



VIII
2020

BILLET D'ÉTAT

WEDNESDAY, 18th MARCH 2020

THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING

1. Policy & Resources Committee – Election of Ordinary Members of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission, P.2020/45
2. Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture – Review of the Structure of Secondary & Further Education: Next Steps, P.2020/51

BILLET D'ÉTAT

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE STATES OF THE ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

I hereby give notice, pursuant to the provisions of Rule 2(4) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees, that at the Meeting of the States of Deliberation to be held at **THE ROYAL COURT HOUSE**, on **WEDNESDAY**, the **18th March, 2020** the items listed in this Billet d'État are submitted for debate.

R. J. COLLAS
Bailiff and Presiding Officer

The Royal Court House
Guernsey

12th March, 2020

THE STATES OF DELIBERATION
of the
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

**ELECTION OF ORDINARY MEMBERS OF THE GUERNSEY FINANCIAL SERVICES
COMMISSION**

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter dated 2nd March, 2020, of the Policy & Resources Committee, they are of the opinion:-

1. To appoint John Aspden as an ordinary member of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission for a three year term with effect from 3 April 2020.
2. To appoint Philip Middleton as an ordinary member of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission for a three year term with effect from 3 April 2020.

The above Propositions have been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications in accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

THE STATES OF DELIBERATION
of the
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

ELECTION OF ORDINARY MEMBERS OF THE GUERNSEY FINANCIAL SERVICES
COMMISSION

The Presiding Officer
States of Guernsey
Royal Court House
St Peter Port

2nd March, 2020

Dear Sir

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The terms of office for John Aspden and Philip Middleton as Commissioners of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission (GFSC) conclude on 2nd April 2020.
- 1.2 In order to ensure continuity of experience, this report proposes the election of John Aspden and Philip Middleton as ordinary members of the GFSC for a three year term with effect from 3rd April 2020.

2 Report

John Aspden

- 2.1 John Aspden is a senior finance professional with significant experience in investment and banking supervision in both the public and private sectors. His biography is attached to this policy letter as Appendix I.
- 2.2 From 1998 to 2015, Mr Aspden was Chief Executive of the Financial Supervision Commission in the Isle of Man, where he was responsible for the regulation and supervision of all banking, securities and funds, trusts and companies, and money transmission activities.
- 2.3 Prior to taking up his role at the Financial Supervision Commission in the Isle of Man, Mr. Aspden held roles in the private sector including Managing Director

of Matheson InvestNet Ltd, at the time Hong Kong 's largest independent distributor of, and adviser on, collective investments for retail investors.

- 2.4 Mr. Aspden has also held the role of Deputy General Manager of the International Bank of Asia Ltd and has worked in banking supervision at the Bank of England and at the Office of the Commissioner of Banking in Hong Kong, now HKMA. He is also Chairman of the Group of International Finance Centre Supervisors.
- 2.5 Mr Aspden has been a Commissioner of the GFSC since April 2017, and has made important contributions to the work of the GFSC in that time.

Philip Middleton

- 2.6 Philip Middleton is a senior financial services strategist with significant recent experience in advising government, central banks and financial institutions on crisis related issues. His biography is attached to this policy letter as Appendix II.
- 2.7 Since 2014, Mr Middleton has carried out consulting and advisory work in central banking and financial services through Rifle House Capital Ltd. He is also Deputy Chairman of the Board of the Official Monetary and Financial Institutions Forum, a leading Central Banking think tank.
- 2.8 Mr Middleton has had significant experience in the private sector, holding various roles within KPMG LLP, including Partner and European Head of Financial Services Strategy, and within Ernst & Young LLP, including Partner and Head of Central Banking, EMEA.
- 2.9 Mr Middleton has been a Commissioner of the GFSC since April 2017, and has made important contributions to the work of the GFSC in that time.

3 Conclusion

- 3.1 The Financial Services Commission (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law, 1987, specifies that ordinary members of the Commission should “be persons having knowledge, qualifications or experience appropriate to the development and supervision of finance business in the Bailiwick”.
- 3.2 Based on their significant professional experience, and their contributions thus far to the work of the GFSC, the Policy & Resources Committee is of the opinion that Messrs John Aspden and Philip Middleton meet the criteria of the Law and is pleased to nominate them for reappointment as ordinary members of the GFSC.

4 Recommendation

4.1 The States are asked to decide whether they are of the opinion:-

- (a) to appoint Mr John Aspden as an ordinary member of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission for a three year term with effect from 3 April 2020.
- (b) to appoint Mr Philip Middleton as an ordinary member of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission for a three year term with effect from 3 April 2020.

