food chain.

So all of these issues are challenges, but they are not unresolvable.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I thank Deputy Brehaut for the intervention.

1420 As I said the accumulation of traffic in one particular area is something that the DPA are going to be looking at as part of the action plan.

Getting back to my speech, I still have not been corrected so I will just carry on with what I was saying. Does not all this condensing of traffic into just two areas fly in the face of the Transport Strategy? It certainly seems to me as though it is does.

1425 Sir, it is absolutely vital that we look at every issue holistically and in this particular issue it is not just about money and it is not just about the future education of our children. It is about everything to do with this whole project, everything to do with this whole issue. To me, to look at it just from the financial or the educational views is blinkered. You have to look at things holistically.

1430 Moving on to the issue of recruitment and retention of our teachers, it was said by some of our colleagues when we spoke in the previous debate that a two-site model will attract far more teachers than a three-site model. How can that be when so many teachers have told us that they are very much opposed to a two-site model? Will those teachers want to stay working within a model that they said they do not believe in? That is another concern. If they do take that view then will we not have a problem with future retention?

1435 One further point I want to make about the need to look at things holistically, and hopefully this will bear out what I am saying to colleagues, sir, through you. It was only after St Sampson's High had actually been built did a previous States then realise they had not given sufficient thought and consideration to the infrastructure in the area. It was only after the school had been built they then realised they had to drastically improve the drainage in the area and make the roads in the area one-way.

I will give way to Deputy de Sausmarez, sir.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I thank Deputy Lester Queripel for giving way.

1445 I believe I am right in saying that that was in the days before States' developments needed planning approval and I think that was a case in point of why that was a poor policy.

Deputy Lester Queripel: I stand to give way to Deputy Paint, sir.

1450 **Deputy Paint:** I was in the Environment Department then and the fact was that we had to do the road one way for the safety of people but it was an afterthought, as Deputy Queripel says.

Deputy Lester Queripel: I thank Deputy Paint for verifying that, sir.

I give way to Deputy Dorey, sir. My speech is going to take a lot longer if people keep interrupting, sir; but I give way to Deputy Dorey.

1455

Deputy Dorey: Thank you for giving way.

I was on the project board for the St Sampson's School and was a Member of T&R and there were plans to do the improvements to the road infrastructure but the then Minister of the Environment did not want to do them, so they were delayed until post the 2008 election when they were then done, as they should have been. But he was well aware that there needed to be improvements and there were plans to do it, but there was not political support for it from the then Environment Department.

1460

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, being well aware of something and not doing anything about it bears out exactly what I was saying. It was a nonsense approach, a completely nonsensical approach to build a school and then look at the drainage and the roads in the area and how to deal with all that. That should have been dealt with in the embryonic stage of the project, not after the place has been built. That is exactly what I am saying here. So I thank Deputies for actually supporting me by saying what they said. That is why we need to look at this issue and every issue holistically.

1465

1470

In relation to the social aspect, upon reflection, I am still of the view that the larger the school, the greater the risk of alienation for some of our children. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I said that in the previous debate last year and, as I say, upon reflection, I am still of that view: the larger the school, the greater the risk of alienation for some of our children.

1475

Now, some of my colleagues will completely disagree with me but that is my view. I respect their view and I ask them to respect mine. I believe smaller schools tick more boxes than larger schools. That is not only my view but it is also the view of many of the teachers I have been in contact with.

1480

In summary, it was John Lennon who once said – (**A Member:** Imagine!) He did say '*Imagine*', he said a lot more than that. (*Interjection*) Ringo Starr said that, actually.

John Lennon once said, 'Life is something that happens whilst you are planning your life'. In other words, you simply do not have control of everything that happens in your life. But that is not the case here because the Committee have had every opportunity to stay in perfect control and in my view, with the utmost respect to the Committee, they seem to have lost control.

1485

Having said that, I very much appreciate the Committee have lived and breathed this whole education issue for months now and I am sure they have had sleepless nights over it. But they have not delivered the detailed policy letter I thought they were going to deliver at this stage. Consequently I do not feel fully informed and that is why I say I have lost faith in the Committee.

1490

In defence of the Committee, there are those out in our community who say that the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture got it wrong, they are to blame. But that is not the case. That is not what those people should be saying. If they feel somebody got it wrong, then surely what they should be saying is the majority of the States got it wrong when they voted for one school across two sites?

1495

Moving towards conclusion, I think it is fair to say that every child has a dream. On that note, I want to recite the last three lines of a poem written by William Yeats, entitled *He Wishes for the Cloths of Heaven*. I have done this before in education debates, I think it is relevant. Those three lines are as follows:

I, being poor, have only my dreams;

I have spread my dreams under your feet;
Tread softly as you tread on my dreams.

In closing, sir, I ask for separate recorded votes on all the Propositions when we go to the vote, please.

1500 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Paint.

1505 **Deputy Paint:** Sir, how I come to the conclusion I have is what I am about to say and I feel very much the same as Deputy Queripel. I first went to the Sarel School at St Saviour's. Now, I was five years old, had very limited English – perhaps not much has changed since then! (*Laughter*) I had to listen to foreign people telling me things that I did not understand. Eventually I got the hang of it and I acted as a translator for another little boy who was in exactly the same boat when I was there. He could not speak a word of English, so I had learned enough to tell him what the teacher was saying.

1510 I then went to St Saviour's School. That was alright. Well, it was school. Then I went to Beaucamps School. I will be quite honest with you all, at that time, from five to 14 years old when I left, I thought the States had taken my freedom away. I just did not want to be there. I would have been much better in my boat at Perelle or going on a beach, swimming.

1515 We then talked about the subject of selection in life. Every person in this world gets selected one way or another. Everyone in this Assembly has been selected by the people who represent them; and that is what we should be doing. I know this is a very difficult subject but that is what we should be doing according to what we believe. You are not going to please everybody and you have got to accept that.

1520 Just a few years ago La Mare de Carteret School was getting very bad results, so something changed there. I do not know what it was, exactly, but something changed. (**A Member:** The Headmaster.) The ratings came up again. I believe it is the teachers that have done that, not the building. It must be.

1525 I really worry about two large schools, for all the reasons that other people have said, so I am not going to repeat them. We have heard of two large schools in England that are doing *really* well. What we do not hear of is the many that are not doing so well and those schools in the UK who are absolute failures. We have not heard anything about that to my knowledge.

1530 I feel very sorry for Scrutiny because they did not get their way. But they are in a very difficult position now and because they have accepted and agreed with the two-school model, anything they do, they may be conflicted. So where are they going to go then? You have put them in a very difficult position. If Scrutiny puts out a report that is in favour of most of the things, are they going to be accused of the report not being honest? They could be.

Deputy Green: Sir, I am grateful for Deputy Paint giving way.

1535 I envisage that might possibly, theoretically might be a problem and that is why, if these Propositions are carried and there is delegated authority to P&R and there is role for the Scrutiny Management Committee to provide some additional oversight, then it could be provided by an independent body that we commission and not by ourselves.

1540 **Deputy Paint:** I accept that but unless some other way is found by Scrutiny, they could be in trouble with everybody.

1545 I have to say that I have been fully against the Propositions that are before us ever since the first one came with Deputy Le Pelley as head. I am not in favour of losing the Grammar School, I never have been. I believe, as I said earlier, that we are all selected in life and you have got to take the good with the bad.

Now, we have heard recently about a huge high school in the UK that burned down. I do not think circumstances like that would actually get here; I think people are *much* better behaved. (Laughter)

1550 **A Member:** I am not sure about my daughter this morning! (Laughter)

Deputy Paint: But there are a lot of other circumstances that might put us in the same position like an electrical fault that burns the whole lot down, like perhaps an airliner crashing or perhaps even a meteorite hitting it. So I would really like to know what would happen with 1,400 children if there was a school that could not be used any more. It is a risk.

1555 So really that is the main thing. I cannot vote for this. I just cannot. My experience from going to school, merchant navy college, where everybody was pulling in the same way, in all the schools I went to here they were harmless children. Some have done very well, but that is life.

1560 This is going to pass, I have no doubt about it, I just hope that in the future I do not have to come back and say, 'Well, I told you so'.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Before I call Deputy Inder, I wonder if it would be helpful if we had circulated the revised Propositions. (Interjections) Okay, you may have had them by email. Some people like paper copies and some people do not like using their electronic devices in the Chamber. So, if those could be circulated to everyone – and we will just pause while that is done.

Thank you. Does everyone have one?

In that case, I will call as the next speaker. Deputy Inder.

1570 **Deputy Inder:** Sir, I will not take too long.
I think John Lennon also wrote *We Can Work it Out*, which also feeds in somewhat –

Deputy Lester Queripel: Point of correction, sir! (Laughter)

1575 **Deputy Inder:** Blimey!

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Paul McCartney wrote *We Can Work it Out*! (Laughter)

1580 **Deputy Inder:** I was trying to be clever. I looked it up on Google. I never liked John Lennon at all, I did not rate him as a writer, and it came up as number 12! (Interjections) I was more of a Strummer man – I know, you have seen how I dress!

1585 I should not be too long. I am not going to pick through it. Deputy Fallaize has always kind of known where I am on this and it is not for me, anyway, I do not think to start picking historical fights. But I am where I am and I am immovable from that.

1590 What I will say, and this is more about disappointment more than anything. I would like people to cast their mind back to around the three-school models debate – Deputy Fallaize, Deputy Graham, Deputy Dorey, and I think Deputy Tooley was one of the four – brought over a chap from the Cotswolds. Was his name Mr Smith? (Interjection) Mr Morgan? I beg your pardon. For some reason I have got Smith stuck in my head, maybe that is another group.

There are no two ways about it, notwithstanding all the nonsense that happened a couple of weeks later over Facebook – Mr Morgan was a very formidable character.

1595 I actually thought that the three-school model was in trouble at that point. The fact it was in trouble for completely different reasons a couple of weeks later is a different subject, but I actually liked that chap. He was a leader, a real leader. The chap was formidable, he was convincing and there was a bit of me that thought, 'Do you know what? He might have something there.'

He was a fan of the larger comprehensive schools and without going through a Tacitus-like history, the alternative model won the day. We walked out of Committee. I sulked for about a week. The Committee disappeared for a year and they were in the process of delivering their successful amendment. And this is the disappointment.

I think I could have moved towards the 11-18 model had I had some confidence in what I saw as leadership.

When we come to selling, ladies and gentlemen, it is about a confidence trick, or a trick of confidence, at least. If you have got someone up front selling a substantial change to something like education, it takes the people with you. The reality is, Members, I do not think I have seen that.

In fact, I do not think Education, Sport & Culture have had a full-time Director of Education for nearly two years now. They did not manage to employ a full-time Director of Education; we have had issues over the creation of positions. I am not going to go back into that in that kind of detail, but there is nothing that I saw that was, as sold, that someone has grabbed this model at a selling point of view and taken the people along with them. I just have not seen it.

With the exception of the post-16 – which, again, I was a fan of – I have said to anyone who would listen, coming out effectively of the tertiary sector I do not like the idea of what I see as de-selecting at 16. I think it is a fallacy that we embed this idea that 11-18 is what it is, the primary route to success. There are plenty of people out there under-employed with degrees than you would ever find that are tradesmen, I can tell you that any day of the week.

But the two main arguments were educational outcomes and keeping politicians out of education. Of the educational outcomes, I am not that convinced that doubling the size of the schools will mitigate ... Sorry, any of the tactical outcomes that are described in the policy letter, I do not see that particularly could have been different with a better-resourced three-school model and I have a great fear that doubling the size of the 11-16 bit is going to cause problems with the school. I cannot get my head away from that. I just do not believe it and I will not be convinced by it.

We come from a smaller school background. We have what we call community schools. Now no one likes that word but I think it was one of the so-called myths that were busted in Deputy Fallaize's response, in his numerous responses. I am sorry: schools which have got 1,400 people in them do not feel right for Guernsey. I work on a gut instinct; it is as simple as that. If it does not smell right, it usually does not smell right.

Deputy Fallaize also, the second thing he said, was to keep the politics out of education and, to a great round of applause, practically a standing ovation. But I have not seen that. I have not seen that at all, sir. Actually the problem with this is because we have not seen that leadership, that selling ability, from the day that the old Committee left. I genuinely wish I had seen that we had had a Mr Morgan-type character that immediately grabbed the two-school model, because that was the big sell. This is effectively, to me, a politically designed education system, when we were told that the best thing you could do was to keep politicians out of education and since that date I have not seen the massive sell.

The messaging is always important and I just do not think – I am sort of repeating myself now – that the public have been carried along with this.

Then of course the other big thing, time-after-time again, and I think Deputy Ferbrache asked of Deputy Fallaize in one of the questions and answers, that we were going to have detailed financial plans. I may have got that slightly wrong, but the expectancy again was I think Deputy Graham said it, we would be back in two or three months, everything is fairly easy – and it did not happen.

We are almost two years on and we still have not got the detailed financial plans. That was the promise when those of you who voted for the two schools, you were promised leadership, you were promised politics out of education and you were promised financial plans, plus other things and probably a better post-16 facility. But there were three substantial pieces of promises that you were given and I just do not see it in the policy letter.

1650 Finally, there has been much talk about integrity and I think it is a bit like educational outcomes, everyone is trying to 'out-integrify' each other. Whether we like it or not, I said two important things in my manifesto and I believe that is, in part, why I had a successful bye-election. I said that I would fight for selection and I would fight for La Mare de Carteret. Now, I lost both of those battles. Some of you talk about honour, integrity, we are trying to outdo each other on it, but that is what I promised my electorate and on that basis, plus all the other things, I cannot support a two-school model, because I just do not believe in larger schools.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

1660

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

Like the last two speakers, I find myself in a difficult place through none of my making, although you could blame me and I would accept I have failed to persuade my colleagues, I have failed to persuade those in the Chamber today and my colleagues of yesteryear. I have failed to persuade them to rebuild La Mare, as I thought that was best for Guernsey; and I failed to persuade you against a one-school model.

So what is best for Guernsey now?

You may say I am closing the stable door after the foal has well and truly trotted off over the horizon. But for me, it feels like someone else has demolished the stables. So instead of now being here today, with La Mare de Carteret rebuilt for some £56 million and three secondary schools rebuilt as promised, what do I do now?

Do I vote for a one-school model I do not agree with? I find that difficult. I do not have that warm feeling it will work. I think it will split fairly soon into two schools. It could give us two grammar/comprehensive colleges and stretch the academically gifted. It could really support and nurture those who need more help. It could have the facilities to mitigate disruptive behaviours and give those that need it nurturing and help, and it could have results that soar. But so could a three-school model of smaller schools.

So do I vote against the proposal, so I put a token marker down for an argument that I have lost? Do I abstain and abrogate my responsibilities, as that is what it feels like to me?

1680 Like I said, I have been taken on a journey to a destination I had no intention of visiting. I now find myself in this new land, but as I look back to where I came from that landscape has been changed and is evolving. The first cohorts of the transition are now in class. I feel like a hostage; others will think I am a dissident.

1685 It would be disingenuous to change my spots just to fit in. Not only to me, but to those who voted for me; and the teachers who contacted me, and the parents. So I cannot vote for the main Proposition, Proposition 1. To vote against it, on the other hand, would be churlish. We do, as a team of Deputies, try and get the best results for Islanders. You would be very hard pushed to win every debate. There is a chance that this is the best for Guernsey and I am wrong. But, as the executive, we in this Chamber we check and challenge each other, we check and challenge each Committee. And at the very end of that process, we hope to have a better result following that input from all of us – the pros, the cons, the agnostics, the detractors.

1690 So on this occasion, I am going to rarely use *je ne vote pas*. Not on all the Propositions. I am sorry but I have nowhere else to go. But, relax. You will not need my vote. You have not taken any notice of it so far! (*Laughter*) But I do hope you deliver, I really do hope you deliver better schooling, better results and a great experience. I wish you well.

1695

The Bailiff: We are lurking very close to 12.30 p.m.; we have already agreed we will sit late this evening, if necessary, I am wondering whether we try and come back at 2 p.m. Could I just have an indication of how many people would wish to speak in general debate who have not yet done so? I thought so.

1700

Can I put to you, therefore, the proposition that we come back at 2 p.m. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: We will resume at 2 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.28 p.m.
and resumed at 2 p.m.*

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

Transforming Education Programme and Putting into effect the Policy Decisions made by the States in 2018 – Debate continued – Proposition 1, as amended, carried; Propositions 2-7 carried

1705 **The Bailiff:** We resume general debate on the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture's policy letter.

Who wishes to speak next? Oh, shall we go straight to the vote?

Deputy Prow – the Graveyard slot immediately after lunch. *(Laughter)*

1710 **Deputy Prow:** Thank you, sir.
I shall be very brief.

I would like to continue the theme that Deputy Al Brouard and Deputy Inder have started, because I find myself in precisely the same place.

1715 I made a long speech yesterday, so I am not going to cover that ground again except to say that my vote will be around the fact that I still believe there is insufficient evidence available for us as this Assembly to make a decision and we are not at the right stage to be able to pass this over to Policy & Resources. So any of the Propositions which delegate authority to approve expenditure I am unable to support.

1720 The fact that my manifesto when I was elected was of the same standpoint as Deputy Al Brouard and Deputy Neil Inder is well-known and well established. I have been consistent and I have consistently said this.

1725 I also made the point yesterday that some of the language that was used in criticising those people who voted for the sursis I do not think was fair. I think it is not irresponsible for us to take up that responsibility. This is a huge undertaking. It would change our education system that has served us well for very many generations; it would change it for ever and it is a massive sum of money all at one tranche. However, I have said all I have to say about that.

All I would say, the stance that I am going to take unfortunately means that I do not feel that I will be able to support 3h, but I thank Deputy Hansmann Rouxel for her excellent speech and I completely agree with everything that was said; but I will be able to support Proposition 7.

1730 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

1735 Obviously people are not very keen to speak to speak at this time. I would just like to try and answer some of the points that have been made. Obviously some will be picked up at the end.

But there were points about the financial predictions which are in the report about the savings. I can give you assurance that there has been some very detailed work that has been done. You can see it in the policy letter there is a timetable and we looked at all the rooms and there has been extremely detailed work to make those financial predictions. If you look at the programme business case it shows the criteria that we used to calculate those predictions.

1740

But I can give you assurance that the work was done by the team that works within the Centre, not the team that works within Education & Sport, so it is done independently of the Committee and there is immense detail in those predictions. And some of the staff said the level of detail is greater than you would ever expect and people who worked outside this Island, for a school at this stage, because there are a lot of unknowns until you actually start running the school.

1745

So in order to make the predictions they have had to go through in great detail you can see all the curriculum has been gone through and the choices that pupils can make at various stages in their education, so that we can have those very detailed financial predictions.

I think Deputy Inder mentioned his concerns about the predictions, and I would urge you to come and speak the officers within the Committee office so that he can understand the level of detail that has been done, because I think the level of detail is so robust and so detailed that it is far beyond what anybody would expect at this stage.

1750

There has also been some talk and Members mentioned the digital road map, and why is that needed. The work that was done which identified what we needed was done by the previous Committee, who commissioned the report. We received that report and included it in our proposals because, having seen the report, obviously the previous Committee had concerns about the situation, and we have then taken the proposals forward.

1755

I am going to read a few phrases out from the programme business case. It says:

The existing digital infrastructure provides a ratio of one laptop for all teachers and, on average, one laptop for every three learners, enabled by broadband networking, wifi and smartboards in classrooms. However much of this equipment is now reaching the end of its useful life and is becoming increasingly difficult to support.

It goes on, and I am not going to read it all:

The perception from schools is that this support is poor and lacks accountability.

1760

So those were the fundamental problems.

People said why does the FDS programme not fix it? And again that is covered within the programme business case. It says:

FDS won't, in the short term, automatically improve the IT support for schools and while it will refresh hardware on a like for like basis this does not meet the challenge of ensuring that teachers are skilled in embedding technological advancements in the way they plan and teach; likewise how children will learn and the skills they gain.

So the FDS will replace existing, but the whole point of this is to improve it to a new level, and again I will outline some of the improvements that we will get for the money that we spend on the digital road map. It says:

1765

The Digital Roadmap for Education, developed during 2018 and approved by the Committee in 2019, set out a more ambitious agenda for the transformation of digital capability and infrastructure in primary and secondary schools.

- 1:1 Chromebooks for all learners from Year 5
- Access to shared tablet devices for pupils below Year 5
- Widescreen TVs to replace Smartboards for classrooms where appropriate
- Specialist IT equipment available for relevant subject areas
- Upgrades to network bandwidth to support the increased number of devices
- More responsive technical support model to resolve issues quickly and efficiently
- Expanded range of training in digital skills available to all teaching staff
- Increased recognition of the use of innovative digital teaching techniques
- A dedicated governance body to oversee the ongoing development of digital policies and oversee the deployment of digital investment into schools

And the key outcomes would be:

- To equip all learners with a core set of digital skills, in line with the curriculum requirements, based on Google Suite for Education and a common suite of complementary software
- To enhance the use of digital technology in the classroom and promote the sharing of innovative teaching and learning techniques between schools
- To equip school leavers entering tertiary education/employment with an enhanced set of digital skills.

The key thing is to make sure that the pupils have the equipment; the teachers have the training and also the equipment to be able to deliver the digital technology; and we have proper governance overseeing the development. So I think that that money is well worth spending, it is additional to what is in the FDS. The FDS would not provide this level of investment and we think it is essential. So I urge you to support that proposal.

People have also mentioned about the transport strategy. In answer to a question I think which was again asked about the transport impact assessment, we have had a draft version but they are going to back and produce another version which will look at the traffic impact assessment which includes the Saltpans Data Park, the Kenilworth Vinery, Saltpans development, Pointues Rocques Development Framework involving 75-125 dwellings, ... allocated housing site between 133 and 263 dwellings, and Leale's Yard, worst case, 400 units. So all those possible developments will be considered in the next version of the Traffic Impact Assessment.

So it is not, as people have always criticised, that we just look at one area, we are looking at all the possible developments within the area when we look at the traffic impact assessment for St Sampson's site.

But I would remind you that in terms of bus service, we expect pupils to walk who live within a one-mile zone of the school and currently, based on where people live, 40% of pupils within the proposed St Sampson's catchment already live within the one-mile zone. So that is 40% of the pupils will not need to use the bus services; and 20% of the pupils in the Beaucamps catchment area already live within the walking zone.

Those comments on 'What are we going to do at Beaucamps? We do not need to do any improvements'. Well, for example the main road which goes past the school has no pavement, so that –

Okay, I will give way.

Deputy Inder: Thank you.

Having some experience of St Sampson's, unlike most people in this Assembly – well it is fact whether you like it or not, Deputy Gollop, I am in the neighbourhood and my children are at the school so I have some knowledge.

Deputy Dorey says that children within a mile of the school can either walk or, I think he said possibly take a bus. (*Interjection*) Walk or cycle possibly. Yes, walk or cycle. But unless that is enshrined in some kind of law he cannot make that happen unless he is going to start blocking road or something like for anyone who looks like they have got a child in the car at 10 past 8. So it would be interesting to see, this sounds very much aspirational – like I have said, aspirational, not based on any likely fact, because it will not happen. People, when it is raining in Guernsey, whether you like it or not they are not going to be letting their children walk in a force 6 down any of the La Vieille Rue or anything like that, or Les Effards.

They will not be walking to school.

Deputy Dorey: As you say, we cannot make people walk and I fully accept that, but what we can do is provide walk and stride zones so that rather than all the people ... Because if there are traffic problems people want to avoid them, so the idea is that we give a number of different locations where children can be dropped off, pupils can be dropped off so they can then walk from that to the school.

But I am just explaining to you in terms of bus service that 40% of the pupils will be in that walk zone, so that the bus service will not be serving those pupils.

As I was saying in relation to the Beaucamps area, there is not a pavement in the road so part of the £1 million allocated is to put a pavement along that main road. We are also looking at the

1815 number of junctions in the area. There is one pedestrianised, there is one traffic light junction at
the end of the Beaucamps road on the Mont d'Aval side, but we are looking at the other areas
where there is quite a high density of population and looking at how we can improve the walking
for pupils. What we believe is that if we make it what parents perceive as safe for children to walk
with proper pavements then they are far more likely to walk. So that is a key part of it in terms of
1820 improving the walking infrastructure for pupils to walk to the school.

There are many different proposals and as has been said as part of the planning application we
have to include a traffic impact assessment so that will be done as part of the planning
application.

I will conclude by saying that there are many other points that can be made, but saying that I
1825 personally have gone through a number of compromises and initially I supported selection but I
accepted that the view of the Assembly was that they did not want selection and obviously we
had a debate either side of the Election.

Again within the Committee my favoured school, and you can see it in the report, was the
Grammar School site but that was not the view of the rest of the Committee, so I have accepted
1830 that and I have compromised. Politics is the art of compromise, and if none of us compromise we
will never make any decisions because we have all got different views – some of us will have the
same views but there is obviously not a majority.

So we have to move the services that we give to our community forward and this applies to
everything that we do in this Assembly. We have to compromise on a solution that has a majority
1835 support. That is what happened in January last year, the Assembly made a decision on a proposal.
It was not supported by all and this is basically to provide the finance for that.

So I fully understand, just like me, that not everybody's first choice is what is proposed, but
sometimes you have to do for the best services of our population actually move forward and that
means compromise. Many times in this Assembly I have compromised and gone with not my first
1840 choice but found where there is a majority sit. And that is the beauty of our system of not having
party politics and that we can, as a group, get together and find a solution that has majority
support.

So I urge Members to reflect and think of the children of this Island and I know not everybody
supports this but please think of those and think there is a majority in favour of this solution. That
1845 is what happened in January and we cannot just delay and let our children sit in schools which just
deteriorate. So please, I urge you to compromise and go forward with these proposals.

Thank you.

Two Members: Hear, hear.

1850

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Sir, I think those are wise words from Deputy Dorey.

There was a moment yesterday where a wry smile crept across my face and it was when
1855 Deputy Roffey was talking in a similar vein, and more or less it was along the lines of we should let
the selection at 11 issue go. As of course he did, because I remember discussing selection at 11
on the stage at St James back in my first term (*Interjection*) alongside my friend Deputy Gollop, I
forget who the fourth persons was, but it was an interesting debate and my views on selection at
11 have remained throughout, and Members will be aware of those views from when we dealt
1860 with it last time. But of course Deputy Roffey's have remained consistent as well and he has
fought for it throughout and yet it would appear that it is okay for some of us to let go of our
values and principles as long as they now align with his. (*Interjections*) I say that deliberately
sarcastically because I follow the remarks of Deputy Dorey, he is of course quite right and we do
have to compromise.

1865 It does not mean necessarily that our views have changed and mine over selection at 11 have
not changed because I believe strongly when we debated this last time and the time before that

the majority of those that I represent favoured the retention of selection at 11 and I have seen nothing in the intervening period to change that view.

1870 Anyway, on to more constructive things, but just before I do I would like to compliment the Education, Sport & Culture Committee for the photograph that is on page 98 in the Billet and it really is worth having a look at, those of you that have a hard copy. What it does is it shows an aerial photograph of the St Sampson's High and it also shows some adjacent property that is owned by my parents, but rather conveniently it has an interesting little box right over the top of the Prison.

1875 Now, one must not forget that one of the consequences of choosing St Sampson's High for this development is that the environs of the school will move closer and closer to the perimeter fence. Like I say, the strategic location of that box somewhat obliterates or sort of fails to obviate that particular thing.

1880 I am sure that was entirely coincidental I am not suggesting for one moment there was any intent but it is an issue that I think is worthy of further discussion. Because clearly one of the key risks associated with the timeline that we were talking about yesterday is the granting of planning permission and I am sure that when Deputy Tindall speaks she will, to the extent that she is able, comment on that process to give this Assembly some sort of comfort that the timeline is in fact achievable albeit with a following wind.

1885 Now, sir, a bit more seriously I am going to pose some questions to Deputy Fallaize now which I know he will welcome – he enjoys answering these sorts of things and usually answers them with distinction. On page 47 under paragraph 14.2 the States' Report states that:

A firm commitment has been made to teachers that there will be a teaching post available in the new school for all current secondary school teachers who wish to have one.

1890 So I suppose the question I need to ask is: if every single person takes up that offer what will be the oversupply of teachers or indeed the dearth of teachers as a consequence of that? It would be interesting to know.

Why is it so important? Well, we did touch upon this in debate yesterday and it is worthy of repetition, 80% of the revenue costs of providing education in the States' system in this Island are of course teachers' salaries.

Question number 2 is on page 50 paragraph 15.2.1, the first bullet point which reads:

An extension of the school day to 4.05pm three days per week with optional activities on one or both [o/] the remaining two days.

1895 What if any are the revenue costs associated with that? The Policy Letter does make clear that there will be some mitigating effects in terms of shorter lunch hours and things of that nature, but in terms of the revenue costs of this model what is the effect of a longer school day?

1900 On page 94, sir, and I return to this with absolutely no apologies because this is something that has irritated me from day one, and it is the issue around pre-school education. In paragraph 29.1 we are told:

The Committee is not currently proposing any changes to States-funded preschool education.

But a couple of paragraphs below the Committee advise that they would:

... like to identify funding which would allow it to expand the current arrangements to include additionally all children aged two to three ...

1905 Well one way that they may be able to achieve that is by removing the ludicrously generous aggregate family income allowances that currently exist. As I understand it, a family can earn £149,999 and still qualify for 15 hours, I think it is, of pre-school education. I think that is absurd. I always have and no doubt always will. But I think that the Education, Sport & Culture Committee need to be a little bit more creative with the funding model if that is going to pass this Assembly.

Oh, I beg your pardon I will give way to Deputy Leadbeater, sir.

1910 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Sir, I thank Deputy Trott for giving way.

This is something – the £150,000 cap for the pre-school provision – has been bugging me since I was on the Education Committee back in 2016 and I know that I did ask a question of President Deputy Fallaize once during question time or something and he firmly committed not to revisiting that, but I think it is crucial especially when you look at carers' allowance, for example, 1915 there is a cut-off point of £95,000. Why is it not equated with that? It just does not really stack up.

Deputy Trott: We certainly concur in that regard.

Now, sir, my final remark is not a question, it is really a set of compliments to all Members of the ESC but in particular its President. The rough and tumble of Guernsey politics on occasions 1920 can become oppressive and I know that better than most because, trust me, the delivery of Corporate Tax Reform during my term as Treasury Minister was incredibly demanding not only on me but on close friends and family.

I think one thing has to be said and that is, throughout this process, whether you agree with these proposals or not, with one exception potentially that received some fairly high profile attention is Deputy Fallaize's decorum, the manner in which he has responded to correspondence, the manner in which he has held himself throughout this debate has been of the highest quality 1925 **(Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and in my view worthy of the commendation of this Assembly. For all those who simply watch politics but do not participate this, on occasions, is an extremely difficult job **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) and sometimes those outside of this Assembly forget that.

1930 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Well, sir, there are obviously lots of people who are going to give speeches 1935 but they have been holding themselves back, but not everybody can go last. I am very pleased really to follow on a succession of speeches which have made a particular point.

Those speeches really talk about the word 'selection' because some people earlier in this meeting have almost spat out the word selection as though it was a terrible thing that should never ever have been uttered and should never ever have taken place. I find that objectionable to 1940 the majority of the people of Guernsey that still, in my opinion, favour selection.

Now, I realise that argument has been lost. I was not in the States on the last occasion that I had the opportunity to make a speech, not as long as I would have liked, in relation to the 11-plus debate some time ago. But Deputy Tooley spoke with passion yesterday and she would not seek to claim the unique right to passion, or the trade mark to passion and neither could she if she 1945 does, and I say this with passion. She was talking about how her children are being educated through the school system.

I am on the third generation that I can remember of children being educated through the school system because I was educated through the Guernsey school system from the age of five years of age; my children, well three of them, started their education in England before we 1950 returned back to Guernsey but they were pretty little when they came back, so they spent the majority of their education needs in this Island; and my youngest one, my youngest son, spent all his education needs in the Island.

I have got seven grandchildren, the youngest one is not two until next week so she has not quite started school yet, but I have two older granddaughters from my eldest son who are now 1955 young ladies and they both went through the Guernsey education system. I have got two grandsons who are at Castel Primary School receiving a very good education. I have got a grandson who is on his second day at the Senior School of Elizabeth College and his mother sent me a picture of him and his sister who is at Melrose yesterday and today, to show me how well

they are doing. So I have got a pretty good experience of not just the theory but the practicality of how the Guernsey education system works.

Now, I commend absolutely the quality of the policy letter and I said this before to Deputy Fallaize I found it very readable, it is over 100 pages and I think it gives all the information we need to be able to make a decision. So whatever decision we make we cannot, in my view, not make it because the information that has been provided to us is not adequate. If you do not want to make a decision to support any of these proposals that is fair enough.

Deputy Roffey, I see, has got a very long speech because there are lots of pages on the desk, I see the desk crumbling, and no doubt he will deliver that in due course. Of course his ideal on this is completely different to mine in the sense that – and I make no apology for it, and I did not have a cuddly, lovely warm feel about Elizabeth College in my time there but if I had not passed the 11-plus, because that was the terminology then, my life would be completely different. My life is where it is now because I had the opportunities given to me by the selection system.

Now, the selection is lost, I accept that, but I feel desperately sad for the significant proportion whether it is 51%, 60%, 30% of people in Guernsey who have lost the ability, the opportunity for their children to go forward. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

We have got various kinds – we have got selection by ability, which I favour because we are all different, we all have different qualities. That does not mean that because you are academic that you are a better citizen than somebody else because might make just as good or a better contribution because they have other skills, but if you are good at art you should be taught by the best art teacher; if you are good at maths you should be taught by the best maths teacher; if you are an apprentice electrician you should be taught by the best teacher of people who teach people to be electricians. So I am favour of selection by ability.

I also have no argument at all – I am not giving way to Deputy Tooley – I am not going to give way to anybody unless it is a point of correction in which case I will have to. I am also in favour, whilst they allow, people who could select to by means; but what I am against are people who and I have no problem with those people who just say select by ability, but those people who select by ability must allow people to select by means too – because people want to do the best for their children, and if they believe that is paying school fees for their children to go to a school here or at an expensive public school in England that is what they should do. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

What I have – and it sticks in my throat and I am angry, I was angry all those months ago when I spoke in debate and angry now – with some Members of this Assembly who are against people having the opportunity to have their children go to school and be selected by ability but are quite happy to select by means, by their own means **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)** to pay for their children to go to a school but say other children cannot.

I find that hypocritical, impermissible and unacceptable **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)** *(Interjection)* and there are some people in this Assembly who voted on that, who voted against selection who should not have voted. **(A Member: Hypocrites)**

I really do commend Deputy Fallaize for the way he has conducted himself throughout what has been a long and arduous process. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** He has done a very good job, the fact I may be diverging from some of the proposals that he put forward is not a criticism of him.

He opened up yesterday in relation to where his two elder children are going to school – I think the little one is a bit too young to go to school yet. Now he should not have had to do that but he did it because he is an honourable man and he wanted people to know that he was practising what he preaches and I commend him very much for that.

I support him in most of what he does except for the support of his football team, but he cannot do anything about it. But what I say to you is this – and my good friend, Deputy Paint, says ‘Oh, I am not an orator’ ... *I* am not but *he* is. He says, ‘I am not an orator, language is not my strength’. But when you speak with the simplicity and sincerity that Deputy Paint speaks with, that is the best kind of oratory because it does not matter what the words are, it carries forward the principle of where we are.

2010 Deputy Paint made this point but it is also made at page 42, paragraph 12.13 I think if I can read my writing in the Billet, which says:

The quality of teaching is the single factor which has the greatest impact on student outcomes.

Now I would be surprised if in this room there are not some of us – or all of us, I should say, who cannot remember some of our teachers that he or she has had a particular influence upon the path that we took in relation to our education. I can certainly – the teacher that was there
2015 when I took my 11-plus Mr Whitwell, he is dead now, but if I could pat him on the back figuratively, literally I would do so, he made a great difference to my life and I make no apology for that.

But you have got to have decent schools I accept that.

Now, Deputy Roffey, I think he probably foresaw that I might be changing from my views in relation to two schools. I accept what he says because he is an honest man and when he says that I banged the table and said, 'Well selection is gone; two schools are going forward'. I certainly said that. But a bit like Deputy Stephens, a bit like Deputy Tooley, I have got to look myself in the face and I have got to carry my principles forward and I *cannot* in all conscience vote for something which is going to irrevocably and permanently dispense with any kind of selection. I just cannot
2025 do it.

I am just not going to have in one year's time, five years' time, ten years' time somebody looking in the voting record and say 'Peter Ferbrache, well he is dead now, or he is in some home or whatever ...' (*Laughter*) I am not going to have somebody look and say, He really was, he was one of the people who put the death knell and the final nail in the coffin of selection'. I am not
2030 doing that. So I am not voting for the two-school model.

I would not go back to the three-school model. I just say this because in relation to that, although we had that letter which was well-written by 57 local educationalists, who must have hundreds and hundreds of years of experience between them in relation to education – two of which I know well, Maureen ... taught some of my children, and Marion Knox is a good friend of
2035 my family, and they are people whose views I respect considerably.

But what I am worried about is we have got a system whereby we are going to spend £x million on building these two monoliths. Now, they will be comprehensive schools, you can call them high schools or you can call them whatever – they will be comprehensive schools, that is what they will be.

Now I fully accept the wisdom – we are very lucky to have him in the States' Assembly – of Deputy Graham who said to me 'Look, I have visited some comprehensive schools in England schools where there are people from all kinds of different cultural backgrounds and they produce excellent results'. I fully accept that and there are comprehensives that do that and there are lots and lots of good comprehensives. But in Guernsey, we are quirky folk.
2040

Deputy Paint talked about St Saviour's school and of course when I grew up there was St Saviour's School, there was St Peter's School, there was the Forest School – ours used to play all of them at football and those were the only teams we could beat because when we played the bigger schools we were not so good. But in relation to all of that – we beat St Martin's, of course – we are now *aping* the English educational system. Well, they are trying to change it in England
2045 because it has not worked, but we are doing it.

I am all in favour of the proposals in relation to the College of FE, Guernsey Institute, call it whatever you will, that should be on one site, it makes sense, it is disjointed at the moment. I am sure the money there will be well spent (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

I have already said in a speech I made earlier in this meeting of the States that I am in favour of the rebuild of La Mare Primary School. So I am in favour of all of those. I am in favour also, despite
2055 what Deputy de Lisle said about the spending of the money on the internet, if you like, digital things. I mean, I do not know what they are. But I am in favour of all of those because the children need good schools, they most of all need good teachers, but they also need good equipment and kit, and if that is necessary then that money should be spent, and it is a false economy to do

otherwise. But I am like Deputy Paint, I am pretty sure these proposals will be passed, and it is a sad day I think for Guernsey that they will be passed.

But when we look at the things also ... I mean, Deputy Meerveld made a point earlier in this debate about – not this particular debate but talking about this issue – about the drop-off points, about whether they are safe or not. I do not know and I certainly would not vote one way or the other simply on the basis of that. He says he made an inquiry, and I fully accept he did, and the response he got was a sensible one: that the children are only the responsibility of the Education Department once they enter the campus. But, and I know not, if those drop-off points are dangerous and if a child is injured they are the legal responsibility of the States of Guernsey; and if a child is injured because of the danger of those drop-off points the States of Guernsey and their insurance company will ultimately have that responsibility. So I hope and trust those things have been looked into.

Deputy Trott showed us a picture of page 9, or whatever it was, of the Billet and some of my less successful clients have been at the premises he referred to in those matters – perhaps even some of the more successful ones if they got less jail than they otherwise should have got. *(Laughter)* But anyway the point he makes, I very much hope, and the answer when Deputy Tindall interrupted Deputy Lester Queripel's excellent speech – I did not agree with all he said, but I agree with the sentiment of what he said and he clearly delivered it with passion, honesty and integrity – **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) to say we will be looking at that in relation to roads, etc.

We are a tiny Island; our road system is not made for traffic. We are going to have lots more people going to Beaucamps, we are going to have lots more people going to St Sampson's. You can tell them that they cannot drop their children off at certain points; you can tell the kids when they get to 16, 17 years of age that they cannot ride their motorbikes, they cannot park their cars – you try and implement it. You have got to build a system that can support that otherwise it is going to be a complete and absolute mess.

So in relation to all of this we should be saying that we vote for certain of these proposals; we just cannot spend the £x million that is asked for St Sampson's and for Beaucamps.

I again accept the point well made by Deputy Fallaize in his excellent opening speech that it has come in many millions less than the figure that was ... To be honest I thought it would cost £90 million to £100 million just for that and I think I may have mentioned that figure to him in the past. So I am very pleased to see it is significantly less than that.

So it is the principle I still cannot grasp, it is the principle I cannot accept, and therefore I will be voting for most of these proposals but I will not be voting for Proposition 1 because I just ... I could not look myself in the face; I could not look the people of Guernsey in the face; I could not look so many people who I have respected over the years in the face if I voted for something that I knew was bad for the ordinary person of Guernsey who cannot afford to send their children to Winchester or Elizabeth College, or any of these other posh schools. They cannot afford to do that. Their children should have the opportunity of going to the best school that they possible can and we are depriving them of that.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

I am not entirely surprised that Deputy Ferbrache cannot look himself in the face because it is a difficult thing to do – *(Laughter)* not just for Deputy Ferbrache, but for anybody actually. But look at yourself in the mirror maybe that is a bit easier.

Sir, he said that he could not look himself in the face if he voted to permanently change our system away from one of selection by endorsing Proposition 1 which is the two-school model. I have got news for him: he has already done that, he voted that way 18 months ago, and this is why we are here now. Not just because of Deputy Ferbrache's vote, but because two thirds of the Assembly did that. So where does that leave us?

Sir, it is clear from some of the remarks this morning and early afternoon, that not all Members of this Assembly support the concept of secondary education in Guernsey being provided in two non-selective colleges. (**A Member:** That is true.) Now, as a result we had the delaying motions of yesterday and today we have had some fairly trenchant criticism of the proposals, particularly of Proposal 1. But if you notice, sir, the one thing that is missing ... The one thing that is missing is an *alternative*. Anybody could have brought one, two months since the policy letter has been published – no, not a single alternative. None have been put forward.

So, sir, today we will either support the proposals including Proposition 1 or *not* support them; and if we do not support Proposition 1 there will be nothing in its place. Instead, we will be completely back to the drawing board, four years after this process started.

Meanwhile we will have children in transition from the old system – which, as Deputy Brouard quite rightly points out, is a burnt platform, it is no longer there – to the new system which we decided to create 18 months ago, and which we would then have decided no longer to proceed with. They will absolutely be in limbo.

I must declare an interest here, like Deputy Stephens I have a grandson who started in Year 7 this week as part of a non-selective cohort. Actually he phoned me up last night – I get phone-calls just like Deputy Inder does from his relatives – he phoned me up last night to say how much he was enjoying it even though his maths teacher reminded him of an army officer. I hope I have not got him in trouble by saying that publicly.

I was delighted, sir, when we in the States decided his Year 6 would be the first not to be blighted by the 11-plus, and I was delighted that he was going to receive the benefits of the new secondary system that we had overwhelmingly approved in January 2018.

But what do we say to him, and to the hundreds like him, and the hundreds more that are coming behind, if these proposals and proposal 1 is rejected today? 'Sorry, we are no longer going to create the system that you were promised even though actually it was going to cost an awful lot less than we first expected when we decided that we were going to create it. Nor are we going back to the old system, that is not possible, that is gone and irretrievable. In fact we have not got a clue what sort of education we are going to give you, but do not worry we are working on it we are starting again we have a lovely fresh sheet of white paper here and as soon as we know we will let you know'.

I would be shocked if any Member voted against Proposition 1 today in favour of a complete lacuna. If you have something you prefer because you cannot stomach what is covered in Proposition 1 put it forward. We might be here very late tonight if you do that, I know, but put it forwards.

Sir, picking up on a few specifics: Deputy Green said he was unsure about the proposals regarding the Guernsey Institute, and that Deputy Harwood has said how would the Guernsey Institute provide the skills that Guernsey needed? Well, the Guernsey institute exists, it has been formed. The only question is whether it operates out of five different sites, most of which are patently not fit for purpose, or whether we give it one purpose-built site in order to do that. So we are not discussing whether or not to have a Guernsey Institute, but what buildings it should operate from.

Deputy Inder has said we should be looking for an inspirational non-political leadership team: well, I have to say I have been really impressed over the last 12 months with the work of our Executive Head Teacher, the former Head Teacher of the Grammar School, who I think has led this project in an absolutely exemplary way. And more recently she has been bolstered by the present Head Teacher of the Grammar School and the inspirational Head Teacher of La Mare de Carteret as a triumvirate leadership team. I have to say most of what is in this policy letter has not been decided by politicians – of course, we have had to sign it off – it has been driven by well-informed educationalists. So the idea that it is all politics, of course we have not hidden behind them, this is a political policy letter, this is a political process, we have to front it up, but it has been informed by the educationalists.

Sir, in the last few days I have had people saying, 'But you have chosen the wrong sites', as if we had just drawn that out of the ether, 'Oh, let's have it at Les Beaucamps and let's have it at St Sampson's'. Not true at all. We started off I think with 10 sites, not just the four existing ones, but lots of new ones – I thought it was a bit daft, because we were never going to get a new one, but anywhere it could possibly go in Guernsey.

Not only did we look at it as a political committee, but a whole load of property experts from the States went and scored all of those sites on a range of criteria from costs, to access, to educational benefits and everything else. It came back quite clearly – Deputy Dorey did not agree – that the ideal sites were St Sampson's and Beaucamps.

In fact not satisfied with that, we thought we had better just have one last check. When P&R decided that we should go out to consultants for the required space, to make sure that we were not underproviding or overproviding space, we actually asked the consultants that were doing that, because they were experts in the area, to take a look at whether or not they thought we had chosen the right sites. This is what they said: 'Both of the selected sites for the operation of the new schools at St Sampson's and Les Beaucamps have, in our view, sufficient space within the grounds to meet the future new build space requirements of the new school system.'

And the important bit: '... they are also *far more suitable* for adaptation and development to meet the future brief of the States of Guernsey than either the Grammar School and Sixth-Form Centre or La Mare de Carteret School sites'

So we have gone out with process after process to make sure that we have got the right sites.

Another criticism that has been made particularly via our computers over recent days is that the physical size of the schools will be just too small; there will not be enough space for the number of pupils. Now of course I profoundly disagree, but I do accept that on this issue the opponents who suggest that there is such a weakness are basing their criticism on a real change of policy. The space requirements which the developments are based on are indeed less generous than those used for the last 20-30 years in Guernsey.

So let's talk candidly. Over that period new school developments in Guernsey have been absurdly large for their purpose and as a result have cost the Guernsey taxpayer wasted millions in capital costs; not only that, but because of the over-large building they are continuing to cost them dearly in inflated revenue costs and maintenance costs. We simply have to bite that bullet. We have to move away from vanity projects and instead produce very good, suitably sized and cost-effective learning environments for our youngsters, because if we continue to over-engineer all we will be doing is stealing money from other Committees and other competing projects for no good reason.

Sir, I would warn those who, on one hand, complain about this fact that they think these schools might be a bit too small for the number of pupils, and then voted with vigour for the P&R amendment to make sure that they really cracked down on us during the process of value for money to make sure that we were getting it right, because they cannot have it both ways.

I think if anything we have pushed P&R as far as we possibly can to actually have extra space above the standard, because we have not gone for the standard UK criteria, that was our starting point but we have actually pushed for Guernsey factors, and I think we are going to have to try very hard to maintain that in the face of challenge from P&R.

So people had better decide what they want. Is it for P&R to rule this project with a rod of iron, or is it bigger schools than those in the policy letter that we are proposing? Because they certainly cannot have both.

Moving on briefly, sir, I have not actually got that long a speech I vented my spleen mainly the other day so I will keep it a bit shorter with some specifics.

Revenue savings: some have suggested that savings of £2 million a year provide a pretty poor payback on the level of investment that has been suggested. But that misses the point, in two ways. The first is actually those revenue savings could be bigger if all we were interested in is some money. And how come we keep being told, 'All we are interested in is money; that is what is

behind the project'. Nothing to do with money, but we could certainly increase the revenue savings if that is all we are interested in.

2215 But this project was never just about money. We are looking to provide high level education cost effectively. Of course we want to be cost effective if we possibly can. Hands up any Deputy who thinks that is a bad idea. But the main driver has always been about improving education in Guernsey, so surely it makes sense to reinvest a proportion of the efficiency savings into improving that offer.

2220 Incidentally, as I said yesterday, if all we were interested in was money actually the best way to really cut down the cost of education in Guernsey would be a change in class sizes. The evidence is really weak that that would damage the educational outcomes. But the 'gang of four' – and I was not a member of them – made a very firm promise, and this States signed up to it, that the new system would mirror the class sizes that we have had hitherto. So I do not think that is an

2225 option, without reneging on that promise to the people of Guernsey.

Whether we should have made it is another matter, but we did.

The second reason that it is nonsense to say this is a poor return on investment is because, if we were to continue to do exactly what we are doing now, the capital costs would not be any less. To carry on with the present system – which we cannot go back to now – but if we had done, we would have had to rebuild La Mare at great expense; we would have had to repair the roof at the Grammar School at great expense; and we would still have had to do the Institute. The costs would have been roughly the same but there would have been no cost savings at all. So actually we are in a far better position.

2230

Now, another criticism is that De Sausmarez College – I think my colleague wants to declare an interest there – will not have any grass playing fields attached to the school, and apparently that is going to badly damage the way that the people at that school excel at sport, which I suppose is why Elizabeth College does so supremely badly in this particular area of life. In reality I do not think people should be quite so hung up with grass. Some of us are of a certain age, I am, and when I was at school the sports were either carried out on grass fields or on hard surfaces. Now that is no longer the case, both colleges will benefit from a large playing field fitted out with 3G artificial turf which will allow most sports to be pursued and, more importantly, pursued in all

2240

weathers and so the sports provision will actually be considerably better than it is now.

That said, of course in an ideal world I would have liked the De Sausmarez College to have a grass playing field as well as all of that, that would have been the ideal. But, sir, if Members are going to reject projects that come before this Assembly because they fall a smidgen short of perfection then they are never going to pass any capital project whatsoever.

2245

Others have claimed the schools are just too big in terms of pupil numbers quoting research that suggests schools of about 800 and certainly a maximum of 1,000 are ideal. It is a very good bit of research, it was carried out in the USA, it related to their high schools that have four year groups and therefore if you translate it to the UK situation where you have five year groups and with 11-18 seven year groups, the figures come out very differently. In fact we are absolutely convinced that the typical size of the best-performing, all-ability 11-18 schools is in line with what we are suggesting.

2250

I would explain why, but I know it is a subject on which Deputy Graham really likes to hold forth so he may want to do it later in the debate. But suffice to say that the colleges we are proposing in terms of the best performing 11-18 schools fall firmly into the Goldilocks zone.

2255

Too much traffic: okay, I will take that criticism. But I will not take that criticism from former Members of the Education Committee who put forward a very large – was it 800 or 900 pupil secondary school at La Mare, and a primary school as well, which were going to be roughly the same numbers of pupils on the site? Okay, different schools, but traffic is traffic on that site – as will be the case in our two high schools – but would actually be more traffic because we know that parents are more likely to drive primary school children to school than they are the secondary school children. So arguments are trotted out when it suits, but then of course not when it does not suit. (*Interjections*)

2260

2265 **Deputy Inder:** Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Point of *correction*, sir.

2270 If you remember correctly – and he probably does not, because Deputy Roffey has a somewhat selective memory when it comes to his speeches – there was actually a slip road going from La Mare de Carteret going out to La Mare Road. So we were intending to build a completely different road. And Beaucamps is actually a completely different road set-up to St Sampson's.

2275 My major concern is St Sampson's. We were not putting 1,400 people into effectively some very tiny cart tracks with tarmac on top of them. So he is happy to withdraw it, I suspect he will not because there is only one truth. But it is an absolute point of correction that we were building a different road to deal with both of those issues of having a primary school and a secondary school on La Mare.

2280 **Deputy Roffey:** I do not understand how that is a point of correction, I did not make any comment about the relative road networks around any of the schools. I simply said (*Interjection*) that it was concentrating the same number of children in one part of the Island as these two schools were, and in fact because it involved a primary school –

Oh, I will give way to Deputy Lowe.

2285

Deputy Lowe: Thank you Deputy Roffey.

I think another element of that as well about La Mare de Carteret that has been missed is the school is built alongside the largest social housing estate, where many of those children are already on site virtually so they walk; whereas, in future, they are going to have to have transport to take them to the new schools.

2290

Deputy Roffey: Of course I accept that the estate thereby is quite large, but to be honest of what was going to be about 1,200 pupils attending those two schools an awful high percentage would not be coming from that particular estate.

2295 But anyway I actually think, look, traffic is important but you can usually find solutions around it. I think we are often too obsessed with traffic, particularly when we get an objection to anything, the first argument we reach for out of the drawer is 'Oh that will bring more cars past here'. We hear it at every single development that people want not to happen, with the DPA the first argument is about cars. Well, I have been around for 40 years I have heard those arguments and most – I am not saying they are all not valid – but most of them actually once the development has happened have been accommodated and have not actually been *nearly* as bad as the scaremongers have suggested.