5 Compliance with Rule 4

- 5.1 In accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees, the propositions have been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications. She has advised that there is no reason in law why the Propositions should not to be put into effect.
- 5.2 In accordance with Rule 4(4), it is confirmed that the propositions accompanying this policy letter are supported unanimously by the Policy & Resources Committee. In accordance with Rule 4(5), the propositions relate to the power of the Committee to nominate persons for election by the States as members of the Commission under paragraph 1(2) of Schedule 1 to the Financial Services Commission (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law, 1987.

Yours faithfully

G A St Pier
President

L S Trott
Vice-President

A H Brouard
J P Le Tocq
T J Stephens

BIOGRAPHY FOR JOHN ASPDEN

John Aspden became Chairman of the Group of International Finance Centre Supervisors (GIFCS) in November 2011, a position which he still holds. In April 2017 he was appointed to the Board of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission.

John was Chief Executive and Commissioner of the Isle of Man Financial Supervision Commission (FSC) from 1998 to 2015. The FSC was responsible for the supervision of all banking, securities, funds, trust and company service provider (TCSP) and money transmission services, as well as the implementation of AMLICFT across all sectors. John was at the Commission during an expanding period for the finance sector, which in particular saw a number of positive assessments of the Island's regulatory regime (including by the FATF and IMF). Latterly he played an important role in the merger of the FSC with the insurance and pensions regulator, to form the new 10M Financial Services Authority.

John came to the Isle of Man from Hong Kong, where he worked for nearly 11 years. He was seconded there by the Bank of England in 1988 as an adviser to the Hong Kong Banking Commission (which subsequently became part of the Hong Kong Monetary Authority). After four years he joined International Bank of Asia Ltd as Deputy General Manager responsible for the bank's retail banking, securities and general insurance operations. In 1996 he joined the Jardine Matheson group as Managing Director of Matheson InvestNet Ltd - then Hong Kong's largest independent distributor of collective investment schemes for retail investors.

Prior to Hong Kong John worked for fifteen years at the Bank of England in a number of market supervisory positions. During this period he was seconded for three years to the Council for the Securities Industry which was established in the late 1970s as an oversight-body for the supervision of UK securities and investment intermediaries.

John has participated in IMF FSAP missions to other countries, and has provided technical assistance to regulatory bodies under a number of IMF, Toronto Centre, US Department of Justice and World Bank programmes. He has recently participated in programmes organised by the World Bank to assist in the recovery of assets for conflict countries.

John was appointed MBE in January 2016 for his work in financial services supervision.

BIOGRAPHY FOR PHILIP MIDDLETON

PROFILE

- A senior financial services strategist with significant recent experience in advising governments, central banks and financial institutions on crisis related issues
- A founder and developer of consultancy and professional services businesses
- An active member of three leading think tanks

CAREER HISTORY

RIFLE HOUSE CAPITAL LTD

2014 to date: Consulting and Advisory work in central banking and financial services

ERNST & YOUNG LLP

2002-2014

2008 – 2014: Partner, Head of Central Banking, EMEA

Member of European leadership Team of Ernst & Young financial services organisation. Founded and led team responsible for provision of services to governments and central banks. Created £30m business delivering advisory, audit and technical services to target clients including bailout, restructuring, and financial analysis. Developed thought leadership activities including the publication of three books and staging of seminars. General management responsibilities as part of leadership team

2006-2008: Senior Client Partner

Responsible for the overall management and relationships of the firm's services to two major banking clients, one a global bank and one a major UK bank. Combined fee revenues of £30 million

2002-2006: Partner, Head of UK Retail Banking

Joined Ernst & Young as a Partner with a brief to establish a UK Retail Banking Advisory business from scratch. Recruited and built a team, developed product and service propositions, created business development and research programmes and materials, worked closely with clients, leading to the establishment of a £60m business. Selected and developed a successor. General management responsibilities as member of UK leadership team

KPMG LLP

1991-2001

1999-2001: Partner, European Head of Financial Services Strategy

Established and developed a £30m strategy business based in the UK and operating Europe wide.

1996-1999: Partner, Head of Retail Banking UK

Lead, developed and grew the retail banking advisory business in the UK

1994-1996: Client Services Partner

Responsible for the delivery of advisory services to two of the firm's major global clients

1991-1994: Managing Consultant/Director, Financial Services Consultancy Practice

Strategy consultant with progressively senior roles on a range of assignments for international financial institutions

A.T. KEARNEY

1987-1990: Principal Consultant in specialist financial services consultancy

ARTHUR D LITTLE

1982-1987: Executive and Managing Consultant

ICC BUSINESS RATIOS LTD (business and marketing intelligence publishers)

1979-1981: Financial analyst and Marketing Manager

EDUCATION

1981-1982: INSEAD: MBA with Distinction

1974-1977: The Queen's College, Oxford University: MA/BA History and Modern Languages

THE STATES OF DELIBERATION
of the
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