2300

Sir, I am not going to go on, and actually I think probably all of us have decided how we are going to vote today, haven't we? I do not think it is going to make any difference. I mean, I could make some really eloquent closing remarks but I am not going to. All I am going to say is: I just really hope that Proposition 1 wins today. I really hope that for several reasons: for the reputation of this Assembly because I think the policy U-turn would be absurd; for the children and parents of this Island because they will have absolutely no idea where we are headed on education when we move out of this Assembly this evening; and for my sake, because if it does not go through if I fail this political test I know somebody who is going to come back and haunt me and I do not want that to happen.

2305

2310

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

2315 **Deputy le Tocq:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, I echo the comments that my colleague Deputy Trott and indeed Deputy Ferbrache have made regarding the President of Education, Sport & Culture and indeed his Committee. Education is a contentious issue at the best of times, let alone a selection issue and schools are communities. I know full well that people get attached to communities and so any question of change or closure of one or moving one is going to raise people's emotions and that makes it much harder to be dispassionate when you are looking at options available.

I did not, however, agree or indeed really understand Deputy Ferbrache's point regarding the fact that he could not on principle support a non-selective system. I understood where he is coming from because I used to be of that opinion initially, but 18 months ago on principle – or maybe he had a different principle then – he voted for a two-school non-selective system. So if it is that strong I am surprised that he did choose to do that last year.

Sir, there has been a lot of talk about selection and in sense those who have said it has gone and we have got a new cohort intake that are non-selective are, absolutely right, but I want to spend a few moments just addressing this issue. As I said, and have said many times, when I first entered this Assembly I was elected on to the old Education Council and I certainly, at that time, supported selection mainly because from my own experience it had benefited me as indeed Deputy Ferbrache said with regard to him. And I am as concerned as he is that the private schools, the grant-aided schools that we have here continue to flourish in an appropriate way, and I believe they can do so alongside our State provision.

But, sir, where I changed my view was not regarding selection – and this touches on some of Deputy Paint's points, and again I can understand where he is coming from. Because the issue is largely not whether to have selection or not, we have got it and it is part of life, it is selection to different schools offering different opportunities and different standards which is the issue.

Selection within a school by subject and by setting properly and by giving the right support I believe will be possible, and this is why I am a supporter of the proposals before us today. Because the schools need to be large enough to be able to effectively put students amongst their peers at different times in their learning journey and that will change, and it will change for all sorts of different reasons. But being able to set effectively by subject requires a degree of selection on a regular basis – not in different schools but in the same school, where there will be multiplicity of different curriculum subjects available which will make each student able to flourish in his or her area of ability.

What we cannot have, sir, however, and this has been argued elsewhere particularly and it was something that I used to use as an argument myself, is selection by postcode and/or by feeder school or whatever. We must not have that; we need to protect our system so that these two colleges one school, are definitely one school and they are offering exactly the same standards and exactly the same opportunities to children in both schools.

Ultimately, sir, education is a parental responsibility and notwithstanding the comments Deputy Ferbrache said about the legal responsibility within the school, which is absolutely right, parents will need to own this initiative going forward. They will need to own these new schools even though they are on sites that currently exist and I think it is a good idea to change their names. I have always supported the idea that our secondary education should all be called colleges because I think that is a big help. But it needs to be more than that, the parents need to own schools, just as many of them do at the moment, they need to be involved.

The Education Committee is going to have to find new ways, particularly with bigger schools, to engage parents in that process because parents should not – some do, but they should be encouraged not to – abdicate their responsibility for young people, even though they are at a stage in life where they are turning into adulthood and gaining independence. There needs to be an engagement there. That will certainly change with larger schools.

But, sir, there are a number of things that we do know about schools of this size that we can be encouraged about and be more assured that we are moving to a more positive environment. Our former Grammar School at one time in its history had pupil numbers within a stone's throw of the maximum numbers that these colleges will be at over the next few years. We know that provides

an opportunity to provide a wider and a better-resourced curriculum and – which I know is important for all of us, and certainly will be important for P&R when we scrutinise this as the process moves forward – to offer better value for money and better usage of the physical facilities in the school, which currently our schools cannot offer because they are torn between having to create a number of different spaces which are very poorly used in many cases.

I am not just talking about the student area size ratios that Deputy Roffey was talking about, although I do understand the points he made and he is absolutely right there will be obviously some fights to have over what is the right proportion. I am glad we are not going for the UK ratio, but at the same time I totally agree with him that there used to be a ratio using Guernsey that had no logic behind it whatsoever and was certainly a negative influence on other projects in terms of wastage of space and therefore a cost, as he said, both in terms of capital and revenue.

Sir, by saying this I am being positive, I am not saying there will be no kickback in some areas; for example, I am looking to see how we can have a system that is both fair and offers value for money – and there have been issues raised regarding science provision at the Les Beaucamps site for example, and we will need to see what is best for that. We will be looking at that degree of detail. I think it is important. It will be difficult to do here and we need to have technicians and professionals around the table to be able to answer some of those questions, but that is something that needs to happen.

So, sir, coming back to my first point, I am optimistic. I am optimistic because we have put to bed a system that may have served Guernsey at one point in the past. Society has changed; we now have a new intake today that is not being selected to different schools. We must find the best possible way of making this two colleges one school model work for Guernsey that is efficient and effective and provides the best opportunities for the new generation emerging.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Graham.

Deputy Graham: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I have not prepared a speech because I hoped it would not be necessary today to be defending a model for which the States voted so comprehensively 18 months ago. But in fact we are not even having a rerun now because then the debate really was between what has come to be known as the two-school model and the three-school model, but now it seems to be a debate between the two-school model and no other model that we have got in view at the moment. So it is not the same debate. But it is what it is.

I have no hope at all of convincing Deputy Ferbrache to have yet another rethink. I am very sad that he has changed his mind. I have no hope of reconvincing him. But I am going to address what I think was at the centre of his argument and it is all tied up really with the whole business of where does the ideology come in, and where does the practical manifestation of these ideologies reflect themselves on the ground.

In the lead up to this debate there have been accusations that the ideology is of a political left nature. Well, I have been masquerading as a centre-right candidate for the last three years and I thought I had got away with it, but I have been outed now. *(Laughter)* But when I think back to when we debated 18 months ago, if a measure of 'leftiness' is that of whether you voted for or against the two school model, I am happy to out along with me Deputy Trott, who has momentarily left who I suppose is a sort of Guernsey version of Kier Hardy. *(Laughter)* Then we have these other closet Corbynistas *(Laughter)* of Deputy Kuttelwascher and Deputy Jeremy Smithies. Anyway, we have all been outed now but I mean, whether we are left of centre or right of centre – let's get rid of the ideology.

The ideology is actually in this business of selection or non-selection and there is an ideology involved there, and I thought really the States had resolved that both in March 2016 and also within the first year of the current political term. But it has come back. My view was and I think you will have sufficient memory to know that I was one of the leaders of those who sought to

2420 retain a selective system. It was not really remotely like the system that we had just got rid of but it was based on selection of a sort at 11. I was one of the leaders of that campaign and I lost it – or, put it this way, we had an argument and we had a vote and we lost the vote. Two successive States had done that within a year of each other.

Now, I detected then that there was no political appetite whatsoever to revisit that central core principle of selection or non-selection, and I think Deputy Ferbrache would have shared that sentiment at the time. Realising that, there seemed to be only one sensible thing to do and that was to say: if successive States have resolved to go to a comprehensive system, where are the best models of comprehensive schools going – elsewhere?

It could be anywhere elsewhere, but it does make sense to look to England because we recruit quite a large tranche of our teachers from there, they are trained there and our own home-bred teachers are trained there. And of course our own students go on to compete with British students in British higher educational institutions. So it makes sense not to divorce ourselves entirely from what is going on in England.

So if you are looking for the best examples of comprehensive schools, what do we mean by the best examples? Now, Deputy Al Brouard says he does not do this softly-feely bit. I think we all know what he means, but it is a misnomer because what we are talking about are tangible things on the ground, tangible elements in our schooling that say to a student whether you have got a breeze behind you and you are whisking through life, or whether you are trudging into a daily headwind, we are going to produce a system for you that gets you through so that you get the very best of education suitable for you and we are going to prepare you to take your place as young adults in our society. That is one measure and that is a sort of softly-feely bit, Deputy Brouard, through you, sir.

But we cannot divorce ourselves entirely from the measure of academic or educational outcomes which traditionally are measured by exam results. Now, the name of Mr Will Morgan who is the Head Teacher of the Cotswold School has come up. Deputy Inder mentioned him and also at the St Sampson's drop-in the other day one of the Douzeniers from St Sampson made the point of coming up to me and saying 'How is that inspirational chap doing?'

Well, I can tell the States this and this is all germane really to what makes good schools. Deputy Ferbrache, if I understood the central argument he was advancing, was that either by selection or by means a parent and their children are entitled to the best available education for them. But I think the inference I drew from what he was saying was that somehow the comprehensive school was not the best, which could be available if you had selection or had the means to go private, and it is that that I want to address now.

We need to face up to some realities here. The Cotswold School is a good example, I spent a day there. It is a school that was the amalgamation of a good grammar school but a community grammar school, and a community failing secondary modern school. Mr Morgan, at the time of the amalgamation, was a class teacher in one of those. He said the amalgamation all went swimmingly for the kids, it was the teachers that were the problem.

But all these years later that school – and remember it is a truly comprehensive school and the cultural and social makeup of the kids there is very similar to Guernsey. If you went to that school and looked around you, you would not have any idea that there were 1,400 kids in it and you would see children who were no different from any of the students you would see in any of our secondary schools here. You could be in any one of them. So the social make-up and the cultural make-up and the demographics are very similar.

There are two almost side-by-side competing comprehensive schools, roughly the same size, between 1,300 and 1,400. They are in competition with a grammar school just down the road and they are in competition with a plethora of good public schools. So parents have a real choice. But there, just outside Gloucester, are two comprehensive schools. They are not even the top comprehensive schools in England – they are in amongst the top 100 or 200, the top 5%, so they are not that exceptional. But there is no reason why we in Guernsey should not have comprehensive schools of that standard and that is what we should be aspiring to.

Now, in terms of educational outcomes it is very interesting. The traditional yardstick by which we measure how you are doing has been the GCSE level the A*-C five subjects including English and Maths. Traditionally if you take the aggregate of Guernsey – the three private colleges, the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre and the three high schools – our aggregate performance is roughly 63% or 64% or 65% of our students achieve that gold standard. The Cotswold School regularly clocks up 80%. Its neighbouring comprehensive school, Balcarras, does slightly even better at 83% or 84%. That is at GCSE level.

Interestingly, it goes on to the performance of their sixth forms and last year the Cotswold School's sixth form performance when measured by the percentage of pupils getting A*, A* and A, A*-B at A level outperformed not only our Sixth Form Centre here it outperformed the Ladies' College and it outperformed the Elizabeth College too. This is by no way a veiled criticism of our teachers here, it is not a veiled criticism of the students; all are doing their best.

But my point is this: our model that we have been living with all these years has been making it harder for them to do their job than it needed to be. And the whole point of this new 11-18 model is to enable that to be done so much better.

I will be candid with you: we have an awkward number of students in the public sector here because we have a disproportionate number of students who go on to the private schools. It has traditionally been round about 30% but it has dropped – perhaps just for one year only, who knows? – down to 27% or something like that, but that does produce an imbalance – sorry I have lost my thread there if you will forgive me, just give me a second. This is the penalty of not having prepared a speech. *(Laughter)*

I hope I have made the central point that the comprehensive ...

Oh yes, it is the awkwardness of the number of students here. If we had another 500 students in the States' sector and who knows in 10 years' time, 15 years' time the balance between the private sector and the public sector may well actually change. But for the moment we have an awkward number of students. If we had another 400 or 500 I could equally be arguing for a one school in three colleges spread, each with their own integral sixth forms. I cannot argue that now and I think frankly the Committee would say this, that the numbers going to the two new colleges are substantially more than we would have envisaged when we first put the model in, but they are not so many more that it is causing one to rethink. But I think our new colleges are certainly not unusually large by English standards and they are going to be roughly the same size as the Cotswold School and the Balcarras School that I have been quoting to you from.

So I hope I have addressed the central point that Deputy Ferbrache was making. Every parent is entitled for their child to go to the best school for that child, and if they can afford to pay for what they think is the best school fine, and I do not think anybody on the Committee is seeking to undermine the colleges themselves.

But if it comes down to selection versus non-selection and the quality of education that that leads to, I strongly suggest to you that the almost unequivocal evidence is that the comprehensive school if it well led – and we heard what a good leader Will Morgan is. But having been there, he is not exceptional, he has got a good staff team around him, and certainly the building is nothing to be taken aback by, it is a fairly old building. But it is having this mixed ability there; attracting the best teachers who like to teach in the 11-18 setting; insisting on high standards; making sensible use of setting by ability and by inclination; and really just going for it.

Talking about going for it in all of this, Members of the States, I have said this in a letter I wrote, there is nothing to fear but fear itself in this. I urge you really to have the confidence in a Committee that – it is a fairly eclectic Committee who have come from several political directions, several ideological directions and we have all rallied round this one central faith in what we are doing, augmented by a previous Vice-President of the Education Council in the previous States.

We have been working our socks off for the last 18 months and we would not have been doing it if we were not thoroughly convinced that what we are doing is the best thing. It is the best thing for our teachers, it is the best thing for our students – and we have still got an argument to win, it

is the best thing for everybody in this Island if we are talking in terms of producing our young people to take their place as young adults in life in Guernsey and elsewhere. (*Applause*)

2525

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: I thank Deputy Graham for that speech.

2530

I am just going to cover a couple of areas which have not really been covered thus far in the debate and that is from a Health and Care perspective, then I am going to make a few personal comments and they are also unscripted so we will see where that goes.

2535

The first thing I would like to speak about is co-location of services. Now, it was following a successful amendment from Deputy Prow and I in January 2017 that the Assembly agreed that the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture should seek to embed an environment for health ethos across all aspects of education provision in the Bailiwick and to make use of any opportunities to meet the mental, emotional, social and physical wellbeing needs of all learners.

2540

The opportunity to provide Health and Care services directly within schools will dramatically improve access for students and their families; it will enhance multi-agency working and raise awareness of health and wellbeing. Through strategic initiatives such as the Children & Young People's Plan we are continuing to show the benefits of multi-agency working and good partnership work is well developed operationally – school nurses, the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service and the delivery of public health initiatives through personal, social and health education lessons are just some examples of how staff from across the two Committees are working together to help learners lead confident, healthy and independent lives.

2545

The development of the new colleges provides an opportunity to ensure that they contain an appropriate environment for complementary services to be delivered in the same place rather than requiring pupils to attend alternative sites. Through this dedicated space shared amongst different partners, learners will be able to access services catered around their specific needs in a convenient manner without missing classes.

2550

The space could include a mixture of informal contact rooms where professionals from across HSC, ESC and other partners could speak confidentially to learners in clinical rooms which could be used by, for example, school nurse or the dentistry provision.

2555

Education and Health outcomes are inextricably linked. At the very broad level international studies have demonstrated that those with more years of schooling tend to have better health and wellbeing and exhibit healthier behaviours. Individuals experiencing positive mental health and wellbeing are likely to face fewer challenges in accessing education.

2560

By investing in services for young people we are focussing on prevention and early intervention. The colleges will support their pupils through their transition from child to adult and the inherent challenges that brings. Through maximising opportunities for partnership working and considering the needs of particular young people we can develop clear and practical mechanisms to promote positive wellbeing, and by developing the colleges with a shared collaborative space we are ensuring that the infrastructure is in place to best support learners for the future.

2565

Now, I would just like to go on to talk about the Guernsey Institute and in particular the Institute of Health & Social Care Studies. In considering the proposals in January 2017, Deputy Prow and I successfully laid another amendment in respect of the importance of the further development of the Institute of Health & Social Care to ensure that its services are responsive to the needs of the Bailiwick, that it is seen as a first choice provider of professional qualifications, that is proactively marketed across the Bailiwick and beyond, and that opportunities to work with other education providers are maximised.

2570

At the time of laying the amendment I spoke of the committee's concern that the Institute risked getting lost in the wider changes and that given the international shortage of health and care workers this was an area which needed focus and timely attention. The amendment was

unanimously approved by this Assembly and set an ambition of identifying and as far as possible delivering within this electoral term developments to the delivery model.

Now, the President of Education, Sport & Culture is aware that the Committee *for* Health & Social Care has been to date disappointed with the progress made and I understand that a meeting is being arranged with the newly appointed Head of the Guernsey Institute in order that we can consider a positive way forward.

As detailed in the policy letter there is an essential need to recruit and train nurses in order to meet current and future demands. Modelling through the Partnership of Purpose has illustrated the importance of continued recruitment, training and retention, and the recent strategic review of terms and conditions highlighted the opportunities available locally through reviewing access with professional training and development.

Ahead of the 2018 debate the Committee *for* Health & Social Care circulated information to all States' Members indicating it considered that to meet needs future cohorts would need to increase significantly, which understandably would require a significant step change in terms of the provision of its services and its marketing and promotion both internally to the Bailiwick and beyond.

In their policy letter Education, Sport & Culture make reference to the difficulties of reaching targets, and I look forward to our officers exploring the options available to ensure that the Institute of Health & Social Care can best meet the needs of its largest customer, Health & Social Care, and the needs of the community.

Personally, I am concerned that the structure may be a bit top heavy, but I do believe things need to change and would hope that under the new structure things will progress well. So that is with my Health & Social Care hat on but I would just like to make just a few comments on a personal level and actually a plea to all those who have spoken about the buildings and the number of buildings and selection.

Really, I just want to say this: just forget the number of buildings. I know that is just mad, isn't it? I mean, this is a debate about buildings. How can we? We must debate buildings; we get buildings; we like buildings, so long as they are not built in the north of the Island. *(Laughter)* **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) But really it is not about the number of buildings; we have debated buildings *ad nauseam* for years and years and years.

This Assembly has debated the number of buildings and agreed there should be two, not three or four; we have got to that point as we agreed twice to get rid of selection. We have had the confirmatory vote, eventually – we should have had it sooner but that is another matter. Selection is dead; it has joined the choir invisible; it is pushing up the daisies; it is an ex-system. *(Laughter)* The only model that works logically and practically in a non-selective system is one with two 11-18 schools, and this Assembly agreed to go to a two 11-18 school model. We have agreed it; we need to move on.

I fought to retain selection twice and I did so as I wanted to retain the Grammar School, not that I had any desire to keep the 11-plus. But that debate has been lost and actually having read the policy letter and seen how opportunities vary markedly between schools I am really glad that it has, because it has removed the barrier to change and should therefore help move towards greater equality of opportunity.

Now, Deputy Graham touched upon it in his speech just now, but in one of the many plethora of open letters that we seem to have been bombarded with over the last few weeks reflected my thoughts on the matter in saying that he had been on a journey in this regard, and I realised that I had been on the same road with him.

Deputy Roffey spoke about return of investment and the cost return, and are they getting enough savings from the build, but really we cannot just look at it in terms of money. I cannot even believe I am saying this to Deputy Roffey and it is Deputy Roffey that has been talking about costs. But we cannot look at this in terms of cost, but it is outcomes. This is all about outcomes. We are not making any of these changes, and at the very start of this debate even going down to

2625 selection it was never about costs it was always about outcomes. Really that is how we ought to read this and read the policy letter.

I have to say, although I have reservations in certain areas, I have taken great comfort from the policy letter in how it has focused on improving outcomes in terms of looking at our young people as individuals and what they need to enable them to grow and learn through the curriculum, and the hours and the support from tutor groups. Not least of which, of course, is the co-location of complementary services. All that surely should help outcomes.

2630 But we know we have got a proper measurement – of progress factor 8? Whatever. Certainly they are having a proper measurement of whatever the progress is. It is really important and I think it is all about where we start with children and how they develop, not necessarily how many children got 3 A*s and A*-C, it is about how they as an individual have developed and grown.

2635 So do I agree with everything in this policy letter? No. *(Laughter)* I do have reservations, I am still a bit unsure about the sixth forms and reducing that size, but then again I have spent hours waiting at a parent consultation and seeing the mass of children in one year group. And I think, no, I can absolutely understand why you would want to split them in two and I am sure that the teachers do as well given the nightmare those sessions must be to them.

2640 I do have reservations over an extra £3.4 million based one year's supposed reduction in the number of children going to the colleges, because I know from the colleges' point of view that they are scratching their head over that number. But that is an area I think that P&R will be able to tease out through the work that they need to do. So I am less concerned about that now since the P&R amendment was passed.

2645 But I actually do think now we do have a set of Propositions that I can support and at the end I think it is a really good policy letter. We were accused from Health & Social Care with 'Oh, it was not a big enough policy letter; it had to have masses and masses of detail'. There is more here but then there are more things that they have been requested to do in one go. I think we have learnt a lot about what is really intended to be outside of this policy letter through a lot of the responses that Deputy Fallaize has made over the last few weeks. I think if you put all his emails together, they would probably be the size of this Billet by now. So I do think we have got the information we need.

2650 So I congratulate Employment & Social Security. I thank P&R for the way they have tried to bring things together. *(Laughter)* What did I say? *(Interjections)* Oh, sorry *(Laughter)* It is habit, it is habit! *(Laughter)* I am always saying that. But I do thank Education, Sport & Culture and P&R for the work they have done. I cannot thank Employment & Social Security this time sadly, Deputy Le Clerc, but there we go.

2660 But I do hope Members take these points from what I think Deputy Le Tocq said and Deputy Graham, and hopefully a little bit of what I said although I am not so sure. But I do hope Members will support all the Propositions now.

The Bailiff: Deputy Smithies.

2665 **Deputy Smithies:** Thank you, sir.

In the phrase of the day, for the avoidance of doubt, that this is Jeremy Smithies and not Jeremy Corbyn who is speaking. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Ferbrache actually has brought me to my feet to make a speech. I empathise with his words but I cannot vote against the amended policy letter.

2670 An old Arabic proverb says – and I will spare you the original language – in translation 'In the desert the caravan has passed and all that is left is the barking of the dogs'. Well, every dog has his day and the caravan may make a return journey, but until it does I must follow the decision of my colleagues and support the direction of travel which is towards the model we have before us.

2675 I am not going to seek to reverse that decision but of course should a future Assembly, of which I might or might not be a Member, seek to overturn the non-selective model then I would maybe support that revision.

However, as I said I had not intended to make a speech, but I have noted two questions which I would like to put to the President of ESC. (*Laughter*) He gets his pen. In his introduction a long time ago he mentioned that A-levels would be offered on both sites but IB on only one. This seems to me to run contrary to the idea of equality of opportunity. Please could Deputy Fallaize tell the Assembly why this decision has been taken? I suspect I know why but I would like to hear it from him, and if there is ever an intention to offer IB on both sites if the demand is there?

Secondly, enrichment activities are mentioned in some detail in 15.4 of the policy letter. I note that the intention is to release staff from teaching activities to enable them to participate in the enrichment programmes, and that 87% of teachers and 61% of support and established staff have said they would offer one or more electives. I would seek assurance that no pressure would be applied to encourage the 13% and 39% respectively to participate in these enrichment activities.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you very much.

Just a few short bullet points.

When I stood in St Peter Port South I was anxious to see the manifesto of Deputy Peter Ferbrache who was an old hand at politics and was returning to politics, he was in my electoral district and I thought I would have a look at his manifesto. One thing that came through very clear was that he was opposed to flip-flopping. He made it very clear that the States should make a decision and stick with it. So I hope he has regard to that when he votes, though I feel that some seed is ultimately is going to fall on stony soil in that regard.

But he also makes an argument from another time and another place, and that is the social mobility argument. I think it is true to say in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s the social mobility argument could be made. But the situation is these days the children of advocates, lawyers, fund managers, surgeons and high flyers put their children through the 11-plus to make sure they do not even have to pay fees and that they get scholarships. (**A Member:** Yes.) And you have people who can ill afford, doing all they can, to get their children possibly to the Grammar. The competition is immense. The social mobility argument has fallen away, it simply does not exist anymore.

Of course the focus of that is that the Grammar was *that* much better than other facilities that were being provided when we know and when you look at the results, that is simply not the case – that the standard within secondary education has raised significantly.

As I am Chair of E&I I suppose I should talk about traffic briefly. These days in *The Press* more recently what we have seen is, and quite rightly, people living in very quiet lanes adjacent, opposite abandoned vinery sites opposing a development. The developer who will say 'This is an ideal site for light industry; I would like to use this site'. And the residents who have lived in this quiet lane for several decades now, since the vinery been redundant for a while, say 'No, no, we do not want traffic coming down these lane; we do not want heavy good vehicles; we do not want the noise; we do not want the bustle, this is a quiet lane'. Forgetting of course that in its day the vinery would have imported perhaps coal, would have taken in coal, would have certainly taken in oil; produce in, produce out; staff in, staff out. These were very, very busy places.

Now, I accept all the arguments from the people who live in these lanes that they and their family need protection, but what happens when I come to this Assembly and try to give them that protection? We would want a lower speed limit, 'Oh, no, you will not'. (*Interjection*)

I will give way if Deputy Gollop wants to say something.

Deputy Gollop: I think my point that I would make is that actually the States is unclear as to its transport strategy and there is a lot of popular resistance on social media towards any restrictions on their use.

Deputy Brehaut: I agree that populism is usually to the detriment of the decisions of this Assembly, and I think it is not just this Assembly, parliaments all over the world seem to be succumbing almost suffocated to this naïve, unpleasant populism that is all pervasive.

2730

But when we try and do things to manage traffic we do get pushback I am afraid from this Assembly. I am not saying each and every time, but generally do get pushback from this Assembly.

2735

The main point I would make I suppose is that when we came in this Assembly earlier – we have been here three days – the first decision was whether to have a tribunal or not, and astonishingly after a day we resolved to do nothing.

2740

Deputy Green is not in the Assembly, but I would say this to him: I was of the view that he may have misdirected the Assembly by saying those of you who voted *Contre* continue to, because I thought Scrutiny could have rallied around to get people on board for that tribunal. But anyway, that was an opportunity lost.

The frustrating thing is of course that Members of Education, Sport & Culture want to give an account of themselves, they want to speak to people, they want to tell the community in relation to that other issue and they were, I think, almost denied an opportunity, sadly.

2745

But it is the reputation of this Assembly that is at stake again. We had a Sursis debated and the Sursis was lost but – I would like to say ‘trounced’, but the Sursis was lost by – was it 13 votes? Another lengthy debate, actually, with not a great deal of core support at the very centre; not a great deal of core support. So we have lost the tribunal, the sursis has been lost and I suppose if you are on the other side of the fence that is the biggest plus.