COMMITTEE *FOR* EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

REVIEW OF THE FUTURE STRUCTURE OF SECONDARY & FURTHER EDUCATION:
NEXT STEPS

Propositions in pursuance of Rule 18 submitted by
the President of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'Review of the Future Structure of Secondary & Further Education: Next Steps', dated 11th March 2020, they are of the opinion:-

1. To agree to the continuation of the development, which is already well under way, of a single States' secondary school operating across a number of sites (initially four sites).
2. To agree that the Policy Letter to be laid before the States by the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture which will allow the States to determine the future model of secondary education must also include any revisions necessary to the timeline and authorised budget for the capital project associated with the development of The Guernsey Institute at Les Ozouets.
3. To agree that the Policy Letter to be laid before the States by the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture which will allow the States to determine the future model of secondary education must also include any revisions necessary to the timeline and authorised budget for the capital project associated with the redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Primary School.
4. To agree that the authority delegated to the Policy & Resources Committee by the States on the 6th of September 2019 to approve expenditure on various aspects of the Transforming Education Programme shall be varied by increasing the authority delegated in relation to digital infrastructure and services in schools and colleges by £600,000 and reducing the authority delegated in relation to the secondary school by the same amount.
5. To agree that the review of models of secondary education against the 'benchmark' model of two 11-18 colleges, which was directed by the States on the 3rd of March 2020, shall be restricted to models organising secondary education in one school in the following configuration of colleges or campuses:

- a) Three 11-18 colleges;
 - b) Two 11-16 colleges and one 11-18 college; and
 - c) Three 11-16 colleges and a separate sixth form college on a different site.
6. To agree that the review of models of secondary education against the 'benchmark' model of two 11-18 colleges, which was directed by the States on the 3rd of March 2020, and for which the baseline assumptions shall be those used in the model of two 11-18 colleges in order to provide a genuine like-for-like comparison, shall include assessment of the following indicative considerations but that the Committee shall be free to include other considerations should it see fit:

Quality of education –

- Promoting the highest possible standards and outcomes;
- Range and equality of opportunities, including curriculum and facilities;
- Curriculum breadth and opportunities to group students flexibly;
- Standard of and access to facilities indoors and outdoors;
- Recruitment, retention, flexibility and resilience of staff teams;
- Pastoral support and wellbeing of students and staff;
- Support for students with special educational needs or disabilities;
- Pupil teacher ratios and average class sizes;
- Extra-curricular and enrichment opportunities; and
- Ease of transition between different phases of education.

Value for money –

- Capital expenditure;
- Revenue expenditure: making the best use of the funds the States are prepared to spend on secondary education annually; and
- Transition costs to move from the *status quo* to the new model.

Infrastructure & organisation –

- Infrastructure at the school sites;
- Infrastructure around the school sites;
- Capacity and capability of the States to implement the model;
- Consistency with States' strategic objectives; and
- School operational issues which are specific to any particular model (excluding those which are general to all models).

7. To note that many of the representations received from teachers and others in advance of the States' debate on education which led to the Resolutions made

on the 3rd of March 2020 concerned issues which were only partially related or in some cases unrelated to secondary education models – in particular, these issues were the internal space planned and the external space available at the school sites and the configuration of that space and the day-to-day operation of the school and its constituent colleges – and therefore to agree that the review of secondary education models shall allow opportunities for discussions about space standards, the configuration of space and the day-to-day operation of the school and its constituent colleges, in particular with unions representing teachers and support staff, and to direct the Committee to take into account these discussions when recommending to the States the optimum future model of secondary education following the review of secondary education models.

8. To agree that the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture as presently constituted shall remain in office until the normal end of committees' terms of office on the 30th of June 2020.
9. To direct the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, following the review of secondary education models, to submit its Policy Letter to the States in time for the matter to be included on the 'Schedule for Future Business' not later than at the Meeting of the States which will start on the 28th of April 2021; and further to note that there would be nothing to preclude the Committee from submitting the Policy Letter sooner if it felt able to do so; and to direct the Committee to attach Propositions to the Policy Letter to allow the States to determine the future model of secondary education and to introduce the future model as soon as practicable.
10. To direct the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, as expeditiously as possible, to draw up a plan for stakeholder engagement to inform the review of secondary education models and this plan shall pay particular regard to the need for improved engagement with unions representing teachers and support staff in secondary schools.
11. To note that the costs of pausing the development of the two 11-18 colleges previously agreed by the States and carrying out a review of other secondary education models against the model of two 11-18 colleges are estimated to be up to £2.5million; and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to make appropriate budget arrangements to fund these costs.
12. To note that pausing the development of the two 11-18 colleges previously agreed by the States and the consequential effects of doing so will result at least in the deferral of revenue savings on secondary and possibly further education; and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to take this into account when recommending the annual cash limit of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture in future years and when assessing the success or otherwise of the Committee's extant revenue savings plan.

The above Propositions have been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications in accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

THE STATES OF DELIBERATION
of the
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

COMMITTEE *FOR* EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

REVIEW OF THE FUTURE STRUCTURE OF SECONDARY AND FURTHER EDUCATION:
NEXT STEPS

The Presiding Officer
States of Guernsey
Royal Court House
St Peter Port

11th March, 2020

Dear Sir

1 Introduction

- 1.1 In recent years the structure of secondary and further education has been the focus of much public interest and many States' debates.
- 1.2 In March 2016 the States directed that from 2019 academic selection at 11 administered through the 11-plus should be replaced by admission to secondary schools based on feeder primary schools. After the general election of 2016, this decision was reaffirmed by the current States later that year. In January 2018 the States resolved that as soon as possible secondary education in the States' sector should be organised in two 11-18 colleges operating as a single school and that further and on-island higher education should be integrated into a single provider (The Guernsey Institute). In September 2019 the States approved proposals for the capital investment necessary to develop the 11-18 Colleges at Baubigny and Les Beaucamps and The Guernsey Institute at Les Ozouets. The structural reforms to secondary education which began in 2018 were due to be completed by 2022/23: the new Colleges would have been fully constructed for September 2022 and all students would have been on the two sites by September 2023.
- 1.3 On the 3rd of March 2020, at their most-recent meeting, the States resolved to pause tendering and procurement processes in relation to the development of the two 11-18 Colleges and to direct the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture to prepare a report comparing this extant model with other potential models of comprehensive secondary education. The States' Resolutions made on the 3rd of March are reproduced in Appendix 1 of this Policy Letter. Those

made in September 2019 are reproduced in Appendix 2 of this Policy Letter.

- 1.4 The future structure of secondary education is of course a matter of great importance and of significant public interest. Therefore, the review of models directed by the States must be carried out carefully and thoroughly. Equally, the number of times this matter has been revisited by the States and the years which have already elapsed since the initial decision to move from a selective to a comprehensive system of secondary education have already caused prolonged uncertainty for parents, children and schools. Therefore, this next review of models must be undertaken without undue delay.
- 1.5 The early stage of the review is likely to be more technical than political, but to start the work with confidence officials need clearer directions than those they have from the States at present. If the review is to proceed thoroughly and swiftly the States must urgently make further Resolutions beyond those made on the 3rd of March.
- 1.6 In particular, there is a need for greater clarity in relation to the following: the terms of the review and the level of detail required when comparing various education models against the 'benchmark' model which is the extant model of two 11-18 colleges; the models which the States wish to be included in, and as importantly excluded from, the review; and the timeline for completing the review. In addition, the Committee wishes to secure the concept of a single secondary school operating from a number of colleges or campuses and the development of The Guernsey Institute, both of which have been left in doubt – possibly inadvertently – by the Resolutions made on the 3rd of March. The States should also identify a budget for the review and acknowledge that delaying the reforms to secondary education agreed previously – in particular not consolidating the number of schools or sites – will inevitably require a higher level of revenue expenditure over the next few years than that anticipated in the Committee's plan for efficiency savings.
- 1.7 Providing the necessary clarity now will allow the review of secondary education models to be appropriately focused and increase the prospects of it resulting in the next States finally being able not only to determine the future structure but to complete the task of introducing it. This is in the best interests of children, parents and schools. It will also inform the Committee's engagement with key stakeholders during the review.
- 1.8 There is also the question of the future of the Committee. The present States' term ends on the 30th of June. Clearly, the future structure of secondary education will be determined after this time, but the review of models must be progressed in the remaining three-and-a-half months of the present States' term. The Committee is confident that it is well placed to oversee commencement of the review. This is especially so if the States are prepared to

provide the further clarity proposed in the Propositions attached to this Policy Letter. Nevertheless, following the aforementioned recent decisions of the States, the Committee believes it requires the express authority of the States to lead the early stages of the review directed by the States. Therefore, the Committee is submitting a Proposition asking the States to endorse its continuation in office. Should the States not wish to do so, it would be advantageous to elect a new Committee expeditiously.

- 1.9 The States' Resolutions made on the 3rd of March impose a deadline of 30th June 2020 to prepare a report following the completion of the review of secondary education models. This provides only a short period of time for the review to be undertaken. Given this, there is an urgent need to understand who is undertaking the Review.
- 1.10 Therefore, the Committee is submitting this Policy Letter and associated Propositions and requesting the Presiding Officer to lay them before the next meeting of the States in accordance with Rule 18 of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees: Urgent Propositions.