2750

But we now, worryingly, face a situation where people are saying although we have acknowledged that we are going down the two-school direction and today we are doing the ‘doing bit’, this is how we can deliver it for you, that people are now saying ‘No, I am not prepared. I have given commitments to my voters and I am not prepared to do that’. It would be a huge stain on the reputation of this Assembly if we sent Education, Sport & Culture away today with absolutely nothing.

2755

So please do not do that and support the proposals.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

2760

Similar to Deputy Soulsby, I would like to say some personal remarks and also some matters on planning as mentioned by several people as well.

2765

I am going to start this time though with my personal comments. So for me the 2018 guide which the States follows, Stage 1 is to scope the scheme and prepare the strategic online case, or programme business case as we call it, and in order to do so for me it contains sufficient detail for the case to have been proven. I think it lives up to the title. It is transformational, it is holistic and thorough, more than sufficient as I say for this stage of approval.

2770

Other Deputies disagree with the process, but that is a debate for another day. Do I agree with the policies involved? Yes, we have had that debate. Do I believe the information provided shows a process which follows the States’ recommended process sufficiently to show me that the policies will be put into practice? Yes. We have not been asked to approve each penny but the process and the principle I am satisfied with.

2775

However, as has been discussed, the question of whether the next stage, Stage 2, the outline business case should be considered by P&R or by the States. Who should scrutinise this more detailed business case?

Deputy Laurie Queripel said in a previous debate on the Sursis that due to the sum of money requested, some £157 million, that he felt the Assembly should be involved. So I ask if the same would apply if these projects had been split into several chunks, although of course it is split into several chunks in the policy letter, but also been split into several policy letters. I do not think that would have been transparent, as Deputy Fallaize explained previously.

2780 So it leads us to another point that Deputy Laurie Queripel said in that previous debate and that was he felt that the philosophical change was one he felt also deserved the scrutiny of the Assembly and not delegate this to P&R. This is the crux of the issue and for some that debate was had over the alternative model. We are debating the next stage and in my view do not need to revisit it.

2785 Deputy Lester Queripel said he believes that the ESC has not produced the detail in the policy letter he expected. That is not the fault of ESC but of the process. If States' Members, as I have said, want to review that process that is for another time.

I actually commend, as Deputy Trott did, both the President and the Committee for producing this policy letter with reduced costs combined, in my view, with bells and whistles on.

2790 So as I believe that ESC has submitted sufficient information, the next question is: do I have the confidence in the oversight of P&R, or rather the experts they will employ to oversee the experts employed by ESC? Yes.

Do I believe we should rely on them rather than Members in the States here? Yes, because we are not the experts in this field, irrespective of Google.

2795 Deputy Lester Queripel mentioned the fact that there were no emails from students, but perhaps the President of ESC could advise if he feels that this is down to the success of the ESC shadow committee? Can he confirm that the views of young people on not just school uniform, school and college names, and ways of developing a single school culture during the transition process have been received and that the level of consultation with young people is suitably substantial?

2800 I had also scrutinised the letter from Scrutiny Management Committee in detail, as there was much in the programme business case as I thought answered their issues, but I will not go through that now.

2805 However, this leads me neatly on to comments in respect of planning. I should add that I obviously had not had the opportunity to fully consult with all Members of the DPA but these are comments of the planning service which I hope will assist.

Firstly, I quote from Scrutiny's letter where they say:

We believe that, based on previous experience, there is a real potential risk that planning issues could lead to significant delays and additional expense.

2810 This concern has been raised before about delays in planning. I am assured that ESC have taken a leaf out of HSC's book when commissioning the work for the Hospital and are using professionals with suitable experience in such developments.

2815 Deputy Trott asked for details regarding the planning process and in answer to my question on this very point we were advised that the planning service are expecting, subject to the States' decision today of course, planning applications to extend both schools to be submitted in mid-October. We have estimated a three-month period for consideration although we understand the ESC programme allows for longer.

The Scrutiny letter continues:

Further, that the likelihood of this is increased by the potential for difficulties to arise over matters such as traffic amelioration, details of which have not yet been released.

Sir, this brings me to the various points regarding the traffic impact assessment which I think worth mentioning as these issues are often raised certainly at the Development & Planning Authority. The Island Development Plan covers this by saying that:

New development may require improvements to be made to the local road network. In the case of proposals with the potential to generate significant amounts of traffic, it may be necessary for the developer to commission a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA). This will be expected to demonstrate how any identified traffic issues can be addressed and any negative impacts successfully mitigated. This could be through physical alteration to the road network or through the implementation of traffic management techniques such as the development of a site specific Travel Plan.

2820 I should also clarify the point that Deputy Lester Queripel made in respect that we do look at a wider area, for example, the Saltpans TIA, which as Deputy Dorey has mentioned is also included in this TIA.

The programme business case informs us that a range of active travel options currently being developed and assessed will inform this comprehensive traffic impact assessment. The
2825 programme business case says that ESC has been

Working closely with officers from the Committee for Environment and Infrastructure (CfE&I), a range of travel and transport measures have been identified, including active walking routes, road, footpath and cycle path improvements, incentives to encourage walking, cycling and car sharing, 'drop and walk' provision (drop-off locations away from the school site), junction improvements and an improved school bus service. These measures are now being developed and specialist transport advisors, recommended by CfE&I, have been engaged to confirm these measures will effectively mitigate the risk of increased traffic around the new colleges, prior to the submission of the Planning Application.

Now, others do not, but I happen to have confidence in this because of successes elsewhere, even in Guernsey. I refer to the travel plan that is being introduced at the Hospital. We are very pleased with the take-up so far despite it only being implemented very recently. This take-up is good because of the use of various incentives such as free bus passes, together with restrictions
2830 on where staff can park. I would like to quote from the HSC blog and the comments by the Director of Hospital Modernisation to staff which says: 'I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you all for supporting the extension of the staff car parking facilities and parking in the white spaces. We have received positive comments and grateful thanks from patients attending the outpatient department clinics. This has also had a positive impact upon the management of
2835 patients arriving to the department for their appointments. I echo those thanks'.

As well as these travel plans the programme business case says:

The impact of the new schools on transport infrastructure has been carefully considered through the use of specialist traffic management advisors

Obviously I also echo that as well.

It also supports the new policy priority, Mitigating Climate Change. As this new priority was added whilst the documents were being written there is not an emphasis on this; however, there is
2840 reference to this in respect of planning matters and the programme business case also refers to the energy policy, Priority 22, and in:

Delivering environmentally sustainable buildings and adopting sustainable ways of working/learning and travelling

The policies of the Island Development Plan already consider the climate and mitigating the change. This is not the debate to extoll the virtues of the IDP in this regard, but there are many which will apply in respect of these developments.

2845 I also wish to point out something which is incorrect in the programme business case. The programme business case says:

The designs have therefore been developed with the planners for formal submission. As a minimum the designs allow a 'letter of comfort' from the planners to enable this information to form the basis for tender documentation to the contractors.

So that no-one is under the misconception that the DPA will treat any States' Committees differently to that of the average applicant I am advised that:

The planning services are unaware of the proposal for a letter of comfort as this is not their practice. Any pre-decision, advice, or comment on development proposals would also be entirely without prejudice to a formal decision and could not commit or bind the Authority. Any planning action application will be subject to public and other consultations and the outcome of an application cannot be determined until all relevant information was available to the DPA and the Authority was in a position to take a formal decision on the application. Hence a letter of comfort would have no standing or status whatsoever within the decision making process and therefore would not be likely to assist the ESC in material way.

I am assured that this would not make any difference, it is just a misunderstanding.

2850 Deputy Green asked the question of the capacity of the local construction industry for such projects. I asked the planning service for their views to assist me with this dilemma and was advised that in their experience the local construction industry has shown itself to be sufficiently robust to handle a number of large contracts at one time. So this is unlikely to be an insurmountable issue. However, this may result in a greater presence of off-Island subcontractors
2855 to ensure all such contracts are fulfilled.

Whilst therefore the effect of many projects may be that off-Island contractors are being involved, however, I do not consider this to be a reason for delay of any project simply to ensure 100% use of on-Island contractors.

2860 So I simply conclude to quote from the programme business case or indeed the policy letter I am not quite sure:

There is a need to remove the current inequity across the secondary school sector and to ensure that a greater proportion of students achieve even better outcomes at the ages of 16 and 18.

I agree. I am happy to support the amended Propositions in their entirety.
Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe

2865 **Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, I have not written a speech I have just made some bullet notes of areas that I wish to raise but one thing I will say is I have grandchildren across the education system. I have a granddaughter in the Sixth Form, I have a granddaughter at Blanchelande and I have a grandson
2870 at La Mare de Carteret Primary School, all enjoying school; and a three-year-old grandson looking forward to going to big school next year. I am also President of the La Mare de Carteret High School Management Committee; I am a member of the La Mare de Carteret Primary School Management Committee; and I am President of the Hautes Capelles Management Committee.

2875 Sir, I have connections right across the education system, including the private school education.

I think it was Deputy Tindall who said just now that she has not heard from any youngsters, and I think others have said that. I have. I have had feedback from some of the youngsters who have gone out of their way to contact me to tell me their views –

2880 **Deputy Tindall:** Point of correction, sir.

I did not say that I have not heard from any youngsters. I repeated what Deputy Lester Queripel said, just for the record.

Deputy Lowe: Okay, thank you, Deputy Tindall.

2885 So the areas that I wish to speak about. The first one is the delegated authority to P&R.

Now, this could be made by just two Members because you only need three to be quorate, and if two of those Members decide that they want to support the £157 million that is all it takes, and that is what this States have actually decided they are happy to do is delegate that to P&R.

2890 I remain of the view that such a large sum of money for a project of this size, and a controversial project at that, the Assembly should be making that decision and it should not be delegated.

2895 I accept that Deputy Green said this morning that Members of Scrutiny could be part of that, no criticism either on the Members of Scrutiny, but that could still only take it up to three more, making it five. I think the States have actually washed their hands of making this decision and I am disappointed at that because as I say it is controversial and I think it should be in here. Yes, of

course, on the HSC one the States actually decided to delegate that – it was not controversial, you are not looking at like-for-like here. This one is completely different.

So now I move on to the traffic and the transport costs, which still concern me as we do not have any details on the extra 700 attending St Sampson's, with no idea how they would get there.

2900 Will there be extra costs not included in the £157 million for the transport or buses needed? Or would that be an extra cost going across to E&I which is a hidden cost because it is an added cost but it is not coming under Education.

Drivers currently are difficult to find to keep CT Plus operating so I am not sure where all these extra drivers will come from.

2905 Traffic flow is another area of concern. At three o'clock currently at St Sampson's High the pupils come out and it causes serious traffic congestion; also going into school in the early morning. But coming out at three o'clock a lot of the traffic goes one way up Les Vardes towards the Hautes Capelles School where over 500 primary school children are leaving school, either as pedestrians or parents driving their cars. It does cause gridlock.

2910 Adding another 700, not necessarily all going up that way, but it does cause concern and has been raised by the school as well about so many being congested in the same area at that time.

Deputy Dorey actually mentioned they were looking at areas of housing to be developed and that would be part of the traffic assessment which I believe should have been completed as part of this report.

2915 All St Sampson's Deputies, I think it was probably last year joined a huge protest that started at Delancey Park regarding development taking part at Point Rock. I look forward to all those same St Sampson's Deputies joining the St Sampson's parishioners who have already opposed increasing St Sampson's School from 700 to 1,400 pupils, resulting in more traffic and congestion. Most days there is gridlock, especially in the mornings going from the Half Way all the way up the

2920 Vale Road to Route Militaire. An extra 700 pupils will be added to that congestion.

Sir, another area of the report I have concerns with are the three longer school days. Why three extra days? I have no idea. For me, the feedback that I have been getting is: are the States actually now putting in a babysitting service, because this is to offer students an extra opportunity for after-school activities making it up to four o'clock? It is not part of the lessons and then removing

2925 homework after that, it is just keeping youngsters in the school for three days until four o'clock.

Well, what about the many youngsters now who leave school at three o'clock, they dash home and then they go off to swimming club or they go off to ballet, or they go off to the other various clubs that many youngsters participate in? I think when this becomes known a little bit more to those clubs there is going to be an objection to that and I think as well many parents will be

2930 objecting to that, because you will be denying those youngsters that opportunity to continue those hobbies whether that be swimming or whatever sport that they are taking part in.

It is not optional that they stay to four o'clock, not from the information that I have, it is a case of they stay there until four o'clock, which will mean some, as one parent said to me 'It will be nearer half five by the time my youngster gets home and that is not acceptable'.

2935 We know there are supporters that some like the one school two site before us today and I am afraid like many others my view has not changed. I still support a four or three school with a sixth form.

Selection needed to change; I accept that, as do many others. I do not think anybody I spoke to said 11-plus should stay. What they were saying was that the system should change.

2940 La Mare de Carteret High should have been one of the schools built and they have been let down for years now, and this report is another nail in the coffin sadly for La Mare de Carteret School.

It has been mentioned about where is the best model of education? Well, I have just said the name of it, La Mare de Carteret School. La Mare de Carteret High School as we all know had

2945 shocking results years ago. The Head Teacher, Vicky Godley, turned that school around and every youngster got a GCSE and that is something to be extremely proud of. The inspection results were not good, were not average, they were excellent and to receive that for the school that we are

saying where is the best model of school, you just need to go to La Mare de Carteret High School and it is sitting there. But we are closing it.

2950 The Prison was mentioned by Deputy Trott. It was already on my radar and part of something I wanted to say today, but unfortunately I did not get up before Deputy Tindall. Home Affairs will be seeking assurances from the DPA when they are considering the plans submitted by ESC, because obviously there could be security issues there depending how close they are going to the Prison and we will wish to be part of that in the consultation process.

2955 So for me it comes across as it is very desperate to get a spade in the ground why a decision has to be made today on the one school two sites, whereas if the report had actually been pushing to get the College of FE done first I could understand that. But this is all about getting it done before the next Election for fears that it might be an election issue I suggest.

I am quite happy to give way to you Deputy

2960

Deputy Tooley: Thank you, Deputy Lowe.

I thank Deputy Lowe for giving way.

2965 Could you just clarify for me, because I am quite sure it is not what you are saying, but I am a little concerned: are you telling me that you think the Prison is not safe enough to be close to a school?

Thank you.

2970 **Deputy Lowe:** A school should never have been built next door to the Prison, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and for somebody to be considering to expand it even closer to the Prison it fills me with despair really, but that is why it is so important –

Deputy Fallaize: Point of correction, sir.

2975 The boundary of the school is not being extended one inch closer to the Prison under these proposals.

Deputy Lowe: That is why I look forward to the plans and having sight of it with the consultation with the DPA and with the professionals from the Prison.

Do you still want to say something Deputy Tooley?

2980 **Deputy Tooley:** Thank you.

I understand that, but in that case why are we not seeing an amendment from you that suggests the closure of St Sampson's?

Deputy Lowe: Because I have not got anything in front of me at this moment in time.

2985 So one of the good things which I am really delighted about in this report is that at last La Mare de Carteret Primary School will be built, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) because again they are another school that has been let down so many times. Both the Head Teachers of La Mare Primary and La Mare High School have been let down and they have had to lift the morale of the staff. So again, to Mrs Hutchinson and her staff at La Mare de Carteret School, I am sure they are absolutely delighted and look forward to a new school.

2990 But what I must say, I just do not understand, we have approved this school to be rebuilt yesterday, or it is in here and will be the final thing in the report, but why on earth have Education, Sport & Culture spent the summer months tarmacking the area of La Mare de Carteret School? Lovely new tarmac. What an expense of La Mare de Carteret School – all the carpark, all the area coming up to the road it has got beautiful new tarmac – and diggers and lorries will be going in there in a period of time. I just question who on earth approved that because that just seems an extortionate amount of wasted money; money that we have not got. I do not think that is the norm.

2995

If we were doing that for our own household we would be patching it if there are holes, in the fullness of that we are going to actually go and develop something on our own property, let alone on a school property. It goes back to this is taxpayer's money and we are custodians of it, and we should be spending it wisely. That is one area where I believe it is not spent wisely.

Thank you very much.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I will be supporting all the Propositions, as amended, including for the avoidance of doubt the unamended Proposition 4 in relation to the La Mare de Carteret Primary School. But I wish just to speak for a moment or two further on that and Deputy Fallaize may wish to respond to my comments in his summing up.

Sir, both he and Deputy Roffey when they spoke in relation to the amendment which Deputy Trott and I laid on Proposition 4 placed great emphasis on some words in what is the Proposition before us. In particular, they wished to emphasise that the delegated authority of the Policy & Resources Committee is subject to the submission of appropriate business cases, and also they wished to draw close attention to the fact that the business cases associated with this project will include the results of the review of capacity in the primary phase across the Island.

It is those words which I wish to draw attention to and to emphasise. Because I think it is that which the Policy & Resources Committee, whether it is this one or indeed the next one after the Election next year, will be wishing to focus on and ensure that the business case does indeed discharge that. I am a little bit concerned that the language that surrounded the debate on our amendment could appear to be an emphatic endorsement that in some ways it was an irrefutable decision to proceed with the rebuild, when we need to draw attention to those qualifying words, in particular, 'subject to the submission of the appropriate business cases'.

What I really wish to ensure is that actually it is that work that is undertaken, and that it should be undertaken quickly in order to fully inform the business case, and actually that should precede the expenditure of considerable time and expense on, for example, design and architects and so on in relation to the site. I think it would be unfortunate to incur a lot of time and expense, and this is something that of course has been done many times before in relation to the Education Estate only to find that actually the business case has not been made and public money has been squandered in the process.

So as I say I think we need to leave it on the record, which is why I was keen to speak in general debate and to have it on *Hansard*, that those qualifications are particularly important for Policy & Resources Committee, and that they do need to be properly discharged. I would seek some reassurance from Deputy Fallaize when he responds that he will be keen to progress that, working with the Policy & Resources Committee to ensure that appropriate resources can enable that review to take place in order to build the business case to support the decision which the Assembly so clearly sought in rejecting our amendment yesterday, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

Yesterday I asked a question about value for money and Deputy St Pier started to answer it but then tailed off. What I was really after was not what he answered, which was to look at some of these streams in the work he would be looking at, but I wanted to know how the value would be assessed and how value would be put to it. The other half of the question was: what amount of value needs to be demonstrated for it to be satisfactory? Now, that is not easy to do but it has to be done if you are looking at value for money.

The other thing that is now a problem for me is the whole issue of the delegated authority. I was on T&R with Deputy St Pier in the last term and we used to have a limit of about £2 million I think it was especially for overruns of budgets and things. I remember in one case there was a

£2 million overrun on Health by one of the many Health Committees we had in that period. Although we had the delegated authority to approve it, we did not; we said we will take it back to the States because it is a big sum.

3055 Now we are going to absolutely astronomical sums and here is the problem now yesterday – and this is a political issue now – two Members of P&R voted for the Sursis. We know Deputy Brouard's position on this but I am not sure what Deputy Trott's position will be on these Propositions. However, one significant thing which I remember was that Deputy Fallaize said he is going to put a spade in the ground, hopefully by June. That is the last month of this Assembly and there will be an Election result with a new team in on 1st July. There might not be the same P&R
3060 and at least half or more of you or us may be gone. This is what has happened in the past two terms, there has been a massive turnover of Deputies.

So what on earth will happen if these Propositions get approved but there is no spade in the ground by June? I can tell you what will happen, this already is an election issue and unfortunately this pushing up daisies of selection is not quite true, because it will be an issue at the next
3065 Election. And, if the spade in the ground is not there in June I can see this being reversed.

Whether that is wise or not does not matter, but that is just feedback from a certain section of the population.

I will give way to Deputy Le Pelley.

3070 **Deputy Le Pelley:** Thank you for giving way.

I would just like to know if you think it is going to be an election issue, whether there is a spade in the ground or not?

Deputy Kuttelwascher: It already is. I think that answers that question.

3075 I will be with you in a minute ...

I am beginning to wonder whether it really makes any difference whether we support Proposition 1 or not at this stage, because it has come back so late in the day for this term. My view now is that the whole issue of delegated authority is there to try and expedite this.

Now, that to me means there is a presumption it will be given, and as the planning permission
3080 will be given. Well we should not be in that position. (*Interjection*)

I will give way now to Deputy Merrett before I continue.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir; because I do want to counter something Deputy Kuttelwascher said.

3085 I would like to know if he would agree with me it was an election issue in 2016 and it was an election issue in 2012, because I really do believe it was, and the longer this Assembly fails to make a decision and move on, then of course it will always be an election issue. We can make anything an election issue as we see fit.

But I certainly believe strongly, sir, that in 2016 this was an election issue and that people
3090 asked me certainly very pertinent questions, 'Selection: yes or no? And were making decisions formed on that one answer, that one area of Government which clearly should concern all Members in this Assembly, if we are being elected as a Government on one issue when we have so many issues in this Assembly as the Government that we need to address.

Thank you, sir.

3095

Deputy Kuttelwascher: I just refer to something Deputy Ferbrache said in the past, and others have said: is that this Assembly appears not to reflect the will of the electorate.

Now, whether you like that or not certainly when I look at St Peter Port South there were actually three issues – air links, sea links, and indeed the Grammar School; and they remain.

3100 I do not know what is going to happen in the next election. Of course it will be an election issue. Therefore pushing up daisies is a bit of a presumption. But anyhow ...

3105 The politics of this is a bit strange now because three things have also happened, which also disappointed me. One was the tribunal vote failure, because I know I spent four years on Scrutiny in my first term and the only thing I really remember from it was during one debate Deputy Trott stood up – he was then the Chief Minister – and he said ‘If I was called before Scrutiny I would not go’. And that is the situation now.

Deputy Trott: And I was true to my word.

3110 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I know, and you have actually confirmed that position now because under our system of Government you do not like it, which is fair enough. That is the problem they have got.

3115 I have actually discussed this issue with – well, suggested a solution to – Deputy Green, on how we can actually get a valued outcome to deciding what happened over a rather critical 24-hour period. It is important, because it relates to judgement; not just judgement of the Head of Education, Sport & Culture, but also P&R. Now, I am sure they can be completely exonerated and everything will be fine, but at the present time it is up in the air and that is unhealthy.

3120 The failure of the Sursis is also of concern to me because one of the major pillars of that argument was relating to assessing value for money by comparing it with how you might provide the same education accounts by a different system. But that has gone now.

The other one that bothers me deeply is the fact that we agreed – and I did not because I abstained from the vote – the fiscal policy framework delay. That is a real red flag to me because it means now there are some real fiscal clouds on the horizon, which are basically requiring P&R to relook at where we are financially and where we will be in the near future, in the near term.

3125 Personally, I know there are all sorts of clouds on the horizon in the financial world in Europe, in the world and elsewhere. *(Interjection)* We have had one minor shock, but we have had a recovery, but this is what always happens, then you get the big one. **(A Member: Yes.)**

3130 We may not be in a position next year to progress most of this. I do not know, but these three things have now created great uncertainty as far as I am concerned. I think Deputy Trott has acknowledged this because one of the things he said when Deputy Fallaize said they expect to put a spade in the ground by June, he said that is overly optimistic, or used such words. If there is no spade in the ground nothing is going to happen until after the Election.

I will give way to Deputy Trott.

3135 **Deputy Trott:** I am grateful because I think Deputy Kuttelwascher is right to labour this point because what I fear, bearing in mind the comments I made about some advice that Deputy Roffey gave me years ago, is that managing expectations in politics is fundamentally important.

3140 What the States is deciding to do today is to re-engage the train. The train will be setting off on its journey but it still has a number of stations at which it will need to stop at, and at any one of those stations the process can be derailed.

Now, I think most people in this Assembly do not want that to happen and we will all be working collectively to ensure that it does not. But the headline tomorrow cannot be that the States has decided that these two schools will come into existence by the end of this States’ term because that is not certain.

3145 He also asked the question about value for money. Now one of the ways you test value for money, particularly if it is a whole-life costing, well irrespective of whether it is whole-life costing or otherwise, is through the tender process, and it is conceivable that at that stage the tenders that come back do not match expectations. That would in itself create an environment of uncertainty.

3150 So it is a best endeavours process, every one, well not everyone, the majority of the Assembly are likely to agree to support these proposals and everyone will be doing their best. But it is by no means certain that the targets can be met, whether that is from a planning perspective, from a

tender perspective, from a value-for-money assessment perspective, and so on and so on. But we have made a very significant leap forward.

3155 So Deputy Kuttelwascher is right to labour this point because the media have a responsibility to report this accurately. (*Interjection by Deputy Kuttelwascher*)

The Bailiff: You have switched your microphone off. (*Laughter*)

3160 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Yes, I am glad Deputy Trott agrees with me and therefore I am almost going to say it almost does not matter what we decide today because it is purely another step and it can fall at the next hurdle. We really do not know.

But I completely sympathise with Deputy Peter Ferbrache's view where he stands, and I stand in the same place because right now I am happy to represent those people, especially in St Peter
3165 Port South who told me what they wanted at the last Election, and I will persist with that view; and whether or not it comes to pass after the next Election, on which I have no idea.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Anyone else? Deputy Dudley-Owen.

3170

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

I thought I would move away from the bullet points that I had originally drafted, sir, and I put it on my computer but it may fail me, this digital device, at the last minute because my battery is running low.

3175 So I will stick to being brief and I will stick to what I consider to be the real Achilles heel of this plan. The Achilles heel for various reasons of any plan to do with the future of education in Guernsey, but the part of the plan that is the biggest area of risk for the one school on two sites is the sixth form – a bifurcated sixth form, splitting our current successful tried and tested provision across two sites miles away from each other in the Guernsey context.

3180 One of the big problems I foresee in proving value for money and justifying breaking up of the Sixth Form Centre is that we do not know the costs of running the new sixth forms. I have been told that it is difficult to extrapolate these figures from the overall 11-18 school costs because they are so integrated, which I think is worrying; because unless these have been worked up and are available then we cannot evaluate the all-important value going forward, as Deputy
3185 Kuttelwascher has just been talking about.

I would like to see this information published and I understand that the savings in the 11-16 part of the school balance the costs of the 16-18 provision, and I would be interested to know if Deputy Fallaize can give any hard figures about delivering and running the sixth form provision to us today.

3190 The splitting of the sixth form creates more problems not just in terms of proving its worth but also in terms of delivery of curriculum. Whilst you can be creative about what you deliver vertically, what about the broadening of courses horizontally?

John Cope who is the Head of Education & Skills for the Confederation of British Industry came to Guernsey earlier this year and he spoke fantastically well at St James, thanks to the Education &
3195 Skills organisation, Bright Futures, who invited him to talk at their event. He talked extensively about the benefits of providing young people with a combination of skills and academic study to our economy. This assertion came from a Skills and Education survey from over 28,000 businesses in the UK and is also confirmed by many businesses that I speak to on a daily basis here in Guernsey, in my position as Vice-President of Economic Development. This is the aspiration, but
3200 the confirmation that this trend is being picked up by students perhaps in response to the call from employers, perhaps in response to the toughening of exam standards set by previous UK Minister, Michael Gove, or perhaps the declining interest and expense in university.

There is an increasingly big interest from UK independent schools in the uptake of vocational courses alongside academic. So the Independent Schools Report published this summer tells us

3205 that the uptake of BTECs by their students at 11-18 private schools has doubled over the last four years. Now, that is something that would almost be unheard of previously. You would go down the road to the local polytechnic or local FE College. Now these schools, Ampleforth and Sedburgh, are now starting to provide BTECs alongside their A-level courses.

3210 Sir, this is a 'seed change' away from the academic focus and we should not dismiss this growing trend here in Guernsey. It is really relevant to us and we need to keep up in one way or another for the sake of our community and our economy going forward.

Deputy Fallaize might tell me not to worry because the IB Career is being introduced and it is a vocational pathway and meets your concerns, Deputy Dudley-Owen. Well, it does not actually because whilst it is a positive move and I am really pleased to see it in fact I think we should be
3215 expanding IB into the Middle-Years Programme which covers 11-16 schools, but actually I am really worried that the GCSE outcomes determine whether or not a student can actually access that IB Careers pathway. In other words, they have passed a number of GCSEs in order to even get there.

So I ask the question: are we not moving away from a selective system at 11, to selection
3220 instead at 16? I would like Deputy Fallaize to tell me, sir, will IB Careers pathway be delivered just on one site in the new sixth form? If students choose a combination of subjects which are delivered on both sites, will this put them off taking that combination – a combination which takes advantage of the broad curriculum available in the 11-18 models? But will they be put off those if they are delivered over two sites?

3225 We know that the federated approach to running our schools proved that moving between sites was detrimental to student choices, because it was shown that students did not like moving between sites. How is this issue being dealt with?

My final question to Deputy Fallaize, sir, is where is the evidence that halving the number of students in the sixth form will not directly impact upon their combination of subject choices?

3230 Deputy Dorey imparted some wise words to us earlier and told us that politics is the art of compromise and whilst I do like this as a creative use of the original Bismarck quote the original actually is far more accurate for this debate and it is that 'Politics is the art of the possible'.

So is it possible to deliver this policy? I am very sorry to say this, sir, but I have grave doubts.

Thank you.

3235

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

3240 Before I make my points I would just like to address some of the comments made by other Deputies.

I will start off with Deputy Roffey, sir. He said he would not be taking any suggestions from the previous Committee who proposed rebuilding the La Mare de Carteret Primary School and secondary school, and that they would be of a large size similar to the ones proposed under the two-school model. Well, I would make several points against that: point one, they would not be as
3245 big by 100 or 200 students. The proper traffic impact study was done as part of the design and a slip road was designed and included in the plans which would have handled any congestion; and, most importantly of all, a primary school and a secondary school have different drop-off and pick-up times, so not all the students would be arriving and leaving at the same time.

3250 Next, I would like to pick up on Deputy Barry Brehaut's observation when he quoted Deputy Peter Ferbrache's manifesto from the last Election. Through the wonders of the internet I have looked up Deputy Brehaut's manifesto and it reads:

Whatever system of government we adopt we must remain focussed on our decision making, and learn to respect those decisions rather than keep flip flopping or back tracking.

He goes on to say, when it comes into focus:

The States by a majority have instructed the Committee *for* Education, Sport and Culture to report back with a three school model without selection at eleven I support that decision.

So I look forward to seeing his vote on this issue.

3255 **Deputy Brehaut:** Point of correction, sir.
My vote is on the record as is everyone's; that is not a revelation.

Deputy Meerveld: No, and now your manifesto is also on the record, contradicting what you were saying about not wanting flip-flop Government.

3260 **Deputy Merrett:** Sir, could I remind Deputy Meerveld to speak through the Chair, please.

Deputy Meerveld: Noted. (*Laughter*)

3265 Right, next I would like to move on to the comments from Deputy Richard Graham regarding the Cotswold School. In the last hour we have all received an email from Mr & Mrs Murphy which says if I may read from it, they have given me permission to quote it: 'Listening to the Education debate, Deputy Graham appeared to claim that Cotswold Academy outperforms the Guernsey Ladies' College. Fact: set in 30 acres, three times Les Beaucamps, it is oversubscribed and can therefore be selective of behaviour. There is a choice of other schools. It did not outperform the
3270 Guernsey Ladies' College in GCSEs. The Ladies' College in 2019 entered 54 pupils – '

Deputy Graham: Point of correction, sir.

3275 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Graham.

Deputy Graham: I think I am entitled to be quoted correctly. First of all, from my intimate knowledge of the school and I have maintained my contact with Mr Will Morgan, they do not select by behaviour. There is competition between comprehensive schools there and he has no more say over who comes into his school than any other head teacher.

3280 At no stage during my speech did I claim that the Cotswold School outperforms the Ladies' College at GCSE. Clearly they could not possibly, being a comprehensive school against a school that although not entirely selective certainly has a much narrower band of performance.

What I did say was that last year in 2018, at A-Level both Balcarras Comprehensive School and the Cotswold Comprehensive School outperformed our Ladies' College and our Elizabeth College
3285 at A Level in terms of the percentage of students who had A*, A*or A, A*-B and I stand by that.

Deputy Meerveld: Okay.

Then that brings me on to the main point here: 'The sixth form –' apparently, according to this email and I have had no time to verify it. (*Interjections*)

3290 'The sixth form at the Cotswold School is selective with high GCSE grades required to be accepted for the A level courses. This is not a like-for-like comparison with a proposed one-school model and never will be'.

Now, interesting also, the mention there of 30 acres – (*Interjection*)

3295 **Deputy Tooley:** Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction Deputy Tooley.

3300 **Deputy Tooley:** Sir, what I am querying is whether it is correct for someone to introduce facts into debate which they are openly saying they have no way of verifying.

Deputy Meerveld: Well, sir?

The Bailiff: It is unusual. (*Laughter and interjections*)

3305 **Deputy Meerveld:** I am not sure, sir, that everything mentioned in this Chamber is always a verified fact.

The Bailiff: Yes. (*Laughter*)

I was going to say it may not be the first time that –

3310

Deputy Meerveld: I said I was quoting from an email which we have all received, and Deputy Graham has already got up and objected to part of it and I accept that.

3315 **The Bailiff:** Well, if it wholly incorrect then Deputy Fallaize can deal with that in his reply. (*Interjection*) Well, I have brought my sleeping bag.

Deputy Meerveld: One other interesting thing from that email is: '... it is sat on 30 acres and it has 1,320 students'.

The two-school model –

3320

Deputy Graham: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Graham.

3325 **Deputy Graham:** I know from my recent conversations with the Head Teacher of that School, and let's face it I think he probably knows better than whoever you are communicating with, Deputy Meerveld. His school population was 1,385.

3330 **Deputy Meerveld:** The 1,320 is on, I think, the Schools of England website. Anyway, I will accept 1,385, no problem, I will accept that.

The two-school model proposes putting 2,500 students on 36.7 acres of land. Now, I am sure that in his winding-up statement Deputy Fallaize will reiterate his 'space does not matter'.

3335 But I tell you when I have our extended friends around to our house and they bring their children, both girls and boys of all ages and backgrounds around to us, they invariably head for the lounge where they get to play on the electronics and whatever else. Very rapidly, that usually ends up with a discipline problem and they get evicted to our large garden where they get to run around much more happily.

3340 One of the questions I have posed to Deputy Matt Fallaize, and I will repeat now and ask him to address in his winding-up, is: in what way will putting our young people into much more confined spaces than we would have done if we had built schools on three sites, vastly reducing the area of facilities available to them, what way will it increase or benefit outcomes? Because I can only see negatives and I think most parents and most members of the public can only see negatives – not positives – to reducing the area, especially as my comparison of costs says there is a nominal cost difference in providing both.

3345 Having addressed those people I will go on to say, right there is another thing that has been raised in this debate: 'Where is the alternative proposal? We have got to vote on this and we have got to proceed with it because we have not got an alternative on the table'.

3350 Why haven't people like myself come back with a counter proposal? Well, there is a difference here between the three-school model and the two-school model now being presented. When the previous Committee was working up the three-school model they were not secretive at all about what they were doing. We met and displayed to all Deputies, we had workshops with Deputies, we invited them and showed the three-school, four-school and two-school models as Deputy Yerby referred to yesterday. We were completely open about what we were doing.

3355 Prior to the debate when a two-school model was proposed, the then so-called 'gang of four' were given unfettered access to our officers and data under the previous Education Committee and were actually given additional funding by Policy & Resources which was granted to enable them to work up an alternative model.

3360 **Deputy Tooley:** Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tooley.

3365 **Deputy Tooley:** No additional funding was given to what was then known as the 'gang of four', the funding was given to the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture who chose to spend it on a number of things, one of which was an attempt to purchase an Astroturf campaign.

3370 **Deputy Meerveld:** I am not sure what an Astroturf campaign is, but the money was requested, the then Committee was put under pressure to make a request – and I will quote what Deputy Le Pelley told me and that is: 'Either do it or it will be done to you'. And we were put in a position to request funding that then was used to draw up an alternative model.
But my main point is –

Deputy Inder: Sorry, but just a point of correction on that.

3375 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: When that vote was taken in Committee I just want it for the record that I did not vote for that and neither did Deputy Dudley-Owen.

3380 **Deputy Meerveld:** I do not think that was part of anything I said, but yes I will accept that.

The fact is that Deputies other than the Committee were given unfettered access to all depth of information and given access to absolutely everything, and were even given funding indirectly through P&R to enable them to pursue an alternative model.

3385 In this situation here, on the two-school model, we got a policy letter produced, admittedly a couple of months of months ago, but only days before the schools broke up – extremely light on detail, something that I have been very vocal about. And we get a programme business case published five working days before the deadline for submitting amendments and sursis.

3390 We get the data on the comparison of costs for the schools which formed a fundamental part of this, one or two working days before the deadline for submission. Not enough data, not enough information has been available.

We asked for traffic impact studies and a lot of the questions I asked well in advance of this debate have not yet been answered. Therefore, there was no opportunity to draw up an alternative plan, or work up alternatives.

3395 I would say that the lack of alternatives is not a good reason to make a bad decision on the proposals, the lack of an alternative. I think the lack of data provided is a perfect justification for *not* proceeding with what is being done.

3400 Now, I am not saying I am going to vote against everything here. I am going to vote against Propositions 1 and 3, but I support Proposition 2 and the Guernsey Institute which, in the policy letter, it admits was the idea of the previous Committee. I am going to support Proposition 4, the rebuild of the La Mare de Carteret Primary School, which was also in the previous Committee's policy letter and it is interesting to note that the new Committee is adopting the design pioneered by the previous Committee, the L-shaped rather than courtyard design.

I will be supporting the other Propositions as well, the IT, etc., those other things that need doing regardless. But I will not be supporting the two Propositions – Proposition 1, to proceed

3405 with the two-school model; and Proposition, 3 to delegate authority to P&R to work that up. Personally, that smacks of executive government.

As Deputy Kuttelwascher has already pointed out, in the past delegated authority was £1 million or £2 million and in this term we have already been asked to delegate authority for hundreds of millions and more is coming. I am concerned about the amount of oversight that this
3410 Assembly is having of those expenditures as they are being implemented.

I still maintain that this proposal does not contain sufficient information to make an informed decision and I will make these predictions: costs will escalate; tangential costs will appear; we will be told that we need more buses or we need more services, external services; other budget items will appear on other Committees' balance sheets, or other facilities will be required. I expect other
3415 costs to creep in from the sides, maybe not directly under ESC but in other areas.

The timetable will slip and public outrage will grow and eventually, I believe, the decision to proceed with two schools will be overturned.

Thank you, sir.

3420 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

I shall try not to make my speech on the past and the history of what has happened. There is a very famous Victor Hugo quote which my French will not allow me to do but it basically alludes to
3425 the fact that I want to live in the future and not the past.

But there are two things I do want to discuss about the past and the first thing I want to urge Deputy Fallaize to do is rescind that Billet of 2013, please. That was dragged out of the history books, brought into amendments. Just please rescind it. If you are not going to fulfil it and if this Proposition passes today, please can you rescind it, arguably, that any Resolution today will
3430 supersede it. But still, please can we rescind that Resolution.

Then I was angered and cross after the last debate because I did not pushback on Deputy Ferbrache about the whole selection and I do wish the selection boat had sailed, in fact I wish it had gone out to sea and sunk, but at the current stage it has not. The first thing to say through you, sir, is that I think Deputy Ferbrache really underestimates his good self in that if he had not
3435 gone to college he would not have succeeded and been the person he is today. He does not know that sir, and I believe he would still be a very good advocate and in the Assembly. That is by the by, but I understand and absolutely respect that Deputy Ferbrache strongly holds that belief.

I strongly hold the belief that I am who I am today because of which school I went to, but I do not know what person I would have been if I had gone to an independent school or a grammar school. But I do not feel I need to know, sir, because again that is my history and luckily that is not
3440 the history of future generations of my family.

But the problem I have with the comments about if you are Deputy and your child is here or the other, I have several concerns with that because if a Member does not believe in selection why would that Member, through choice – and I admit have choice, I have choice that I have worked
3445 incredibly hard for, but I have choice – why would that Member then put their child into that system? Because they simply would not.

If the system was means tested and we thought for some unknown reason that the taxpayer should pay for people's children to go to the colleges, well that might be slightly different again, sir, but that is not the case and has never been proposed.

Is it not, sir, I put to you, that the majority of independent schools have something called the bursary system and a scholarship system where they fund places for children from various different backgrounds to attend their schools, not at the cost of the taxpayer but at the cost
3450 through that institution?

So I do not want to have the colleges in some sort of elevated position where it is only the privilege of the rich – I would say famous, but I do not think that is quite the case – but certainly I
3455 do not want that, sir. But at the same time I am getting a little bit tired of that discussion, and I

think it really does need to stop, because if I took that stance on every vote I would not vote on anything to do with tax, anything to do with benefits, anything to do with anything in life because actually I am a human being and I have a life too. (*Interjections*)

3460 But what I do find quite interesting is the issue when it comes to this – I cannot remember Deputy Ferbrache's words and I do not dare quote him because I am sure he will remember – is that if Members do not believe in that but then they do put their child through the selective system but they do not agree with the school that child has been selected to, then I have concerns, sir, if they do not abide by the system that they supposedly believed in. That would
3465 disturb me. But that is not the case so we will move on potentially and hopefully to the future.

So what Members really have not said in this debate, sir, I do not believe ...What I believe in is the extended opportunity and the excellence in education. That is what I believe in.

There are many good things in this policy paper. I really resonate with the vertical tutor groups, I really resonate with the ability to study across the 11-18 range with a far more equitable
3470 opportunity for every child at every stage, at every age, to be able to make those choices when they have matured, with the support of parents, guardians, teachers, all the way through – so nothing has been decided, nothing has been cut off at the age of 10, because the age of 10 is when a large percentage of children were taking that rather horrific test.

So I think Deputy Ferbrache did say this and this we can agree on, the quality of teaching. It
3475 says in the policy paper, and I have no reason to disbelieve it, it is the single factor which has the greatest impact on student outcome and that I completely abide with. So that, I think, should be at the centre of this: the quality of teaching and how we can attract teachers to teach the 11-18 range.

I am going to talk about the active travel plan, but I really do not want to because I know
3480 Deputy de Sausmarez will cover this off so much better than I ever would. What I want to embed in our young people, in those formative years – and especially in children who are entering secondary education – that having a car to get to school does not make them successful or 'Oh, I have got a car so am now an adult.' It does not make you feel like an adult. In fact, I do not think I learnt to drive until I was in my 20s, I just did not need a car and I was not interested. I want to
3485 teach our children independence, self-reliance, rather than reliance on parents or guardians or relying on a vehicle as a sort of status symbol.

If this Assembly really believes that children in secondary education cannot get across our Island – which is how big? – safely, then maybe we need to look at actually, and what a shame
3490 Deputy Lowe is not here, having a sexual offences register and making sure that our children are in a safe environment and they should be able to get from A to B and anywhere on this Island. I believe they can. I have trust in that.

I have trust in our young people to get from A to B safely. I think they need to make informed, intelligence-based decisions and so do the families. I believe that may in the circumstances be in a vehicle, maybe on a bike, maybe walking, let's let them make the decisions, but let's give them the
3495 environment in which they can make those decisions, let's just do that. Let's make sure they can get safely from A to B.

Now Deputy Inder mentioned the Education Law and I resonate with Deputy Inder on this because to me changing the Education Law is just so important. I want educationalists governing the schools not politicians, and the Mulkerrin Review on Education stated that how can a
3500 Committee – and I am referring to the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture – be an effective governing body to the almost 30 schools in the Bailiwick? And he ended by saying it is simply not possible. Actually my preferred quote, sir, is that:

... to imply that the [Committee] can be an effective governing body to the 27 schools in the Bailiwick is nonsense. [It is simply not possible].

I actually think I can concur with him.

3505 Right, I want the schools to have the autonomy from political interference but I do want to have the agreed levels of accountability, educational outcomes, use of budgets. The fact that we

have at the moment in our schools the like-for-like replacement of the staff; Head Teachers not being able to be in full control of recruitment or even their budget in my world is absolutely nonsense.

3510 And independent, external inspections are absolutely key to this. We need to be able monitor procedures to enable identification of any problems quickly but, more importantly, address them more expediently. But I am between a rock and a hard place here, sir, and I will tell you why. If this debate was about delegated authority – and I am hearing from many Members that delegated authority is causing concern. Now, Members will know I am on record for saying this and it is not hundreds of millions actually, Deputy Meerveld, it is actually just over £100 million, but it is still an
3515 awful lot of money. I think at some point we do need to have a debate –

Deputy Meerveld: Point of correction, sir.

I was referring to the Health Plans and to the Transformation of Technology, etc. So in aggregate it goes over.
3520

Deputy Merrett: I believe this Assembly does need to have that debate at some point on delegated authority. I believe we do need to and the fiscal rules policy paper was withdrawn but at some point we as an Assembly have to decide just how much delegated authority we are willing to give Policy & Resource. We do need to have that debate because – and I am quite
3525 prepared to be corrected – they have £2 million anyway –

Deputy Trott: Thank you.

It is Policy & Resources; it is in the plural, it deals with a number of different issues. *(Laughter)*

3530 **Deputy Merrett:** Okay, and so are the millions in the plural, because they quite frankly are.

So if this was about delegated authority and if I was making a petition to the delegated authority I would also struggle to agree any Propositions. But that is not the debate today, sir.

If it is about the outline business case, well, let me think, what would satisfy me? Now Education, Sport & Culture going to send that to Policy & Resource ... I am in, not a *unique*
3535 position – because there are three of us; well, myself and two others – that if Scrutiny wish to see the outline business case and I would really like to move towards more real time scrutiny so we are actually working in real time, so that if we see that outline business case we have got concerns, when we pull in – it is public hearing – Policy & Resources, Education Sport & Culture, and have that Q&A session that is what I would like to move towards.

3540 So whereas I absolutely concur and appreciate Deputy Laurie Queripel's point that he feels there is a democratic deficit, because I am on Scrutiny I do not feel that way. But if any other Member wants to be on Scrutiny or come on to that panel then clearly they can approach and let us do so. If I remember rightly, sir, I was nominated and placed on Scrutiny unanimously so clearly at the time no other Members wanted to come on to Scrutiny, but clearly they can if they wish to,
3545 especially joining a panel, making submissions. I know the President will agree with me, you are always very welcome. We struggle to get people to come on to panels and to help us but they do and we are grateful that they do, but it is not as if we have an awful lot of people running toward us saying, 'Yes, please, I will come and go on that panel' or 'I will do that review for you'. So that is why I am between a rock and a hard place.

3550 Now, I would like to say this on the record because some Members, I was quite surprised, but Scrutiny are doing a capital application review and I would suggest that any Members who have concerns about the process actually come to Scrutiny make a submission, email us, pick up the phone and talk, have a coffee. I do not mind how we communicate but let's just communicate, because I would be very interested to do so; I am sitting on that panel and I would be very
3555 interested to hear from any Member.

Okay, now the other thing that has really bugged me, so I am going to say it so I do not go home and rant at home, is this idea that we have moved from policy for some reason to ideology.

We are politicians and another Deputy once said to me the clue is in the name, as in policy – politicians – and it is not just about ideology, this is about a policy or a direction that this Assembly agreed 18 months ago.

The question I would put to Deputy Fallaize, please – because I am pretty certain that I can foresee this, but I just want Deputy Fallaize to tell me this when he sums up please. If we do not vote in this, my understanding, sir – and Deputy Fallaize can correct me or do as he sees fit, which is the benefit of democracy – we will be having children going in to schools which are not fit for purpose, as in they are not fit to deliver an all-ability education, that we will not be having any other students going in the Varendes site because – and that always makes me quite ... The idiosyncrasy of this debate is, 'I do not want selection, but I want to keep the Grammar.' I am not quite sure who you put in the Grammar if you do not have selection, I do not understand that at all.

But my understanding is this, sir: if we do not agree this today, we will be having our students going on to sites that are not fit for purpose and clearly – and I apologise, actually, sir, because I am only referring to 11-18 and this policy paper is far bigger than that, so I apologise for that. But I want to stick on this point for a moment, that these students are going in to schools that are not fit to deliver an all-ability system, they will struggle to deliver an all-ability system, and we will have another site that is not having any children going into it at all.

I do not understand why any Member of this Assembly would think that is acceptable to this year's cohort, who I have questioned Education, Sport & Culture on because I have been very concerned that this year's cohort are going into schools without the necessary backup from getting resource to deliver all ability. So I am very concerned about that.

La Mare de Carteret School: rescind that Resolution please. Please, Members, we need to deliver that.

We have got ourselves into this 11-18 two schools trench, but the other part of this is clearly the future of further education which is something that if we want to invest in the community, this is not restricted to 11-18 anybody – well, over a certain age – can go to these colleges and extend their careers. We are asking people to work for longer, we are asking people potentially to change their careers; we need to have this layer of education where they can go in at whatever age, obviously there is a minimum or maximum, I am assuming, Deputy Fallaize I am sure will tell me if there was and I am sure Deputy Graham would never accept it if there was. We need to invest in this; this is not difficult.

Now, Deputy Lowe has stepped back in the Chamber.

So, I am not against development in the Island, full stop; at all, I am not. What I am against is inappropriate development, so I think Deputy Lowe referred to Point Rock. I happen to believe that the area that is on is a greenfield site and the area surrounding it, through research and through other reasons, this is not the right debate for this but as Deputy Lowe mentioned it, that actually it would be a preferred site to look at a brownfield site more central to the parishes and hence why I brought that forward from the IDP requête we debated last sitting. I am glad we debated it last sitting, sir, because I do not think we would have got to it this sitting.

So development is the right development for our community, for people who are living now and for people in the future. Absolutely! Investing in infrastructure, investing in our community and future communities, absolutely, that is what we should be doing, planning for the future.

Now, the last thing and I think Deputy Green really helped me out because I concur with virtually everything he said, and Deputy Soulsby. My real concern is, as a States – and I will put this to Deputy Fallaize; and we are doing the capital allocation review – how we go from feast to famine. I really am concerned – or famine to feast, I should say – really concerned about that.

We need as a Government to get far more savvy with how we programme and how we deliver our capital portfolio projects. We really do, and I am not content, I cannot remember which Member said it, but I am not content with 'Well, that's okay because we will get off-Island providers'.

Now, this is going to be controversial but I want the best people to do the job, regardless of whether they live in Torteval or Vale or – gosh, lo and behold, they might even live in Southampton! I want to best people to do the job to give the best quality, the best value to our community. That is what I would like. Now, I would obviously like that to be on Island and if it is, fantastic, we will use it. But we really have to be, as a Government, far more savvy, far more clever, far more prepared, far more organised, whatever word we use, in how we use our capital projects, because I am really concerned, sir. I mentioned this before to Deputy St Pier when giving the Q&A session that we are at a real risk of going from famine to feast.

Now part of me thinks, excellent, because actually I really want that to happen, I want the industries to have that injection and I certain want our community to have the investment in their infrastructure. So part of me thinks at long last we are doing it, but part of me thinks well, this is quite embarrassing isn't it, because we are literally going to go from famine to feast.

I have listened intently to this debate. I am going to wait until Deputy Fallaize sums up. I do believe in 11-18 education. I have no qualms about that. I do have concerns about a two-school model. I think Deputy Fallaize may recall, or he may not, I was very interested in looking at three 11-18 colleges and how that could work, or could not work, and the disparities between them. It became apparent to me, I think it was at least two years ago, maybe two and a half, that that could not work on the Island for various reasons – I had not brought it to the table, I was not in a position to and I would not have done, because as Deputy Fallaize said, I think, 11-18 over two schools would be the only possibility of getting that educational system, the all-ability system, agreed by the States.

I will just finish by saying that I am concerned, I think Deputy Trott and I am not saying he is not a realist, because I totally believe he is, but it does concern me, I think it was trains and stopping. I think we have a responsibility as a Government to try to give certainty to our community whenever we can (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and I think it would be really disingenuous of me not to vote for the 11-18, because I have already booked that train into action and I would just feel very uncomfortable with saying 'Oh, well, actually it has come in less' – no argument there; 'I have not seen an outline business case; oh, but I can because I am on Scrutiny' – so there is no argument there. I do not like delegated authority, no, I do not and I have said that on numerous occasions. I think there is some appetite in the Assembly to discuss that and to try to come to some sort of conclusion on that, but that is not for today.

What I do not think Education, Sport & Culture should hide behind, and 'hiding behind' is probably a harsh term but I am not always diplomatic, as Members know: 'This is the process therefore we had no choice'. I am uncomfortable with that because obviously we have choice. If Members believe something is not right then we have a responsibility to try to change it.

So, *if* I am not comfortable - because I do not want to predetermine anything with the capital allocation programme, if I am not comfortable with delegated authority, then I have routes to address that –

Do you want me to give way? One moment, Deputy Trott

This debate is not the debate for me to try to address that.

I will give way to Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Sir, it is on a separate matter, the matter that Deputy Merrett was referring to earlier, but I think it is a very valid point about feast or famine.

Back in the early noughties, public sector capital procurement projects were experiencing extraordinary levels of tender price inflation, as Members who were around at the time will recall, to the extent that at one stage it peaked at 43% on an annual basis, which meant that a construction project that was expected to cost £100,000 ended up coming in at the tender stage at £143,000. And a lot of that was the States' Public Sector Programme inflating the construction industry.

3660 The remedy was a creation of desk-top economic model which was designed in order to ensure that public sector procurement took advantage of troughs in the construction market. In fact, Sir Charles Frossard House was built precisely during one of those troughs.