2 The Transforming Education Programme and the States' Resolutions of January 2018 and September 2019

- 2.1 The development of the two 11-18 Colleges is only one part of the States' Transforming Education Programme. It also includes, *inter alia*: the concept of a single States' secondary school operating across a number of colleges or campuses; co-locating health and care services at those colleges or campuses; developing The Guernsey Institute; redeveloping La Mare de Carteret Primary School and reviewing provision in the primary phase across the Island; significant investment in digital infrastructure and services to schools and colleges; curriculum development; and replacing the 1970 Education Law, which for at least 20 years has been acknowledged as outdated and inadequate for a modern education system.
- 2.2 Most of these projects which together make up the Transforming Education Programme were directed by the States in Resolutions made in January 2018 and September 2019. Many of them are now affected by the Resolutions made by the States on the 3rd of March, some more materially than others and some perhaps inadvertently. The Committee and officials who will work on the review now directed by the States would benefit from greater clarity about which parts of the Programme should be continued and which parts should be paused. This requires further States' Resolutions. The Committee also wishes to inform the States about the status of these projects following the most-recent States' meeting and Resolutions.

3 The development of one secondary school

- 3.1 Clearly, the development of the two 11-18 Colleges has been paused. This is not in doubt. However, the direction of the States *“...not to enter into any contractual obligations...or continue with any associated procurement processes for implementation of any elements of the 1 school on 2 sites plan...”* possibly engages not only the concept of ‘two sites’ but also the concept of ‘one school’ operating from a number of sites (whether from, for example, two, three or four sites). There has been no material political opposition to the concept of a single school since it was first presented to the States as far back as March 2016 and then agreed by the States in January 2018. Preparations are being made to formalise this from September 2020. Undoing them now would be disruptive and costly – for example, in relation to school uniform arrangements already in place for September and school inspection arrangements already in place for the next school term and school year which are compatible only with the ‘one school’ concept.
- 3.2 Operating as a single organisation – initially across the four existing sites – will help to work towards aligning opportunities for students and allow resources to be used more efficiently and flexibly, albeit some inefficiency will remain unless and until the number of school sites is consolidated by the next States. It is also an essential part of moving towards the delegation of greater authority and leadership away from the Committee and the Office *of the* Committee to the level of schools and colleges which has been endorsed by the States.
- 3.3 The Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached include asking the States to put beyond doubt the development of a single States’ secondary school according to the current schedule.

4 Co-location of health and care services at each secondary school site

- 4.1 The plan to co-locate health and care services at secondary school sites is an integral part of the ‘one school in two 11-18 colleges’ model and the capital projects to establish that model.
- 4.2 Under the terms of extant States’ Resolutions there is no way of developing this concept other than in the ‘one school in two 11-18 colleges’ model, not least because doing so would require additional capital investment beyond that authorised by the States, and in any event it may not be practicable to accommodate such services across three or four sites.
- 4.3 Therefore, following the direction of the States to pause the development of the two 11-18 Colleges and to draw up a comparison of that model against

various other models, there is no choice but to pause the development of co-located health and care services at each secondary school site.

5 The Guernsey Institute

- 5.1 In January 2018 the States agreed *“that the College of Further Education shall have a single board of governors and a single executive leadership team; and further to agree that it shall be an objective of the College to integrate with the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and the GTA University Centre as soon as practicable, most probably to operate as discrete faculties within the same College; and further to agree that it shall be an ambition of the College of Further Education to form a partnership with a UK university, ultimately to replace the title College of Further Education with the title University College Guernsey”* and that as soon as practicable this sector of education should be provided with purpose-built facilities.
- 5.2 In pursuit of these States’ directions, the Committee has been developing the integration of the three providers as The Guernsey Institute.
- 5.3 In September 2019 the States agreed to *“note that the capital costs of the policy of organising further and higher education in purpose-built facilities on a single site, which was agreed by the States on the 19th of January 2018, will be up to a maximum of £51.1 million; direct the Policy & Resources Committee to add this project to the capital portfolio 2021 – 2025; and delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure up to a maximum of £51.1 million charged to the Capital Reserve (in respect of the total project costs comprising building; transformation and transition) subject to the approval of appropriate business cases submitted by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture which must demonstrate that the financial resources requested for the construction and operation of the preferred option balance cost and outcomes and therefore represent value for money in the development of The Guernsey Institute at Les Ozouets as part of the Transforming Education Programme”*. As a result of the Resolutions made by the States on the 3rd of March, the development of purpose-built facilities at Les Ozouets may be delayed again.
- 5.4 The timeline for this capital project is linked to the timeline for other capital projects in the Transforming Education Programme which have now been paused and delayed. This timeline can no longer be guaranteed and cannot be confirmed until the next States have determined the future structure of secondary education or at least revisited the order and schedule of each of the capital projects within the Transforming Education Programme. It is too soon to know whether this may have any effect on the capital sum required.
- 5.5 The Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached ask the States to direct

that the Policy Letter which will now need to be laid before the next States to allow them to determine the future structure of secondary education must also include any revisions necessary to the timeline and the authorised budget for the capital project at Les Ozouets.

- 5.6 The Committee believes that the concept of The Guernsey Institute, including integrating the three aforementioned providers, enjoys widespread support and that the States have no wish to impede the development of The Guernsey Institute, including the planning phase for the capital development at Les Ozouets. However, the States have now directed the Committee to re-examine various models of secondary education previously presented to current and former Committees, which could result in the next States adopting and introducing a model other than ‘one school in two 11-18 colleges, and some of these models include providing post-16 education in ways which are not compatible with the concept of The Guernsey Institute in the form in which it is currently being developed. In view of the propensity of the States to agree strategic policy and then pause or reverse it during implementation, it would be unwise and potentially costly to continue developing The Guernsey Institute, including the planning phase for the capital development at Les Ozouets, only to find in a year or two that the States want to establish a model for secondary and post-16 education which is incompatible with the concept of The Guernsey Institute in the form in which it is currently being developed.
- 5.7 In order to overcome this problem, or at least greatly reduce the risk of it arising, the Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached include asking the States to protect the concept and development of The Guernsey Institute by excluding from the review of models of secondary education all models which would not be compatible with the concept of The Guernsey Institute in the form in which it is currently being developed. This would exclude from the review, for example, the model proposed to the States by the previous Committee because that model would have divided further education between two separate providers and also excludes models containing what in Guernsey has typically been referred to as a ‘tertiary college’ because that would absorb all post-16 studies, including A levels and the International Baccalaureate, as well as further education and on-island higher education.

6 La Mare de Carteret Primary School

- 6.1 In September 2019 the States resolved to *“note that the capital costs of redeveloping La Mare de Carteret Primary School will be in the range of £13.4 million to £22.4 million; and to delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure, subject to the submission of appropriate business cases by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, of up to £22.4 million, which may be drawn down over a period of two years from 2022, for the*

capital redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Primary School as part of the Transforming Education Programme; and to note that the business cases associated with this project will include the results of a review of capacity in the primary phase across the Island.”

- 6.2 The Resolutions made by the States on the 3rd of March do not touch upon the material policy directions in the preceding paragraph, but one consequence of them is that the redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Primary School will inevitably be delayed again.
- 6.3 The timeline for this capital project (2022-24) is inextricably linked to the timeline for other capital projects in the Transforming Education Programme which have now been paused and delayed. A revised timeline cannot be established until the next States have determined the future structure of secondary education or at least revisited the order and schedule of each of the capital projects within the Transforming Education Programme.
- 6.4 An additional complication in relation to the capital project at La Mare de Carteret Primary School is that the cost and timeline are to some extent dependent on whether or not secondary education is going to continue to be provided at La Mare de Carteret and, if so, how large the secondary school will be and where on the site it will be located, and these things now cannot be known until the States have reaffirmed or varied their strategic policy direction in relation to the future structure of secondary education. It is too soon to know whether this may have any effect on the capital sum required.
- 6.5 The Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached include asking the States to direct that the Policy Letter which will now need to be laid before the next States to allow them to determine the future structure of secondary education must also include any revisions necessary to the timeline and the authorised budget for the capital project at La Mare de Carteret Primary School.

7 Primary phase review and SEND review

- 7.1 As noted in paragraph 6.1, in September 2019 the States resolved that the business cases submitted for the redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Primary School should include the results of a review of capacity in the primary phase across the Island. The Committee intends to commence this review before the end of the current States’ term and can see no reason why the Resolutions made by the States on the 3rd of March should have any effect on the timing of this review, albeit there may now be some delay in putting into effect any policy or operational changes arising from the review.
- 7.2 Another important part of the Transforming Education Programme is a review

of Special Educational Needs and Disability. This review is under way and the Committee can see no reason why the Resolutions made by the States on the 3rd of March should have any effect on the timing of this review, albeit there may now be some delay in putting into effect any policy or operational changes arising from the review.

8 Digital infrastructure and services to schools and colleges

- 8.1 Among the Resolutions made by the States in September 2019 was one providing States' approval for the expenditure of up to £5.8million on improving digital infrastructure and services to schools and colleges ('The Digital Roadmap').
- 8.2 Most of this investment is for hardware for schools and colleges which is mobile, such as digital screens for classrooms and devices for students and teachers. Much of the IT equipment in schools has reached the end of its useful life and some of it is in very poor condition. Therefore, the intention was always to start the installation of this equipment well before the 11-18 Colleges were fully constructed. However, the funds for training and project and change management required to realise the benefits of this investment were included in transition funds allocated to other projects in the Transforming Education Programme and in particular £600,000 was included in the authorised budget allocated for the 11-18 Colleges which have now been paused.
- 8.3 Therefore, in order to continue with the Digital Roadmap, which was not paused by the States' Resolutions made on the 3rd of March, the Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached include asking the States to increase their delegated authority to the Policy & Resources Committee for the Digital Roadmap by £600,000 and to reduce their delegated authority to the Policy & Resources Committee for the 11-18 School/Colleges by the same amount.