3665 For reasons I have never been able to understand, the Commerce & Employment Department of the day decided to abandon that particular model and as a consequence, to my knowledge, no-one within the States currently has a particularly good handle on what stage, what temperature the construction market is.

But the numbers, the lack of value for money that the incorrect timing of construction projects for the public sector can create is staggering, as evidenced by the example I gave earlier.

Deputy Merrett: I thank Deputy Trott; we agree. Hurray!

3670 In closing, sir, I implore the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to look at the Education Law. I am sure they are, but that is something that one of the reasons I think the majority of the Assembly voted the way they did, because we actually do understand that five Deputies are not the best people to govern 27 schools. I think that is probably broadly accepted by most of the Assembly and I look forward to that work.

3675 I will leave where I started, sir, not in history, in the future. This really to me is about extending opportunity and excellence in education.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tooley.

3680 **Deputy Tooley:** Thank you, sir.

3685 It has been already, and we are not at the end of it yet, a long three days of debate around largely various things to do with education, and having a lot to do with the writing of the policy letter as all Committees do, but perhaps having more to do with the writing of this policy letter often than Committees have. Because actually as anybody who has worked with any of the people I worked with on this project will know, there is not a single one of the five of us who were involved who does not put their heart and soul and physical words into a policy letter that we bring forward. As a group of us, we sat poring over the paperwork with pens, changing words and making sure this said exactly what we felt it needed to say because of what we genuinely, fully
3690 believe in is the best way forward for education and for a comprehensive system of education for this Island.

3695 Not necessarily what we would propose if we were doing this somewhere else, but the right system for a community of our size in a situation such as we are where we are, remote in a way from larger land bases but interdependent with those larger land bases for our teaching staff, for future opportunities for our young people and so on.

3700 The system that we believe we have created that we are offering up in this Policy Letter is the one that we believe is right for our community. It is not one we have picked up and lumped in from somewhere else, it not us aping what has happened elsewhere, it is us taking the best out of those things and trying to create something that will be right for our community – our community in which our own children and grandchildren and those of our friends and family grow up and need to benefit and prosper.

I have sat for the last few days wondering what at the culmination of this debate I would feel were the really important things to add to that that has gone before and to leave as a marker, hopefully on your minds and on your hearts as you go into the voting on this debate.

3705 A lot has been said about public opinion and what is out there in the public in terms of how people feel about the model and about the future of education. I think I would be right in saying that I am one of a minority of Deputies who engages with social media as well as with the print media and the broadcast media. So I am aware of the commentary that is out there. I am certainly alone among the Members of the ESC in engaging with those things; and although over the
3710 summer I have not been well and I have not been, perhaps, communicating outwardly quite so

much in those things as a result of that, I have certainly been reading what is been said and so on. And a lot has been made of this 'huge public outcry'. But it really is not a huge public outcry.

3715 There are some vociferous, loud voices out there who are repeating similar things on a regular basis. But there are a very small number of people actually making those comments. And that is not to say that they are the only people who do not like this, but they are a very small number. So to claim that there is overwhelming public support for an alternative presented or not presented to this model, is quite simply not the case.

3720 If I believed everything I read on social media I would not know whether I was standing on my head or my feet some days. I have been told – or it has been written on social media – that I, as a Member of this Committee, am trying to move this Island all the way to the left. We are trying to tear down academically excellent establishments and reduce everyone to base level. I have also been told on social media, that I am trying to build an academic platform which is so high that nobody who wants to engage in technical studies would ever be able to progress onward. Well, both of those things cannot be true.

3725 I have been told that we are all about saving money. I have also been told that we are all about penny-pinching, and why are we not spending it? I have been told that we are building schools that are too big, too grandiose, 'too set up to win architectural design awards', instead of just being places which will deliver education. And I have been told that we are cutting space to the point where nobody will have room to move their shoulders, much less be able to lift their bag onto their back. None of those things are true.

3730 I am a great believer in knowledge. I really, genuinely believe that we need to give every single child on this Island a huge wealth of background knowledge to enable them to understand the world and their place in it. (**A Member:** Hear hear.)

3735 I am going to tell you a little anecdote. I was sat having dinner with my family. We do not have no politics and no religion rule at my dinner table. It is unusual, because I believe, actually, it is more important we teach our children to speak respectfully about those things than that we teach them not to speak about them, because I think that is one of the things that damages the world in which we live. And when we were discussing one day a programme that had been on that was discussing the sentencing or the court cases around soldiers who had been involved in the Bloody Sunday events.

3740 We were sat the table – my children are aged between seven and 13 –and we had this quite long, detailed conversation about what had happened and about what was going on at the time. So we had this conversation and my seven year old said, 'Is that why the backstop is a big deal?' Because he sat at the table, – and I did not really realise he was listening and one of them was definitely more interested in Minecraft than he was in anything else that was going on – but they had that background of knowledge.

3750 *Many* families on our Island are giving their children that background of knowledge that helps them to understand the world in which they live. But there are families where that background of knowledge is not imparted to their children, and actually where ... I sat in a meeting and somebody said, 'This would be like trying to unravel the Gordian knot'. There are families on this Island – *many* families on this Island – who would not be able to engage in that conversation because that is not the background knowledge they possess. I genuinely believe it is critical that we give, particularly the less advantaged families within our society, that kind of background knowledge that enables them to engage with others, whether they are going to be academic or not.

3755 When we were children – I think even the youngest among us this would be case – I came from a *very* ordinary family. My parents both worked in factories, I went to the bog-standard comprehensive in my town and when we would come home, after school and after Coronation Street the television would be on and we would just be relaxing, kicking back, chilling out. But 3760 what was on television was *Tomorrow's World* or *Question Time*, or the *News* or *Panorama*. There was not the option of changing over to *SpongeBob* or *The Simpsons* or *Family Guy* or whatever.

What was fed to us as a kind of almost passive society was the knowledge that enabled us to access the world on a much higher level. That is not the case for our children and young people.

3765 Now, that is partly because doors have been opened to them they have been given other options; and that is great. That is great but, as educators, as a society that is responsible for ensuring that our young people, when they go out into that wider world, whether they choose to come back here to live and work, or they choose to go out to the far-flung – not corners of the world but parts of the world – deserve the chance to be able to hold their place in that world because they understand how it all fits together.

3770 I believe in that kind of education. And I think that is important to say, because there is a lot out there about what we are trying to do which would suggest that we are not trying to do anything that looks like that. And that is what we are trying to do.

3775 We are trying to ensure that every single child on this Island has access to the kind of education that gives them all of those wonderful opportunities whatever they decide to do with their lives. I believe in our young people. I believe in our society. I believe in an Island that wants to do that for our young people.

3780 I have listened and I understand and I respect the views of those who fought for selection and who feel it would be giving a kick in the teeth to the communities that supported them – because I know there are many – to now say, ‘Do you know what? I am going to give the go-ahead to this new plan.’ But – and I have to this, and I am sorry that I have to say it – if you leave this the States of Deliberation having voted and having said, ‘Okay, well, the battle was lost and selection is gone, but I will not vote for this’, what you are saying is the battle is lost and selection has won, but you are going to have to deliver it with your hands tied behind your back. And it is not our hands you are tying behind our backs, it is the hands of the children and the young people that are in our schools. And that is not right.

3785 I do not believe there is a single person who is elected to this Chamber who wants to tie the hands of our children and young people behind their backs.

One of my favourite promises ever written – it is a Bible passage and I know not everybody likes that – but it is one of my favourite ever promises and it is this:

For I know the plans I have for you, plans to prosper you and not to harm you, plans to give you hope and a future.

3790 I can look out at the children on this Island and I can say that. I know the plans I have got for those children. I know that those plans are to prosper them and not to harm them. I know that those plans are to give them hope and a future.

Please vote for those plans. *(Applause)*

3795 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you sir.

That is quite a tricky speech to follow. I commend everything that Deputy Tooley has just said.

3800 I think she touched on some really important issues – before I take it in a probably slightly more mundane direction – but I think I would like to start by paying tribute to all those people who have taken the time to get in touch with us to express and explain their views. Those views have been disparate and various and they have been expressed in many different ways, but they are all very heartfelt. It is an emotional topic.

3805 Yes, I know that we have heard from a lot of people including a lot of people currently in our education system. And so I think it is important to acknowledge that and to treat all opinions with respect.

3810 So transport – I will start with transport – *(Laughter)* I actually considered not even mentioning it, **(A Member: Ooh!)** *(Interjection)* but now I have been goaded into it! But actually Deputy Tindall did a very good job, and Deputy Merrett as well has touched upon this. We have got some data which is very current data – local data – but I do not think it is been published yet. It shows that the majority of our students are driven to school, but it also shows that the majority of our

students would prefer to get to school actively, i.e. walking or in particular riding their bike – that was a big winner. So what we can extrapolate from this data is that they do not currently have that choice – that free choice – to do so. So we got to look at what the barriers to that are.

3815 The barrier – we know this again – is generally safety or the perception of safety. They are actually subtly different things: safety is the empirical statistics around safety, but the perception of safety is obviously how safe people feel in that environment. So they are subtly different because often you have quite a different perception of safety than the statistics will tell you.

3820 But actually when you look at what the main barrier is, the biggest factor that impacts that safety is mixing non-motorised forms of transport – so people on foot, on bikes, etc., push-scooters, whatever – with motorised transports. I am sure I have bored people with this before, about the physics of why that is the case. But it is disproportionate and motorised vehicles present a disproportionately bigger risk to people outside of those vehicles.

3825 So we have got a vicious cycle at the moment. There is a wonderful cartoon, which I might have mentioned before, which kind of sums it up and it is a cartoon of a car and two parents and a child standing between them. The caption is, 'There is too much traffic for little Billy to walk to school so we drive him'. And of course that is the vicious cycle in a nutshell, because we know that the presence of motorised vehicles, of traffic, is the big deterrent to people actually getting there by other means, even when it is an eminently walkable distance, for example.

3830 This is exacerbated in the Guernsey situation quite often by the absence of pavements or adequate pavements and separated paths and things. But one of the most effective things is to provide good infrastructure and to provide those options for people to not have to mix.

3835 So infrastructure is really key, but as Deputy Tindall suggested, she mentioned the word 'travel plan' and I do not know how familiar people are with concept of a travel plan, but basically it is a package of measures, or a package of actions more like, that both incentivise and make it easier, safer and more convenient to get to school, in this instance, in a variety of ways. So reducing the dependency that people have, that is illustrated by that cartoon.

3840 It is about giving people a broader range of choice. Some of these things are touched upon in the policy letter and I think actually it was probably quite a good thing it did not go into much more detail. I have been involved in many of the conversations and can testify to the amount of work that is gone into this. But there is an awful lot of work that has been done in this area and I for one am quite excited by some of the opportunities that this model presents. I think it could actually be a really good opportunity to take the bull by the horns and really transform, for want of a better word, the scenario.

3845 I think the problem that we often have is we tend to look at the situation with our Guernsey goggles firmly on and we tend to think, 'Ah, well it is been rubbish for decades', this whole transport paradigm – it is not easy to walk somewhere, I do not feel comfortable jumping on my bike and therefore it can never be. But actually other places which are very similar in many ways, characteristics-wise, to Guernsey have done an absolutely fantastic job of revolutionising how students of all kinds can get to school. And I have to say that does include students with special educational needs as well.

3850 So yes, I mean some of the things Deputy Tindall alluded to are mentioned in the policy letter relating to transport, and personally I am optimistic that we can really make a good fist of that, I think it is going to be great.

3855 One of the communications that we got was a letter about the College of Further Education and there was a list in that letter of probably about seven or eight bullet points, and they were failed promises and stalled decisions since the 1980s that had led to the point that the College of FE finds itself in physically right now. Then I flipped over to the appendix of the policy letter and looked at what the Inspector said about those buildings and I was just nearly close to tears.

3860 I think Deputy Roffey earlier in this meeting described further education in this Island as the 'Cinderella of education' and I think it is time Cinderella went to the ball. We collectively – successive Assemblies for decades – have let them down and it is such an important area to get

right and really there are so many other reasons, I think, for supporting this, but that has to be one of the critical ones.

3865 So I disagree with Deputy Lowe about the extended school day and the enrichment opportunities. I think that is again a really exciting opportunity for students and I would say, from a personal point of view, I had a bit of a penny-dropping moment a year or two ago, where – and I have got several children – I realised that mine did *very* few after-school activities, and I realised that was just disorganised parenting. Because I just could not ... When you have to drag four
3870 children along to one event to get one child to that event, or however many children, it is a real hassle, it really is. And the path of least resistance is often, 'Ah well, I will not bother at all then', and then you think, 'Well, if that one is not getting to go to Scouts or swimming club or whatever it is, then it is a bit unfair to send any of the others'. But honestly, the hassle of having to drag all of the children along to one activity and then entertain them while one of them is running around
3875 a track or whatever; they are just a logistical effort, apart from anything else, I find personally really draining.

Just for the record, I did make a very conscious effort to pull up my parenting socks and find ways around that; and actually one of the ways is to club up with other parents, by the way, and send children in gaggles along to these things. But actually– (**A Member:** Gaggles are geese.) I
3880 think it is the correct collective noun, I am not sure.

But actually that whole logistical thing is one of the barriers to enrichment. Those are *really* important enrichment opportunities and actually having to get from school to somewhere else in order to access those activities is a barrier, and it is a particular problem for students whose parents do not – I mean probably students like my children whose parents are just slightly too
3885 busy or whatever to get their act together, but also parents who, however much they might want to, do not have the means to do that. Especially in secondary education, shift work or other working patterns just prevent that from being the case – or care duties for younger children means that it is just *really* difficult for parents to get students to those activities.

So I actually think the more that we can offer onsite, the better. That is equality of opportunity.
3890 I think we are really lucky in Guernsey, we have got a fantastic array of those kinds of activities taking place in the Island. I think that is absolutely amazing, and I think that is a really wonderful part of living here and all the rest of it. But not all students can access those kinds of activities and I think the kind of plans that Education have set out – ESC have set out – in their policy letter do you provide a much more equitable access to that range of activities that some students,
3895 especially, might not otherwise have. So I think that is something really to be welcomed.

I have to say intuitively I was concerned –

Oh, I give way to Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, Deputy de Sausmarez.

3900 I agree it is great to have these things after school from three o'clock. In fact, I think at La Mare 90% of those students attend after-school activities that they have put on at La Mare High School. So they are already there, it is because it is compulsory, and I think that is the difference that I have got and the concern that I have got. Because there are others who attend various clubs and they are not going to be able to do that any more because they have been made to stay at
3905 school.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Well, I think one of the problems is that the school buses leave when school finishes. And so actually for some students – possibly a lot at La Mare, because I know the catchment area is in the whole quite close – a big problem is if the school buses go at three and
3910 those students have got no other way of getting home then they are by default going to have to miss them. So I think actually this is a *really* great way of giving those students access to a really exciting range of enrichment opportunities.

I was quite nervous, I think, about some of the issues relating to sports facilities as it is something dear to my heart. But actually, looking into it, because those concerns have been raised, I am actually feeling much more confident about that now.

I think Deputy Fallaize in his opening speech referred to the fact that it is not the total acreage, the total space available, it is very much about how you use it. And certainly I think that because the facilities that will be provided will be able to be used more efficiently, certainly than the equivalent grass pitch – which I know was something that was discussed with heads of PE – then I think, again, students' access to sporting facilities is going to improve across the board. I think even though it might fall short of the idealised perfection that I have shining in my head, I think the provision is still going to be better than it currently is now. And again, I think it opens up opportunities to students who might not otherwise have them.

I am really glad that various speakers, most recently Deputy Tooley, have put students, children back at the heart of this debate, because I think that is what this is all about and I think it is so important we do not forget that. But a comment that Deputy Graham made in his speech as well reminded me – yes, of course students are at the heart of this, and yes of course their families are affected – but actually teachers are the other people who are absolutely inextricably linked to the decisions that we make here today.

And we have heard, again, a variety of views from teachers: some incredibly supportive of the proposals in the policy letter, others raising a few questions and others who are very concerned. I think it is important that we acknowledge that there is some concern among our teaching staff, and as one teacher who wrote to us explained, in that teacher's opinion, many of the concerns are very understandably from teachers who might not have experienced, for example, an 11-18 setting of this kind, or not for a while, or not an all-ability 11-18 setting.

So I think it is *very* understandable and obviously mix into the equation that this involves change, and of course we are human beings and change is hard. So I think it is *very* important to recognise that those concerns exist and that we *really* need to be sensitive in our approach, and most importantly support those teachers in the transition because ultimately it is they who will have the biggest impact on our children.

So I am sure the President of Education, Sport and Culture will give me the assurance that is the case. But I would like to hear that reassurance.

Personally, speaking as a parent, I declare an interest, I have four children who will, all being well, hopefully progress into this new system starting from next year. My oldest has just gone into Year 6 – do I need to declare an interest on the name? I do not think so, because Education, Sport & Culture, my one criticism is they being misnamed one of those colleges and missed out a vital 's'. (*Laughter*) But I will not be churlish enough to try and amend it in. (*Interjection*)

Yes, I know it is a different branch the family, so I have got nothing to declare.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you sir.

I will not speak for long.

Like Deputy Tooley, I from time-to-time pop up on Twitter and Facebook and other social media; and of course you have to accept, sometimes with a pinch of salt, the comments that you get and the motivation for people putting it there. But nevertheless, it is *a* response, usually from people who have been or may be electors. I noticed *The Press* in an editorial today on a different topic from an earlier debate this week, said that this States does not always accord with public opinion and reject it very much.

I think we have seen a lot of that perhaps in the last few days on the Education debate, because although one can only commend the work, the meticulous diligence, and in a way the attitudes to debate that Deputy Fallaize and his team have demonstrated today and earlier, the thing is they succeeded in going from a very divided Island between them and us – those who

3965 wanted the selection to continue, the old system, and those who wanted change. They managed to further divide it into those who want a two-school model and those who want three-school model. It has become a rather complicated playing field, one could say, between different outlooks.

3970 Deputy Ferbrache very much came, really, out of the political closet today, in saying that he still is fundamentally a supporter of the old order and the benefits of selection. Now, I suspect he is absolutely sincere and correct in that he would not have become the notable politician, lawyer and personality in our society had he gone to a different school. But that was a few decades ago.

I think the point has to be made, and should be made, that for many years now, and even more so in the future, schools will match the curriculum which at one time, in the 1950s, 1960s, 3975 and maybe 1970s or even 1980s, was exclusively for pupils who had passed or were paid to go into private independent colleges and/or the grammar school. I think that misunderstanding often colours what a lot of the older generation perhaps put across and other opinions; so we have to deal with that and understand it.

I would be very reluctant, personally, to return to the selection debate and in fairness I do not 3980 think Deputy Meerveld or other politicians generally speaking have suggested that. Deputy Smithies hinted at it today, maybe. But I think despite perhaps 61% of the people who replied to an Education consultation wanting to keep the status quo in some form, the 11-plus was the most unpopular element of it. I agree with speakers who indicated that in some respects it was no longer serving social ability or other goals. So I think we need to park that.

3985 But the issue today surely is whether we finally decide to go for the two-school model in the configuration ESC have put across or to, perhaps, take a rain check as to whether the two-school on two large sites is exactly the way we want to go.

Perhaps the best speech – well, actually Deputy Tooley made a cracking speech as well – but the best speech perhaps was Deputy Graham's. Nevertheless, there was a little bit of difference of 3990 opinion, say, when Deputy Meerveld got to his feet raising an email that he had – I wish my IT was as good as that to get all these emails. I nevertheless looked directly on Google at one of these characters and I saw that there is indeed a very excellent school in the Gloucestershire County near Cheltenham, the Balcarras School. *(Interruption)* Yes, that is a comprehensive. There is a very complicated admission criterion, which would not be relevant to read, for 2019 and 2020. And it is 3995 not true to say that it is a selective system, in the sense that our Grammar School used to be or the colleges used to be.

But what appears to be the case, is the young people who live in the catchment area have a greater right to attend than those who are outside it, other children with the strongest geographical claim, measured in a straight line from the ordinance survey address point of the 4000 child's home address, using the local authority's computerised measuring system, will receive the highest priority – edited a bit.

The point is, however interesting Gloucestershire is, it is not Guernsey, and Guernsey has a different culture, a different social history, maybe different social challenges. I think when we have seen fluctuating education results in some of our schools over the past decade we have either 4005 congratulated ourselves with a degree of complacency or we have almost punished ourselves in a sort of self-flagellation mode.

But actually, a lot of those trends are the mirror of what is happening in our sister island of Jersey and the Isle of Wight. There is an insularity factor which sometimes leads to it, and it is precisely because politicians in the last two decades, such as Deputy Trott and Deputy St Pier and 4010 others have created quite a robust economy, with virtually full employment, in fact we have more jobs than people. That possibly has led to a certain complacency with some students, but not others. Those who are academically motivated probably do as well as anywhere and those who are perhaps more drawn to other areas of life, like sport, have been more relaxed.

The thing is we have to move to the future. I thought long and hard about whether I should 4015 abstain on this, and I have decided actually the best thing to do is to still stick to my philosophy which is not to go back to selection but is to consider, I would say, a more radical education vision

than the one that we have here. Because I think we are actually perhaps fighting the last war with the idea of two large all-singing, all-dancing schools.

Yes, Deputy Graham is absolutely right, there are great examples of them working in the UK, there are also examples of large schools *not* working very well. They work in parts of France and Germany. But we are really now embarking into a new era of digital transformation and social change. We have seen a growth, for reasons that are not entirely clear, of the home schooling model. We have seen Blanchelande, for example, a small independent school do remarkably well, despite the constraints of its space.

I believe we would be better off thinking outside the box and having a matrix of smaller schools and colleges that would work together, where appropriate, but would also complement each other and compete and be more on a Guernsey scale. I think the two-school model, although it has its advantages, I would admit that the one really powerful aspect of it is that it delivers, in theory, curriculum choice, albeit one school would not have the Baccalaureate.

But just on the issue of the sixth form, we are losing the Sixth Form College, that Deputy Dudley Owen, amongst others, was extremely proud to own and support, and that has delivered first-class results and has been, not exactly comprehensive, but it has taken young people from at least four different schools and integrated them into a culture of excellence. And we cannot prove that the new model of ESC with the two-campus model of the one-school site will do as well, so I offer a degree of scepticism there.

But I think a deciding factor, for me, is the fact that the two campus sites will eat up more of the land around them – we might not allow that in other planning contexts, with more build, creating larger campuses, but still not large enough to have everybody having meals at school, for example, at the same time. But when myself and a few other States' Members have asked over the last few months, 'Well, that is all great, but where is the Sixth Form Centre going to be, given the fact that you losing the Sixth Form Centre and you are having sixth formers in two campuses?'

The answer came there none, because the sixth formers will not have their own space or facilities; they will be perhaps having to use the canteen and catering facilities there and then. And I do not think we have given enough thought to the cultural issues of mixing mature, almost young adults actually they are, who have the right to vote, the age of consent and all that, with younger children. That is a concern. And of course we should also consider within that framework, the special needs aspect.

So I think we actually are still overly influenced by the thinking of the day. I will give you an example: Deputy Roffey and other Members, Deputy Le Tocq, I think as well, have mentioned that in former lives, in the Education era of post-2001 when we supported the Torode amendment we built in too much capacity per pupil into the schools, and we are not doing that now. Hang on a minute: who decided that? Probably the Education members of the day, on advice that they had from experts and educationalists; and now we are saying that is not quite right.

I do not think, given the fact that this policy letter was published the day the schools broke up and effectively came to the Chamber the day the schools went back, has given people sufficient time. I believe too that many of the other elements in this will delay it anyway and therefore, although I will support most of this States' report, I will not be voting for Propositions 1 or 3, although I would be very happy for the last part of 3 to pass, but not the extensive delegation to Policy & Resources, because we are effectively giving to five out of 40 Members an extra sursis.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you.

Can I invoke Rule 26(1) please? (*Interjection*)

The Bailiff: I put you to the motion that debate be terminated, those in favour; those against.

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I think that was lost.

Deputy Lester Queripel: A recorded vote, please, sir.

Deputy Oliver: Can we just continue, then? I am sorry, I have got two little ones that need feeding at home.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: Thank you, sir.

I will try to be brief. I would not want to get in the way of what you have got to do.

(Deputy Oliver: Sorry.)

I will go very quickly back though a little bit and say that my very first position, of course, was to try and save selective education. I have got no intention of going back there, but there was the idea that we wanted to change the method of selection.

One or two of my other key concerns about that was the fact that in changing the system we were going to have massive amounts of money that were going to be having to be spent, in a time of austerity. And I do not really believe that austerity is over. I think that we are talking now about it might be a little bit of a mini-break, but it is going to come back. They are now talking about a recession coming back in again and I think we may be back where we were, perhaps not 2008, perhaps nearer 2010.

But my other big concern – and this was because I had spent some 10 years as a negotiating secretary for a local trade union, a teachers' trade union. Not only had I been a local negotiator on terms and conditions of service, rates of pay, holidays, the whole raft of things, and I had also been involved in various tribunals and things regionally, that is the South of England, but also to attend various national conferences as well. I had a pretty good idea, I thought, of the kind of turmoil that you are going to face in negotiating these changes with the trade unions. You are not dealing with one, although they may come round a table and actually appear to be one group, there are many of them and they come from many different backgrounds and they have many different aspirations.

My first suspicion, to be honest, was when the College of Further Education actually asked the Education, Sport and Culture group, with the approval of the teacher's associations in the actual schools, if we would actually allow them to remove the bars that they put in place for working in each other's institutions, because that immediately said to me one group wants the other one's pay and the other one wants the other one's conditions of service. Now, I have been poacher turned gamekeeper here, because I know when I have been doing the negotiations, as a member of that side of the argument, I would have been looking for my members to gain more and for the authority to have actually paid out more.

Now, I am trying to be careful with the money because I know that it is going to cost us more. If they want to work more money for less hours it is going to be more costly to us. So that is where I started from, as well as the selection debate.

From that position – we lost it – and I moved on to looking at the three-school model which, as President of Education, it was my Committee, I was directed to do. And we did that with just as much vigour, I would suggest perhaps even more vigour than the current ESC has done for their two-school model. The amount of work we did, the number of displays and the consultations that we had were actually phenomenal. We mentioned early on, somebody else mentioned it, that we had actually put up the various school models that were available. There were only four or five votes I think for a two-school model, and I was really cheesed off to find in fact that Deputy Fallaize had put four of them up himself – three or four – he did actually have a roll at the end and say at the end that is what he had done. *(Interjection by Deputy Fallaize)* He is saying he did not now, he has got a short memory, but I remember at the time that was said.