9 Secondary education models to be reviewed

- 9.1 The Resolutions made by the States on the 3rd of March require the Committee to use the extant policy for the two 11-18 Colleges as a benchmark against which to review "*...other viable models of non-selective educational delivery in Guernsey previously presented to and considered by the Committee*".
- 9.2 The Resolutions are unclear about what is meant by "the Committee". It could be interpreted to mean only the present Committee elected in February 2018 or it could incorporate the period since the current title of the Committee was established in 2016 or each of its predecessor committees in law, including the committee which carried out a substantial review of secondary and further

education and considered various models around the years 2000-2002. If this is not clarified urgently, there is a risk that the review of models will later be seen as having started from the wrong place and incorporated the wrong material.

- 9.3 The Resolutions made by the States on the 3rd of March require considerable work to be undertaken reviewing models of secondary education for which no enthusiasm is apparent politically and/or professionally and/or publicly. This includes a model involving 'middle schools' which would provide education for children between the ages of 11 and 14 completely separate from the primary phase and the later secondary phase. It also includes a model involving four schools for children between the ages of 11 and 16 (or 18), which is the *status quo* but which the States have resolved on multiple occasions to move away from and for which there has been no material support since 2016. In the opinion of the Committee, it would be wasteful in terms of time and money to include such models in the review.
- 9.4 In contrast, the wording of the Resolutions made on the 3rd of March does not require the Committee – neither the present Committee nor its successor – to include in the review a model for which there is clearly some enthusiasm, namely three 11-18 colleges. In the opinion of the Committee, it would be unhelpful to commence the review without the States clearly requiring this model to be included.
- 9.5 The Committee is also of the view that from the outset there should be no room for doubt about which models are included and which are not included in the review. This will immediately provide stakeholders with greater clarity and allow the review to be more focused and to be concluded more swiftly than it would be otherwise. It will hopefully also reduce the risk of the next States' debate on these matters, i.e. when the next set of proposals are presented following the review, becoming derailed by vague hopes that if further reviews are undertaken there might be a model yet to emerge which could garner widespread support.
- 9.6 Taking into account the long list of models previously presented to Committees, those for which some interest was expressed leading up to and during the recent States' debate and the viability of various models, the Committee is proposing to restrict the models which should be assessed against the extant model for two 11-18 colleges to the organisation of one school in the following configuration of colleges or campuses:
- a) Three 11-18 colleges;
 - b) Two 11-16 colleges and one 11-18 college; and
 - c) Three 11-16 colleges and a separate sixth form college on a different site.
- 9.7 These were also the models which were presented either for review or

adoption in amendments laid to the Requête debated at the recent States' meeting.

- 9.8 The Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached include asking the States to restrict the review to these models. They are listed separately to allow the States to agree that each one in turn should be included or excluded and to make the list more easily amendable should any member of the States wish to propose adding to or subtracting from the list.

10 Level of detail to be included in the review

- 10.1 The Resolutions made by the States on the 3rd of March require “*a comprehensive comparison of the structure and implementation of the [one school in two 11-18 colleges model] with other viable models of non-selective educational delivery*”. This wording makes it clear that the extant reforms (i.e. one school in two 11-18 colleges) are to be used as the comparator against which other models are to be assessed or compared. If this is to be done on a like-for-like basis, the comparison will need to be against a wide range of characteristics of the one school in two 11-18 colleges model, e.g. capital and revenue costs, curriculum, sports facilities, pupil teacher ratios, co-located health and care services, support for children with special educational needs, etc. and the same space standards will have to be applied consistently to each model.
- 10.2 What is meant by “*a comprehensive comparison*” is less clear. In the States' debate which led to the Resolutions, a range of interpretations was offered. Some members suggested that the necessary comparisons had almost been done already and that the task ahead was mainly to compile previous analyses and present them in a single document while there was a suggestion that nothing short of an Outline Business Case or possibly a Full Business Case would be acceptable for each potential model. The Committee and in particular officials who will carry out the technical analysis of models require clearer direction than this if they are to start the review from the right place.
- 10.3 The Committee suggests there are two different ways of approaching the necessary comparison of secondary education models. The first way is to compare them to a level of detail which would normally be considered reasonable to allow the States to make a strategic policy decision before requiring the Committee to oversee further development of the detail and the introduction of the reforms. The second way is for the States unusually to be presented with a much deeper level of detail about each of the various models and this would probably include staff structures, detailed traffic impact assessments and extensive curriculum modelling. The Committee recommends the former – the first way – but wishes to obtain clarity about what the States

expect.