But anyway, we decided that the two-school model had so few votes that we were not going to proceed with it. We went through the motions of doing the three-school and all the rest of it. That was presented to this Chamber. This Chamber, in its wisdom, decided not to go that way. That is fine. We have now come up with a two-school model, which I think is just not fit for this Island. And I have to say that I cannot vote for it because it is just not my philosophy.

Somebody said before it is about children; children are at the centre of it all. Well, they are, and I have spent 33 years of my life teaching children, most of them in the secondary school. I actually taught for 33 years in the same secondary school. And, just out of interest, when I was having an interview I was actually asked, 'What were the strengths of everything about that?' I said, 'Well, I know the kids, I have actually developed things, I know where every brick is, I know where every child can go and hide, where they can be doing the things they should not do.'

And the person who was interviewing me said, 'It could be argued, you know, that you have actually done one year of experience and you have repeated it 33 times.' And that is also true, perhaps, of some of the whizz kids that are actually being looked at around the world as experts today if they have been in the same place for the same amount of time, doing the same job. So be very careful of experts.

But the experts here are the classroom teachers and the classroom teachers, by an overwhelming amount of traffic through my computer and through my iPad, are telling me that three schools is better than two schools and that 1,400 children in a school, for Guernsey, is too many. Now, I am telling you that I think you should listen to their concerns, listen to the experts. This is not going to go away; this is going to carry on. These people are going to have these same concerns for some considerable time yet.

Yesterday – I think it was yesterday, it seems like a lot longer ago than that – we actually asked the advice of some experts in this Chamber, the Scrutiny Panel, and Scrutiny told us, in their expert advice, with their background, that they thought the best way forward was to have a tribunal of inquiry. And we decided, overall – I did not – but overall this Chamber decided not to go along with that. I tell you, I think that that was a mistake. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I think you have not listened to the experts and it is going to come back and it is going to bite you.

Now, I do not do all this Facebook and Twittering and all the rest of it, but I have one or two friends who do, and I was told that yesterday there were one or two people, in fact even one or two in this Chamber, who were saying things like, 'They seem to have defeated themselves, what a bunch of fools, they have done nothing, they have actually had this opportunity, they are throwing it away and nothing is going to happen, it is all going to fizzle out.'

Don't you believe it! In not getting these things resolved you are actually making the thing go further down the road, and the further down the road it goes, the nearer we get to this blessed election, and that is what you do not want, to have all this stuff mixed up in that.

What is more likely to happen, and what I think was the reason for the way that voting went yesterday, was that P&R were trying to say to Scrutiny, 'Do this in one particular way'. Scrutiny were going to have their hands tied to one particular action and to one particular element of investigation. By losing that, it is not going to fizzle out. Scrutiny have now got all of the tools back in their box, they can do anything they want, and if it is not satisfactory they can come back to this Chamber and say, 'Do you know what, several of you told us that if we tried it out first and it did not work, then was the time to come and ask us for a tribunal'. And that is suggesting to me that they are going to support a tribunal of inquiry, if it does not actually come out ... So if you had a snap inquiry or a snap hearing and you did not get the evidence, I do not think it is the end of the world, I really do not.

So I say disregard the advice of experts at your peril. Now, we are talking about a Guernsey situation here. We can have the best school in Gloucester, you can have the best school in Scotland, whatever, but this is Guernsey. Guernsey is where I have lived all my life. Guernsey is where I have taught for all of my teaching career and Guernsey is what I know best. The local people will come and talk to you and tell you what's what, what they feel. And I have had dozens of people stopping me – not this lunchtime – but yesterday lunchtime and the lunchtime before,

4170 saying, 'For goodness sake, go for three schools; two schools is too big, it's not the Guernsey way. It's not the way we want our children to be educated, in schools that big. It is almost like a fish finger factory. It's massive, it's too big.' And I would tend to agree. I do not think that you are going to be able to deal with children in the same sort of way if you have got 1,400 of them on a campus.

4175 When I was teaching in my secondary career if there were 500 or 600 children in the school, and I think at St Sampson's High, it was St Sampson's Secondary School in those days, it actually had about 700 and something, I just about new every single one of them. And if something was kicking off in the playground, it was, 'John, stop it' or 'Mary, go and see the Head Teacher.'
(**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It was done! (*Laughter and interjections*)

4180 Freudian slip, sir! I did not mean any particular Mary!

But it was done. You could stifle things out very quickly. But if you do not know who these people are, because there are just so many of them, you run a risk.

Also, when I was 18, I think I may have told you this when I was standing for the election of friend of President of ESC in my time, we went up to play at a school not too far away from where
4185 we were in the middle of Sussex, and it was a school of 1,500 to 1,600 pupils, Thomas Bennett it was, and it was on three sites. We were 18, 19 or 20 years of age, we went to play this football game, we got absolutely thrashed because there were so many kids there for them to choose from but right at the end of the day one of the youngsters from their school went into our shower, into the visitor's shower, and he got bawled out by the member of staff who was on duty,
4190 and it turned out that it was another member of his own staff that he did not recognise because the school was so big!

They had so many teachers there working on the school syllabus and on the school campus that the two of them had now realised that they were both members on the same staff – perhaps they had not seen each other in the raw before – but it does say something, doesn't it, when you
4195 have got two members of staff in a PE group of perhaps 15 or 20 people and they do not recognise each other because the school is so big, on split sites.

Just another little question and perhaps you can answer this one for me, Deputy Fallaize. If you have one school on two sites you have one school. Are you going to have a deputy head in each school or a head in each school? If it is one school it should be one head, it might have two
4200 deputies in either place. Are you going to have a head of department in each site or are you going to have just one in one school? And if you are going to start doing that, are you going to start rewriting the whole book about how – I think was a purple book with a Burnham agreement, with all the various teachers' arrangements. Are you going to start renegotiating the whole of that book to make it fit your model? How are you going to actually work out the teacher assignments and assessments and where they go and what the school sizes are?
4205

We also have had on social media quite recently the three senior teachers, the executive head teacher and the head teacher designate of de Saumarez College and the Victor Hugo College saying they are absolutely in favour of this particular model. Well, I am not surprised really, and I do not mean to be derogatory when I say this, but those three people have been captains – I am
4210 going to give an army analogy here for the benefit of Colonel Graham.

We have got three great captains who have been very good looking after their little regiments, or whatever, and overnight they have been made brigadiers, because from a 400 or a 500 size school, two of them are suddenly going to be in charge of 1,400 and something (**A Member:** Ka-
4215 ching!) That is a *massive* change. It is huge! It is a bit like saying, 'Captain, forget being in charge of your 32 men' – or however many men a captain looks after – 'you have now got a thousand'. Also, when you start working out all these things, you are going to be having all sorts of people on very different rates of pay.

I do not know if the Members here know exactly how the school system works but a school is based on its size by the number of pupils it has got, but the number of pupils have different value
4220 points according to what their age is. So as you get into a bigger school with a sixth form, that

school can be quite a big size. It might be a group four or a group five now but it could very well be a group 10, 11 or a 12 and suddenly the salaries become massive.

4225 So when you are talking about making savings over the number of staff you are going to use, and it is going to take you some time to ease them out, how much money is it going to cost you to actually pay the wages of these people, especially if there are big promotions involved?

4230 When our Committee were looking at various things, we discovered that the number of promoted posts within the Grammar School – (*Interjection*) in order to keep the staff there, it was entitled to something like 75 teacher points, promotion points, and it had 130-something in order to keep those people employed and to keep them on that site. That is a *massive* wage bill. How are you going to ease that? And how many years are these people going to be

4235 I think transferring into these new schools, how many years are they going to have safeguarded with those high salaries? And how are you going to say to a teacher who has been in a small secondary school, perhaps a head of department or something like that on a scale 3 – I am using old terminology from when I was there – but someone who was on a scale 3 say. How are you going to compare them and work out what their value is compared to someone who has been teaching A-level who has been on a scale 5?

4240 You merge the two together, who is going to get the top job? Who has got the A-level experience? That is where it is going to go. Have you actually managed to talk through all these secondary school teachers who have not yet realised, perhaps, exactly how those stars are going to be merged? And that is why I am telling you. I think you have got massive situations coming along where you are going to have to do a lot of very careful negotiations, and you are going to be dealing with three, four or five different unions.

I see the Bailiff – he wants to go for his tea. (*Laughter*)

4245 **The Bailiff:** No, I was telling you to address through the Chair!

Deputy Le Pelley: Through the Chair, I beg your pardon, sir. I was just about to put out a bacon roll for you.

4250 **The Bailiff:** But I would like to go for my tea as well! (*Laughter and interjection*) I had not been thinking about it for a moment, but now you mention it, it does sound very attractive.

4255 **Deputy Le Pelley:** If I could just wind up very quickly, I would say *please* remember that your experts are the teaching force and the people at the heart of all this are your children. Please take advice, not just from that from the senior ones, who are going to be the ones who have done the desktop studies and know how they can fix this and that and the other and how their careers might be doing quite nicely, thank you. Think of the ordinary classroom teacher who is going to have to pick up the pieces and actually deal with this day in, day out.

4260 Think of the children, a young Year 7 child, and maybe a vulnerable child, walking into a school of 1,400 kids. That is big and you really need to make a very careful consideration about this.

I have told you that I think two schools, or one school on two sites is too big for Guernsey. I cannot change that view. I have said it right from the word 'go'.

4265 When we lost the debate I went to the States and said, 'Look, I am resigning.' Deputy Meerveld and Dudley-Owen resigned on the same day, and I think one or two others shortly afterwards. We said, at that time, it is something that we cannot do, our conscience does not allow it. We do not want to be dealing with such vast numbers of children on one campus. Please, we are handing it over to somebody else who wants to do it.

And the four or five of you, four plus one, bravely came forward. I have no problem with you coming forward and taking that on.

4270 But we did say at the time that we were going to keep a very close eye on you and that we were going to be very careful in scrutinising everything you did. We wanted to challenge, to interrogate everything that you did. Not because we were being nasty, but because we thought it

was an impossible task. We did not want any short corners, we did not want any lack of due diligence. We wanted people to make absolutely certain that everything that was done was above board, was correct, no short corners, no rushing to get things done to fit a timetable. It had to be the right thing, in the right order; and the right thing for Guernsey children.

I do not think it is, I cannot support it, and I will not be supporting the two-school model.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize for a reply to the debate.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

I suppose if you could choose a time not to reply to a debate that has taken 13 hours, on an issue of this importance, it would probably be 6 o'clock on a Friday evening, but that is the position.

Deputy Le Pelley, I think, has been true to what he said when he and his Committee resigned in that they would provide scrutiny and interrogation. They have done that, I think, in spades recently. But I do not think it would have been possible for our Committee to have come back to the States with any form of two-school model, to any level of detail, which would have persuaded Deputy Le Pelley and the members of the previous Committee to be supportive. I do not say that to criticise them in any way but I think Deputy Le Pelley said that philosophically he is just in a completely different place, I respect that, but the Committee has worked according to the direction set by the States last year.

I am not going to reply to every point that was made or question that was asked or we would be here until this time tomorrow. (*Interjection*) Perhaps Deputy Gollop wants to be, I do not know. (*Laughter*)

Deputy Gollop, by the way, said the policy letter was published on the last day of the school term. That is incorrect. The policy letter was published, I think, on 4th or 5th July and the school term ended three weeks later (*Interjection*) and the policy letter –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Point of correction, sir.

Deputy Fallaize: I will give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Great apologies for being pedantic, but it was two weeks later.

Deputy Fallaize: Okay, two weeks later. And the policy letter was published two months in advance of the debate. If the implication of those criticising the publication date is that nobody who is involved with education, either a parent or a student or a teacher, can possibly do anything other than be on holiday or lie on a beach during the school holidays, I do not accept that and I do not think many of them would either.

Deputy de Lisle spoke of his concerns about, as he put it, losing the Sixth Form Centre at the Grammar School and Les Varendes for three reasons, he said, a range of A-level and IB courses are offered there – he called them services to the colleges; what he meant is that they admit some students who have been previously in the grant-aided colleges and they have good results.

Well, all of those things will apply equally in the sixth form provision in the new model. They are not unique to the *status quo*. We will have the same teachers, we will have broadly-speaking the same profile of students. There is no reason to believe that results in the sixth form will decline in any way as a result of these changes. But the most important thing is that all of the students – all students – in the 11 to 16 phase will benefit from being in schools with sixth forms, and I do not think I need to rehearse all of those benefits, many of them have been raised previously over the past two days and this was debated extensively last year. But they certainly include the allocation of resources. In 11-18 schools, students in the 11 to 16 phase benefit from additional resources which are necessary for the sixth form part of the school. In a non-selective system in

4325 particular, we should try as far as possible to ensure that all students have equal opportunities. They will not all have equal outcomes but they ought to have access to equal opportunities.

Deputy de Lisle does not support the Proposition in relation to La Mare Primary because he thinks there should be a review of the Primary sector before there is any construction at Lamar Primary. But that is provided for in Proposition 4; the approval of the business case is dependent
4330 on a review of provision across the whole sector.

Deputy Green asked some questions which followed his Committee's letter of comment. He is right to say that the balance of savings is indicatively two thirds at the Guernsey Institute and one third at the 11-18 colleges. That is because of the level of expenditure at the moment in the FE sector, running across three sites very inefficiently – **(A Member: Five.)** five sites if you incorporate
4335 the Institute and the GTA. But the College of FE is particularly inefficient, through no fault of their own, running across three sites with high maintenance costs. There are some courses being provided at multiple sites, which is very expensive.

The financial model assumes some move from full-time students to apprenticeships. That is not because we are driving that, it is just consistent with what is happening across that sector of
4340 education and training. Actually, the higher education ambitions are relatively conservative, much more so than even Jersey has been able to achieve already and it is based on a relatively small number of students in the HE offer, at least in the early years.

He asked me to rehearse the case for integration of the further and higher education providers. I mean, this is not really a debate about that because the Guernsey Institute has been
4345 created on 1st July. The issue here is that if Proposition 2 is lost that organisation is going to be left in what are clearly unsatisfactory, to say the least, facilities. And in the judgement of our Committee, we just cannot allow that to persist.

Yes, the work is going on in relation to the Education Law and there will be a policy letter before the States this term. The devolution of governance work is going on in conjunction with
4350 the Education Law work; because the two obviously are effectively two sides of the same coin. But he will know that we have appointed a shadow board to the Guernsey Institute and we have in place a scheme of delegation with them, and even before the Education Law changes are enacted we will seek to delegate some additional responsibilities to the shadow board, albeit that ultimately the States will have to make decisions about devolution when the changes to the Law
4355 are presented.

He asked whether the construction projects would proceed as a package or would be procured as a package or discreetly. That is yet to be decided and that is subject to discussion at the present time. It will depend on the further dialogue we have with the construction industry, but the model and the model proceeding does not depend on one or other of those options.

4360 Yes, the cost of any additional buses is included in the transport costs which are set out in the programme business case. Deputy Dorey covered questions in relation to transport.

I think it is relevant that the previously proposed model at La Mare de Carteret included 1,200 to 1,300 students, which is very similar to the number of students there will be in the two colleges. It also included around 1,000 students at Les Varendes at the same time as there would have been
4365 another training facility at Les Ozouets. So it is true to say that, under our model, the distribution of the traffic is different but the principle, actually, of getting well over 1,000 students on to, effectively, the same site or to the same part of the Island is not that much different from what was proposed in the previous model.

It was claimed – although I did say in my opening speech that claims about staff leaving in their droves were untrue – it was repeated in the debate. Between 2016 and 2019 there has been
4370 no change in staff turnover, and I am talking about teachers.

Deputy Inder was critical of how the –

Deputy Inder: Sorry sir, point – could he –
4375

The Bailiff: Is this a point of correction or are you asking him to give way?

Deputy Inder: I am asking if he might give way.

Deputy Fallaize: I will certainly give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Could you just repeat that again: there has been no change in staff since between 2016 and – ? (*Interjections*) There has been no *turnover*? (*Interjections*) Right, okay.

Deputy Fallaize: No, there has been no change in the rate of staff turnover between 2016 and 2019. It is about 12.7% or 12.8%.

Deputy Inder was critical of how the model has been 'sold' since the debate last year. That was his word, 'sold'. But then he said, 'By gut instinct I do not think that this model is right for Guernsey. I just do not believe in it. I made promises at the election and therefore I am not going to vote for it.' So presumably however well it could have been sold between the previous debate in this debate he would not have accepted it –

Deputy Inder: Just a point of correction, sir.

What I actually said was I do not think it has been sold to the public. It would never have been sold for me. My point was how it was sold to the public. That was the criticism and the fear I still maintain.

Deputy Fallaize: Deputy Le Pelley says that an overwhelming majority of teachers favour a different model. Now, sir, this, with respect to Deputy Le Pelley, is a terrible distortion –

Deputy Le Pelley: Point of correction sir, I was referring to the traffic – I believe I said – email traffic that I had received.

Deputy Fallaize: Yes okay, well that is a completely different thing isn't it, because the number of teachers who have got in touch is but a small minority of the total number of teachers in education? And we know that people who are opposed to things have more motivation to represent their views than people who are in favour of things. We know that from other debates that we have in this Assembly.

The truth is that among parents, among Deputies and among teachers there are a range of opinions – some are very enthusiastic for this model, some are very opposed; some are on balance in favour and some on balance opposed; and quite a lot in the middle who are either indifferent or undecided about it. I think that to claim public opinion or the opinion of the professionals to your side of the argument is a distortion of the truth.

Deputy Trott asked: if all teachers continue, what will be the oversupply of teachers? Or the other way around but I think I got the point he was trying to make. The answer is there will not be an oversupply of teachers and the reason for that is because there is an increase in the school population over the period of the next few years. So if the turnover continues at its present trend there will be a need to hire more teachers because there are more students. Now, proportionately, the costs will come down if the proposals before the States today are accepted. But in terms of absolute numbers, if all the teachers continue then there will not be an oversupply.

He also asked about the cost of the extended school day. It is quite difficult to separate that from the rest of the model because, for example, there are some additional teachers required for certain provisions in the model who will also be able to staff the extended school day, and we would need them for the extended school day anyway if we did not need them for the other provision for which they are needed. So it is quite difficult to separate, but it is responsible for the lion's share of the reinvestment which we are proposing. So the model is capable of saving just north of £3 million per year; we are suggesting savings of up to £2.2 million in reality and the

lion's share of the difference is accounted for through the extension to the school day, which obviously can be explored in more detail when business cases are submitted.

He did make comments about preschool education, he knows we have slightly different views about that but I will not detain the States longer than necessary by going into that debate.

Now, Deputy Ferbrache said he was going to vote against the Propositions, or at least Proposition 1, because he continues to believe in selection at 11. Now, I entirely respect his position on selection at 11 in the same way that I know he respects mine being opposed to selection at 11. But the States have voted twice, this States and its predecessor, to remove selection at 11. He regrets that, but that is the way the States voted; and the States set a timeline for that to happen. Now, as a consequence of that, this year, this week, Year 7 students have been admitted to secondary schools on a non-selective basis, in a transition model to move specifically to two 11-18 colleges. That is the reality.

If Deputy Ferbrache had come to the States saying, 'I want to make another appeal to the States to retain or go back to selection at 11', we could have had that debate. I do not know whether he would have prevailed, but I think we would all have respected doing that. But in practical terms – and Deputy Ferbrache always tells us he wants to deal in practical matters, not just in theory – to hijack this debate today, or the vote that we will go to when I shut up and sit down, on a theoretical debate about selection at 11 which has already been settled, I submit to Deputy Ferbrache would be to do what he is always urging the States not to do and to deal in the theory rather than the practice of where we actually are.

If the States vote against the Propositions today what we are left with is not selection, it is non-selection in four schools. We will have one school, an 11-18 school, three 11-16 schools and that is the most unequal distribution of resources you could possibly imagine. We know that particularly the three 11-16 schools will be too small to provide what they need to provide – at least at Key Stage 4, at GCSE years – so much so that when that model was proposed to the States some years ago it had to involve busing GCSE students around the Island to different schools because none of the schools would have been large enough to provide the necessary curriculum breadth. But that is the system that we will be stuck in if the States vote against these Propositions without replacing them with some other Propositions for a different model.

The things I know that Deputy Ferbrache would want to see, whether it is a selective system or a non-selective system, which is adequate provision for children with communication and autism difficulties, first-class sports facilities, curriculum breadth. We will not be able to provide any of those things in the model that will exist if the States vote against these Propositions without replacing them with anything else. That is what we would be condemning our students to and anybody who tells us that they want to deal in practical terms really I think, respectfully, needs to reflect on the practical effect of casting a vote against these Propositions when no substantial amendments to them have been brought or have been successful.

Deputy Gollop, similarly. Deputy Gollop says he is going to vote against these proposals, not because he wants to return to selection, not because he wants to return to a different model previously proposed and rejected, but because he favours what he calls a 'matrix of small schools in a radical structure'. Well, with the greatest respect to Deputy Gollop, that is just absurd. That is like being a commentator on politics. Deputy Gollop is not a commentator – well, he is a commentator on politics (*Laughter*) – but he is also the Member of a Government and he has to deal with the practical effect of the way in which he votes. He knows as well as I do that no matter how long Deputy Gollop remains in the States, no matter how often he argues for it he is not going to get a matrix of small schools in a radical structure through the States. (*Laughter*)

So he is just putting up a synthetic strawman presenting it as an alternative to voting in favour of these proposals. The reality is either he votes in favour of these proposals or he votes for the consequences of these proposals losing with having absolutely nothing to replace them. I think I know that, in his heart, Deputy Gollop knows that is not in the best interests of students, teachers and our community.

4480 He was critical about the way that the sixth form space will be used in the new colleges, but I say to Deputy Gollop, and one or two others who raised this point, I do not think that lay politicians are best placed to decide exactly how sixth form students or any other students should be provided for in schools. I think it is better, as far as possible, for those decisions to be left to school-leaders and professionals.

4485 I think most of us say that we favour more devolution in the school system because we want school leaders to be empowered to run their schools. Oh but, no, we want to get ourselves deeply involved in exactly where the sixth formers should go for the time that they are not in lessons, or exactly how the catering should be done.

I will give way to Deputy Gollop.

4490

Deputy Gollop: Well, we are 'lay' in almost every topic, and we get involved. Is Deputy Fallaize suggesting, as a development of that, that maybe politicians should not be involved in evaluating the schools from a planning point of view?

4495 **Deputy Fallaize:** I do not think that is a particularly good analogy. *(Laughter)*

But the other thing is, and this has occurred to me more and more in recent weeks as I have listened to some of the criticism about the detailed provision set out in the policy letter in relation to the new schools, some Members are criticising arrangements for the new schools – I do not say this critically, it is inevitable – but they do not have a clue how the same thing is organised in the present schools.

4500

So if I said to Deputy Gollop, can you please tell me exactly how the arrangements are made in practical terms for sixth formers today? He would not be able to tell me. But yet he is critical about the way in which the policy letter suggests that sixth form arrangements will work in the future.

4505 There is a perception, I think Deputy Ferbrache talks about England – or perhaps it was not Deputy Ferbrache, but somebody did because I wrote it down so they must have – and created the perception that everything about education in England is failing and everything about education in Guernsey succeeding. Now, that is not quite true.

First of all, and I do not think that we should hold England up as some sort of ideal model for lots of reasons, but actually results in England these days are above the OECD average and have been relatively stable for some time. In Guernsey, we spend more per student than in England, we have a more advantaged cohort, we have smaller class sizes and historically our results have been inferior to those of comparable parts of England. So I think the perception that – actually I think it was Deputy Ferbrache's phrase that we were removing a system that is working well that led me to make those remarks.

4515

We need to take what works well here – and there is much that does work well – and we need to take what works well from elsewhere, and adapt it to the local context. That is what we need to capture in our new model of education. We, from the beginning, 18 months or 21 months ago, when we started on this journey, until this point; that is essentially the basis on which we proposed this model to the States and we want it to move to the next phase off the back of this policy letter. It is the model best able to capture what works well here and what works well elsewhere and adapt it to the local context.

4520

Deputy Le Pelley asked about the staff structure in the 11-18 school: I can tell him, as I think he knows, there is a single executive head teacher and principals at both of the colleges and those appointments have already been made. In relation to the rest of the staff structure; that is being developed by that senior leadership team. I mean the Committee is not going to – the Committee dare not do this after the events of recent weeks – come along and start saying, 'Well, that is how many leaders we want in this role on this site and that is how many we want on another site'. I think these decisions have to be made at professional level.

4525

I will give way to Deputy Le Pelley.

4530

Deputy Le Pelley: Thank you Deputy Fallaize.

No, my question really was that if you are going to allow two head teachers to start sorting out how their promotional points are going to be, you are actually not going to be having one school on two sites. You are actually going to have two schools.

4535

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, okay, I see the point he is making. The whole of the staffing structure will be considered as one organisation. So if there are any differences between the colleges in terms of staff structure it will be because that has been a decision made by the whole of the senior leadership team which spans both colleges. So I agree with the point he is making.

4540

The costs of any staff restructuring and dealing with legacy issues: those costs are set out in the budgets that are included in these Propositions. Of course the staff structure which emerges will require some considerable discussion and negotiation with professional bodies; that has already started and there are well-established processes through which that happens. I think in the main the Committee and its officers who are involved in HR have a good working relationship with the professional bodies and we are confident that through dialogue and discussion we will be able to get to the necessary decisions that need to be made about the staff structure.

4545

Deputy Smithies raised some good questions about sixth form provision. IB will be available to all students even if it is provided for only in one college. Now, we are not asking the States to agree to that today, so it can be adapted in the future by the Committee or by the school leadership team. But at the moment there are only about 20 or 25 students doing the IB and so to run it on both sites, as I am sure Deputy Smithies will appreciate, would not be very cost-effective. If the numbers go up – and they may well go up – then it will become cost-effective to run it on both sites. But I said when I opened debate that we would have at least the same breadth of provision in the sixth form as we have now – that is true; and that would require round about one in 10 students to move site either occasionally or permanently – and that includes those who would wish to take advantage of IB studies.

4550

4555

The other question he raised, which was very useful, was that he wanted me to confirm no pressure would be applied to teachers to lead the enrichment activities. I can confirm that is the case. In any event, the exact shape of enrichment and the extension of the school day still require negotiation and discussion with professional bodies. But what we do know is that the proposed enrichment model can be staffed by the teachers who have already indicated that they would be prepared to do it without having to go to the teachers who would rather not do it. So there is not going to be any pressure applied to them.

4560

I can confirm what Deputy Tindall said about the usefulness and value of the Youth Shadow Committee and the relationship between the planning application and the traffic impact assessment.

4565

Now, to go back to enrichment, Deputy Lowe was concerned about the enrichment model because she actually said that she thought the enrichment model was basically babysitting. I will come back to that in a moment. But she raised concerns about students, children who are already doing after-school activities but outside of school – in clubs outside of school. But the proposal to have an extended school day until around four o'clock is on three days a week, so there would still be two other days per week. And what are the students doing who go to the colleges at the moment? Do none of them take part in clubs outside of school and after school? Because they do not finish until quarter to four. (**Deputy Merrett:** Four.) Four? Okay, Deputy Merrett says four o'clock, I apologise.

4570

4575

So do we assume that 30% of all the secondary school students in Guernsey at the moment are denied access to afterschool clubs which take place outside of school? Well, clearly they are not – they are not having a dreadful experience, I should not think, denied access to activities after school. We are just proposing a replica of that. The Grammar School already finishes half an hour or so later than the high schools. So I doubt that those students at the Grammar School are all denied access to the kinds of sports clubs and other clubs which Deputy Lowe spoke about.

4580

Now, I think, respectfully, calling it babysitting was really quite derogatory. The issue here is that, yes, okay, some children do have access to afterschool activities because their parents will ferry them around here, there and everywhere – the parents may be able to do that. But there are a lot of children for whom that is not the case. They are reliant on school transport, for example, and the buses leave at three o'clock. So they do not have access to that sort of enrichment activity. That is just not reasonable. We make no apologies for being committed to equality of opportunity and enrichment. Extending the school day and offering those extra-curricular opportunities to all students is a key part of equality of opportunity.

I will give way to Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, Deputy Fallaize.

I just want to clarify it was an expression that had been said to *me*, which is what I said in my speech.

Deputy Fallaize: Okay. Well I accept that, but I think whoever said it to Deputy Lowe was not describing it accurately. But I accept what she says.

She praised La Mare de Carteret High School, rightly, and she spoke about the exceptional leadership of Mrs Godley. But of course Mrs Godley has been appointed as one of the principals of the 11-18 colleges and there is no reason to believe that she will not be able to bring to that college the excellent leadership that she has brought to the La Mare de Carteret.

Deputy Lowe is concerned about the proximity of the Prison to the college at St Sampson's. I can assure her that her prisoners will have no trouble from our students. (*Laughter*) And, as I said, the boundary of the school is not changing. The extensions – and Members who have looked at the floor plans will know this – at that site are not even going as far as the start of the multi-use games area. So there is no effect in relation to the Prison.

Deputy St Pier wanted me to qualify that the development at the La Mare de Carteret Primary School will be subject to the review of primary school provision across the Island. It will be, and that is of course as a result of my Committee successfully defeating his amendment, because his amendment tried to restrict the review only to the terms of the 2013 resolution, which was the southwest of the Island and the Catholic schools. But thankfully the States had the sense to reject his amendment and so there is going to be an Islandwide review of provision.

Delegated authority: now, Deputy Kuttelwascher spoke about delegated authority and I think there is a slight misconception here, because the delegated authority is not actually replacing the authority or the approvals of the States. Typically, in the past, if we had the old way of approving capital projects, this is the kind of policy letter that would have come to the States asking for States' approval for the expenditure. And probably there would not have been that kind of business case that we have submitted because that just did not happen until relatively recently but some of the details in the business case might have been incorporated in the policy.

But essentially, less information would have come before the States ... When he first joined the States – he and I were elected to the States at the same time – in our first term, probably well into the second term, if we had capital projects before the States they would have had no more detail, probably less detail, than is before the States today in the policy letter and the business case combined, and the States would at that point have been asked to provide all of their approvals for the capital expenditure.

It would not have gone to the Treasury and Resources Department subsequently, or the Policy Council, and it would not have come back to the States, as all of the necessary approvals would have been provided. So I would ask Deputy Kuttelwascher to see the delegated authority in those terms. The States are not losing any of their previous authority, it is just that there is now another layer of scrutiny and oversight and approvals through the Policy and Resources Committee.

Deputy Dudley Owen returned us to the issue of sixth form provision. The reason it is not possible – I think Deputy Dudley Owen believes that we are trying to conceal things by not saying to her, 'This is the cost of the sixth form provision in the 11-18 college and this is the cost of the

11-16 provision'. But we would not be able to do that if she asked us to do that in relation to the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre today, because the two parts of the provision are so closely interlinked and interconnected that once you are running them as one organisation it is just not possible to disaggregate them in the way that Deputy Dudley Owen has requested.

There has been very extensive modelling done of what can be offered on the two college sites at sixth form. There will be a mix of academic and vocational courses through the IB careers programme that we will offer. There is no suggestion of introducing selection at 16. Post-16 is post-compulsory education and there are entry criteria to get into post-compulsory education, whether it is a sixth form or a university, etc. There is not going to be any change in relation to that.

I think (**A Member:** That is it.) I have probably dealt with Deputy Dudley Owen's questions to the greatest extent I can, although I respect that I am not going to be able to do it satisfactorily. If I have not, I am happy to give way to Deputy Dudley Owen.

Deputy Meerveld: I was enormously grateful to Deputy Meerveld for not spending ages and ages taking us through his 'land per student' analysis. He did refer to it and told us that it was the basis of one of his criticisms of the model, but I am very grateful that he did not run through all of it because he saved me the undoubtedly laborious and lengthy task of having to correct it.

Now, okay, Deputy Meerveld made a point and he said that he could not be criticised for not bringing alternative proposals to the States despite being so opposed to these proposals. I do not think that is quite right, because he says, 'Well, look, the policy letter was only published a couple of months ago and how could there possibly have been time?'

But Deputy Meerveld was a Member of the previous Committee. He must know the old three-school model like the back of his hand and he could have, if he wanted to, bring that back to the States and say, 'Look' – I will give way in a moment.

He could have said at this stage – he has got to sit down now, sir, because only one person is allowed to stand at any one time, but I promise I will give way to him in a minute. He could have come to the States and laid an amendment saying, 'Look, you have now got more detail about the so-called two-school model and I want to ask the States to support the old three-school model again'. He could have done that. He knows all the details of that model; he did not need to rely on information from my Committee or officers in the States to do that. He could have done it. He has chosen not to do it.

So I respect his right not to do it, but I do think it is fair for him to say that others should not criticise his appeal to the States to chuck out these Propositions without having anything else on the table.

But I will give way.

Deputy Meerveld: I thank Deputy Fallaize for giving way.

Deputy Fallaize is making an assumption that I would come back with an identical three-school model – a model that has been rejected by the Assembly. There are changes I would have made to that model. That model was a consensus plan developed by a previous Committee and to come up with a comprehensive response to the two-school model analysed in the way that the previous two-school modellers have had an opportunity to was impossible with the information available and the fact that some of the information I requested has still not been supplied.

Therefore it was not possible – in the time and with the information available – to come up with a proper comparison and breakdown of various potential models to be able come back to the States with a comprehensive proposal for an alternative.

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Fallaize: I do not accept that, but Deputy Meerveld has done this a few times. I remember not too long after he was elected to the Committee he published his blueprint for education which I think – I am not going to describe it because I will inevitably get some of the details wrong and he will jump up and tell me that – but it was a blueprint for education. Then he

was behind the Committee's proposals. Now he says that there might be a different model that he has in mind.

Well, with the greatest to Deputy Meerveld, we cannot prolong this debate about the future of our education model simply to indulge the journey which he seems to be going on through one model of education, then another model of education, then a different model of education.

A Member: A matrix of small schools. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Fallaize: He has had ample opportunity over multiple debates and many years to put his ideas before the States and I do not think it is legitimate for him – or I do not think it is wise at least – to ask the States to throw out these proposals knowing that there is nothing else credible on the table.

Deputy Merrett wants the Committee to propose rescinding the 2013 Resolution about primary schools and I think now that ... Well, if the States vote in favour of Proposition 4 there will be a new resolution in relation to that review. And I think in the list of resolutions to rescind, I am sure we can include the 2013 one.

Deputy Merrett wants to know what will happen from September 2020 if the proposals are lost. Honestly, I have no idea. But I will come back to that, I am nearly finished and I want to make that point as the last point. She talked about the role that Scrutiny could play as the process develops.

Oh, I will give way to Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Thank you.

I have been trying to find the opportune moment – *(Interjection)* No, no, because I absolutely do not in any way, shape or form wish to rain on your parade.

However, in your closing remarks in addressing that issue raised by Deputy Merrett, could you also confirm that whilst you and your Committee have tried very hard to create as much certainty around this process as possible, and you are to be lauded for that, the pragmatic way of communicating with our community is to manage expectations, as I and others have said earlier. And that none of us can be certain that spades will be on the ground in June, despite everyone's best endeavours, because there are a number of hoops which we cannot at this stage determine with sufficient accuracy.

So it is a 'best endeavours basis' and therefore when you address what might happen after June if the construction process has not started, in addressing Deputy Merrett's question, it is also appropriate for you to make the point that the same outcome could occur, through no fault of any individual group within this Assembly.

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, what Deputy Trott says is correct, and I will, since he makes that point, include that in the few words I want to say at the end of this speech. But there is actually a material difference, I think, between the level of uncertainty there would be if the Propositions were lost and the level uncertainty there would be if the Propositions are approved. I think he accepts that. But nevertheless the point he makes about levels of certainty is correct.

In relation to Scrutiny's involvement, my Committee is very happy to participate in any public hearing. In fact we wanted a public hearing. I wrote to Deputy Green when the policy letter was published and said, 'Look why don't you have a public hearing on this? I know you do not normally do that around policy letters, but it is big issue and there is lots of public and political interest. It might assist your Committee to grill us, as it were, in a public hearing'. And actually I thought the Scrutiny and Management Committee was going to do that.

Now, in the end, they decided to pursue their interest in the matter through a letter of comment, but if they want to revisit public hearings in the future, they will find my Committee very willing to do that. And in fact there is a programme board, as you would expect, to carry forward all of the projects in this programme. If Deputy Green wants any member of his

Committee to sit in some capacity on that programme board as an additional level of oversight then they are very willing – and Deputy Merrett appears to be extremely excited at that suggestion! *(Laughter)* It is not going to be Deputy Merrett, alright. *(Laughter)* No, no, I am only joking. We are very willing to discuss that with them and do that.

Deputy Merrett talked about the burden on the construction industry. It is not an unfair point but the capital programme proposed is phased over a number of years. She asked, what is the problem with having three 11-18 schools? Well, the problem is we just do not have enough students, particularly at the sixth form level.

So the basis of our model all along has been that we need 11-18 schools and we need larger year groups. That is what will help us to provide more opportunities in a non-selective model; more resilient staff teams; a greater range of curriculum opportunities and extra-curricular activities. Having two colleges simply is the right number which falls out of those policy principles that we started with.

Now, I personally still think that a majority of States Members believe that if we are going to have a non-selective system it should be on the basis of having 11-18 schools and larger year groups. I accept Deputy Ferbrache's absolute principled, strong support for selection, whether it is through the 11-plus or any other form. But Deputy Ferbrache must have given some consideration to what might happen if there is no selection, and I believe he and many other Members of the States – a majority – would still say, 'If we are going to have to have non-selective schools, I still think we should have 11-18 schools and I think we should have larger year groups because I know that provides the greatest possible benefits at the lowest cost'.

That is the non-selective option available to the States today. The alternative is the non-selective option which costs more and provides fewer educational benefits.

I would like to give Deputy de Sausmarez the assurance that she sought, but I am afraid I cannot remember what it was that she wanted me to provide assurances about. But I am happy to give way.

Deputy de Sausmarez: It was just around supporting teachers in order for them support students.

Deputy Fallaize: Oh yes, I enthusiastically provide that reassurance.

So, where are we? *(Laughter)* We are going to go to the vote very soon – before seven o'clock.

We have had multiple debates in this term, we know, about education. We have had policy decisions made twice to remove selection at 11. The non-selective system has started; we have this Year 7 group that has started secondary school this week in a non-selective transition model towards two 11-18 colleges. In this debate – we have been debating this for two full days, more than normal full days in the States. We had the Sursis from Deputy Dudley Owen, whichever way you look at it, either to defer consideration of these matters and/or revisit other models – or at least provide the space in which some Members of the present or a future States may have decided to revisit other models. And that Sursis was defeated by a two-to-one majority, the same two-to-one majority which approved this model last year.

So that is where we are. And I implore Members, and this is really an appeal – I know this is the kind of thing that does not persuade the electorate in any way, they do not need to concern themselves with these sorts of things – but this is an appeal to the Members of this Assembly who are not a debating society, but a Government. **(Several Deputies:** Hear, hear.)

And today I could conceive, at the start of the debate, of the States saying, 'We have had another look at this model. We do not like it. We want a different model'. But I really cannot conceive of the States saying, 'We have been on this journey for years, we have made these policy decisions, we have removed selection at 11 – not just agreed to remove it, but actually removed it and we now have a non-selective cohort in Year 7. We have made a decision to have one school in two 11-18 colleges, 18 months ago. We have sent this Committee away to get on and develop that and introduce that. We have sent students into Year 7, in a transition model that can only

4790 work if we are going to move to two 11-18 colleges; and now potentially with absolutely nothing else on the table, we are going to chuck it out'. Surely, we cannot do that as a Government.

We are not a debating society where Members can simply get up and express their point of view, as if their point of view has no consequential effect on our population, on students and teachers and others. We are a Government and we are going to leave here today – I will give way
4795 in a moment – either having approved the proposals before the States, or having absolutely no idea whatsoever what the future holds for secondary and further education, other than we will be stuck in a four-school non-selective model which actually is the least favoured model of the vast majority of Members of this Assembly.

That is where we will be as a Government if these proposals are lost.
4800 I will give way to Deputy Paint.

The Bailiff: Your microphone.

Deputy Paint: It is just a point that Deputy Fallaize said. He said they cannot do it now, but it
4805 was done a few years ago, where the States agreed to have an incinerator and a year later they chucked it out, and that cost £15 million. (*Interjections*)

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, I do not think that that analogy holds. And incidentally I do not want to offend Deputy Paint or any other Member. I am not saying the States cannot chuck it out. Of
4810 course they can. The States have the right and the powers to vote against these proposals if they so wish and those of us who would be deeply upset about that would just have to accept it and live with it. I am saying I think it would be an incredibly unwise thing to do, partly because it is the right model, but partly because there is nothing else credible on the table.

So I said yesterday that my Committee – and I do not think most States Members would
4815 contest this – believes that the reforms which are now happening in education must have three underlying objectives: the highest possible standards of education; equality of opportunity for students; and making the most efficient use of the limited resources which the States are prepared to invest in education.

The model we will be stuck in if these proposals lose is the worst possible model on all three
4820 grounds. It will provide enormous inequality of opportunity; it is the most expensive to run; it will not be any cheaper in terms of capital costs; and the aspirations we have for raising standards of education for students of all abilities will be lost.

On the other hand, I accept for some Members that the model that is before the States is not their preferred model. It is not a perfect model, but I do not think perfection should be the enemy
4825 of the good. And the choice between the States today is a practical choice. It is not a theoretical choice, it is a practical choice. And this model that is before the States and which can be put into effect by voting for Propositions 1 to 7 is, of the credible options available to the States – or likely to be available to the States in the foreseeable future – clearly the model best able to deliver on the objectives of high educational standards, equality of opportunity and efficient use of
4830 resources. And I implore the Members who voted in favour of this model 18 months ago to vote in favour of this model today.

Oh, I was sort of getting into that. (*Laughter*) I will give way to Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, Deputy Fallaize, I have asked a couple of questions he has not
4835 answered and it sounds like he is not going to answer them. I wonder if he is able to answer them. Shall I put them again to him, sir?

The Bailiff: I think he said in his speech that he would not be able to answer every question that has been asked of him. It is a matter for him whether he wishes to or not. If you sit down he
4840 can have the chance to reply to you. (*Laughter*) But only one Member can stand at once, so he is not going to stand while you are standing.

Deputy Fallaize: Right, hold on. Oh right, okay, I will answer these two questions. He has completely ruined the elegance of my conclusion (*Interjection and laughter*) but nevertheless I will answer them anyway.

4845 He said, 'Have there been any discussions with transport companies about whether they would be able to provide transport if the school holidays were shortened?' The answer to that question is 'No', because the Committee has no plans to shorten the school holidays.

I know that Deputy Lester Queripel disagrees with that position, but the Committee does not have any plans to do that. School terms are set at Committee level, so I suppose the States could
4850 direct the Committee to shorten school holidays if they wished, but it is not something the Committee is going to do his own volition and it is not a proposal the Committee is going to put to the States.

I am afraid he is going to have to remind me of his second question.

4855 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** It was in relation to retention of teachers who do not believe in the one-school two-site model. I was wondering, will it not be a problem retaining those teachers; and, if it does appear to be a problem, what will the Committee be doing to at least attempt to retain those teachers who do not believe in the model?

4860 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, I think that is a fair point. But remember that we have just come out of a model which the overwhelming majority of teachers for a long time have said they did not favour – the selective model. But they continued to work in it. And it may be that that model discouraged some people from coming to the Island – it is pointless speculating about that, we will never know – but clearly there were a lot of teachers working in that model diligently and
4865 professionally, doing their best for their students, who would have preferred a different model.

The same is true at the moment while we are in this sort of temporary transition model and I am sure the same will be true of the new model. But at the moment we are not seeing any spike in staff turnover. It is very consistent over the last three, four, five years, as I referred to.

I hope Deputy Queripel is happy with that, but the practical reality of voting against these
4870 proposals is to be stuck in the worst possible model. We will not be able to deliver the educational benefits, it will be the most expensive and there is nothing else that is credible on the table.

So I urge Members to vote in favour of all these propositions, as amended, and to – oh, I was going to say 'to bring some certainty'. Now, the position is, to pick up Deputy Trott's point, if these Propositions lose, there will be the very opposite of certainty, there will be complete
4875 uncertainty none of us will be able to leave –

A Member: You have said that.

Deputy Fallaize: I know I have said that, but I am answering the question which Deputy Trott
4880 has specifically asked me to answer before I sit down – and Deputy Merrett, right, okay? Deputy Merrett asked the question originally and then Deputy Trott asked the question subsequently, right. (*Interjections and laughter*)

So, there will be absolutely no certainty whatsoever. We will leave here with no idea of where secondary education is going.

4885 If the Propositions are successful it will be clear that having, 18 months ago, voted in favour of the model of one school in two 11-18 colleges, today the States would have provided all of the approvals necessary for the capital investment and then we would be in what is now the normal process of submitting business cases to the Policy and Resources Committee, going through planning applications and those hurdles would have to be overcome before the construction
4890 started.

But even if there was a delay to the timetable, it would be a delay to the timetable. Whereas if the Propositions are lost, the whole plan, obviously, will have collapsed, and so the magnitude of uncertainty is *much* greater if the Propositions are lost, notwithstanding that – because nothing is

ever certain in life, particularly when you are undertaking large capital programmes – the element of uncertainty and the hurdles to overcome, which Deputy Trott outlined, exist even if the Propositions are carried.

So I hope that that has made the position clear and I ask Members to support all of the Propositions. (*Interjection*)

The Bailiff: He has sat down now.

Deputy Inder: Before we go to the vote, I have got a question I have got to ask you, sir –

The Bailiff: You want to ask me, yes? What do you want to ask me?

Deputy Inder: It may be the Comptroller actually. It is just reminded me, something Deputy Trott said and it is something that has always –

The Bailiff: Is this reopening the debate, Deputy?

Deputy Inder: No, it has got nothing to do this debate is about –

The Bailiff: Well, if it is nothing to do with the debate we can go straight to the vote.

Deputy Inder: Sorry, maybe it is a point of order then, sir, I beg your pardon.

The Bailiff: Well, if it is a point of order then you can ask me a point of order.

Deputy Inder: We have got a new Member of the DPA. Deputy Trott has mentioned the role and importance of it through this – which is likely to be a successful vote for Deputy Fallaize and his team, in the delivery of the Educational Transformation Programme.

Now, what we have seen before, in this quasi-judicial role, is sometimes – I would like to see clarification from the Comptroller the split of the Deputy role and the Committee role. What I would not like to see –

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall addressed this in her speech and she said that the Authority had been given advice that they may speak because there is no live planning application.

Deputy Inder: I am just asking, just in the future, if there are likely to be planning applications, so for the *Hansard* record, is it the case that if a Deputy votes ... Is there a split between their role as a Deputy and their Committee role on the DPA?

The Bailiff: As far as this vote is concerned, Deputy Tindall has told the Assembly that the Authority has been advised that because there are no extant planning applications the Members of the Authority are free to vote in this.

If you have a question you want to ask about the powers of the Authority, then that can be tabled on another occasion.

Deputy Tindall: Can I just observe that Deputy Inder was not in the Chamber when I said that, so –

The Bailiff: Well, that is unfortunate. I have had to be in the Chamber throughout the debate and I rather assume that other people, if they are not here, are listening to the debate.

Can I just explain why Deputy Oliver is not here and the advice I had to give Deputy Oliver? Deputy Oliver has had to go home because she has got young children waiting to be fed. She did

ask me if she could appoint a proxy to vote on her behalf. I had to say no because I am bound by the rules and Rule 26(2) says:

A Member may vote only from his or her seat in the States' Chamber.

Now I know that SACC have been asked – or I believe SACC had been asked, or are going to be asked to review that Rule. Until they do, that Rule is binding on me, it is binding on Members and therefore I have to say to Deputy Oliver that no proxy could be appointed and that is why, reluctantly, she had to go home. She stayed as long as she could but she had to go. So I thought I would just explain that it is my fault, not hers, that she said go because I had to remind her of what the Rules say.

So we will vote. We have had a request to take the Propositions separately, so we will vote first on Proposition 1 which, for the benefit of anyone listening, is concerned with the capital costs of the policy of organising secondary education in one 11-18 school operating in two colleges.

And may I have a recorded vote on Proposition 1, as amended?

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 22, Contre 15, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	Deputy Paint	None	Deputy Oliver
Deputy Green	Deputy Brouard		Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Dorey	Deputy Dudley-Owen		Deputy Mooney
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Yerby	Deputy Prow		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Ferbrache		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Kuttelwascher		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Gollop		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy Leadbeater		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy Tindall	Deputy Meerveld		
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Inder		
Deputy Tooley	Deputy Lowe		
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Smithies			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			

The Bailiff: The voting on Proposition 1 was 22 in favour with 15 against. I declare it carried.

And we move on to Proposition 2, which is concerned with the capital costs of the policy of organising further and higher education in purpose-built facilities on a single site. Proposition 2.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	Deputy Paint	None	Deputy Oliver
Deputy Green	Deputy Dudley-Owen		Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Dorey	Deputy Prow		Deputy Mooney
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Kuttelwascher		
Deputy Brouard			

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

The Bailiff: Well, the voting on Proposition 2 was 33 in favour with four against. I declare it carried. And that brings us to Proposition 3, the delegated authority to Policy and Resources Committee.

4965 Proposition 3.

There was a recorded vote

Carried – Pour 25, Contre 12, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	Deputy Paint	None	Deputy Oliver
Deputy Green	Deputy Dudley-Owen		Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Dorey	Deputy de Lisle		Deputy Mooney
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Prow		
Deputy Brouard	Deputy Kuttelwascher		
Deputy Yerby	Deputy Gollop		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Leadbeater		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Meerveld		
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy Lowe		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Tindall			
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Smithies			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			

The Bailiff: The voting on Proposition 3 is 25 in favour, 12 against, I declare it carried. We move on to Proposition 4, concerned with the capital costs of redeveloping La Mare de Carteret Primary School.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Yerby
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Merrett
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

CONTRE

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy de Lisle

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Prow
Deputy Laurie Queripel

ABSENT

Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Mooney

The Bailiff: And the voting on Proposition 4 is 33 in favour, with 2 against and 2 abstentions. I declare Proposition 4 carried.

4970

Next, Proposition 5, concerned with the Digital Road Map.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 30, Contre 7, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Yerby
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey

CONTRE

Deputy Paint
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Prow
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies

NE VOTE PAS

ABSENT

Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Mooney

Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Merrett
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

The Bailiff: And the voting on Proposition 5 was 30 in favour with 7 against. I declare it carried.

Deputy Laurie Queripel?

4975

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I just want to point out; I think there is a mistake in 6a, a grammatical error. If you go down to one, two, three, four, five – the sixth line, or go from the fifth line actually, ‘and to agree that the Committee will work *for* the Committee for Health and Social Care and the States’; I think that should be ‘with’ or ‘and’, one of the two, sir. I do not think anybody can work for anybody else. *(Laughter)* I just want people to be mindful of the fact that there is a mistake in there. I do not know if it has any relevance or ramifications at all but –

4980

Deputy Fallaize: I noticed this mistake as soon as we submitted the policy letter, and we got in touch with the Bailiff’s Office and asked if we could deal with it just by corrigendum but we could not. We would have had to have laid an amendment and I was hoping that no one would notice. *(Laughter and interjections)*

4985

So the Proposition is not really to work *for* Deputy Soulsby’s Committee, even if she would like to do that at times. So can we just kind of change it – ?

4990

The Bailiff: Can we just take that as amended? Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: So we take 6a), with the word ‘with’, rather than ‘for’ in the fifth line.

Now, Deputy Prow has notified me he no longer wishes to call for a separate vote on 6a) and 6b), so we will take Proposition 6, that is 6a) and 6b) together. *(Interjections)* Do we need ... ? Can we go *aux voix*?

4995

Several Members: Yes.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I did ask for a recorded vote on them all, please.

5000

The Bailiff: We will go with a recorded vote on Propositions 6, that is 6a) and 6b), which is concerned with the Delancey Campus.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 3, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 3

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

5005 **The Bailiff:** And the voting on Proposition 6 was 33 in favour with 3 against and 1 abstention. I declare that Proposition carried. And that brings us to Proposition 7, concerned with special education needs and disabilities and inclusion.
 Proposition 7.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 37, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	None	None	Deputy Oliver
Deputy Green			Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Paint			Deputy Mooney
Deputy Dorey			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Yerby			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy Langlois			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Roffey			

Deputy Prow
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Merrett
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

The Bailiff: Well, while the Greffier counts those votes and just confirms that is unanimous, can we quickly deal with the schedule of future business?

I confirm the voting on Proposition 7 was unanimous with 37 in favour and none against.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

XII. Schedule for future States' business – Approved

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for future States' business, which sets out items for consideration at the Meeting of the 25th September 2019 and subsequent States' Meetings, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.

5010 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I lay the Schedule only to note that of course the business which is unfinished from this meeting will need to be inserted immediately before the substantive business for the meeting, sir.

5015

The Bailiff: So I put that to the vote. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare that carried.

And that brings this meeting to a close, save that I am sure you would wish me to pass on behalf of all of you to Deputy Yerby our best wishes and congratulations on her forthcoming wedding. *(Applause)*

5020

And just one more, Deputy Lowe would like to sing *Happy Birthday* to Deputy Gollop. *(Laughter and interjections)* Happy Birthday! Perhaps she will buy you a drink in the Prince of Wales instead!

That concludes the business, please close the meeting.

The Assembly adjourned at 19.25 p.m.