- 10.4 In order to provide the clarity of direction required, the Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached include asking the States to require that each of the models which the States resolve to include in the “...*comprehensive comparison of the structure and implementation of the [one school in two 11-18 colleges model] with other viable models...*” should be assessed against the following indicative considerations but the Committee should be free to include other considerations should it see fit. In each case the baseline assumptions will have to be those used in the extant model of two 11-18 colleges in order to provide a genuine like-for-like comparison.

Quality of education –

- Promoting the highest possible standards and outcomes;
- Range and equality of opportunities, including curriculum and facilities;
- Curriculum breadth and opportunities to group students flexibly;
- Standard of and access to facilities indoors and outdoors;
- Recruitment, retention, flexibility and resilience of staff teams;
- Pastoral support and wellbeing of students and staff;
- Support for students with special educational needs or disabilities;
- Pupil teacher ratios and average class sizes;
- Extra-curricular and enrichment opportunities; and
- Ease of transition between different phases of education.

Value for money –

- Capital expenditure;
- Revenue expenditure: making the best use of the funds the States are prepared to spend on secondary education annually; and
- Transition costs to move from the *status quo* to the new model.

Infrastructure & organisation –

- Infrastructure at the school sites;
- Infrastructure around the school sites;
- Capacity and capability of the States to implement the model;
- Consistency with States’ strategic objectives; and
- School operational issues which are specific to any particular model (excluding those which are general to all models).

- 10.5 Although the States have directed a review of secondary education models – which engages issues such as the number of school sites, the location of the sites and the age range of students to be accommodated at each site – it cannot be overlooked that many of the representations received from teachers

and others in advance of the most-recent States' debate on education concerned issues which were only partially related or in some cases unrelated to models. In particular, these issues were the internal space planned and the external space available at the school sites and the configuration of that space and the day-to-day operation of the school and its constituent colleges.

- 10.6 Therefore, engagement with stakeholders which must form part of the review risks being unproductive if it is limited to consideration of models only. The Committee proposes that the review should allow opportunities for discussion about space standards, the configuration of space and the day-to-day operation of the school and its constituent colleges, in particular with unions representing teachers and support staff. Although the Committee believes it would be unwise to rule these matters out of the scope of the review, if that is what the States intend it would be better for them to make that clear at the outset of the review when this Policy Letter and the Propositions to which it is attached are debated and voted upon.

11 The Future of the Committee

- 11.1 Since the States resolved – by 18 votes to 17 with one abstention – to pause the establishment of the two 11-18 colleges the Committee has considered its future. The President of the Committee has also sought to discuss this matter with the lead signatory of the Requête which led to the States' Resolutions of the 3rd of March.
- 11.2 The Committee considers that it can serve the States best by remaining in place until the normal end of its term of office on the 30th of June 2020. There are several reasons for this which the Committee wishes to share with the States and publicly put on record.
- 11.3 The future structure of secondary education is an important part of the Committee's mandate and policy agenda, but it is far from the only part. The Committee has already submitted a Policy Letter containing its proposed 'Plan for Sport' which, if approved, will provide for substantial additional investment in sport and physical activity in the years ahead. In the next few weeks the Committee intends to submit a Policy Letter which, if approved, will provide drafting instructions to allow the States finally to replace the 1970 Education Law early in the life of the next term. Both of these Policy Letters are the result of considerable work and the Committee believes it is best placed to present them to the States before the end of this term. Similar considerations apply to a third Policy Letter which the Committee is at an advanced stage of preparing – on supporting the Island's native language – and which it intends to submit to the States before the end of this term. The Committee believes it is also best placed to continue the progress on other aspects of the Transforming

Education Programme, including in relation to The Guernsey Institute, new school inspection arrangements, new performance measures and curriculum development. The Committee is also in the middle of overseeing preparations for the 75th anniversary of the Island's Liberation and the 80th anniversary of the Evacuation, both of which are to be celebrated before the end of this States' term.

- 11.4 The model of secondary education which, at the direction of the States, the Committee has been establishing has not been rejected but paused. It remains the only model of non-selective education to have been approved by the States. Other models laid before the States, either for review or approval, have on every occasion been rejected by substantial majorities. Ultimately the future structure of secondary education is a matter of policy which requires an element of political judgement: no model is going to be introduced unless a future States' Assembly agree it and see it through. This matter is not going to be resolved apolitically. And it has been the subject of such prominent and extensive debate over successive States' terms that the views of almost every States' member are widely known. Even if the present Committees vacates office, the States are not going to be able to elect members who are in all respects seen to be politically indifferent or neutral on the question of the future structure of secondary education. Any group of members forming a Committee would need to demonstrate that they are overseeing a review which is fair and objective and the present Committee is fully committed to doing this.
- 11.5 In any event, in its early phase the review of models of secondary education directed by the States is likely to be more technical than political. Once the framework of the review has been established – which the States can do by agreeing to the Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached – no policy development will be required on this matter until the next States' term and the technical analysis of various models will be carried out by officials in conjunction with stakeholders. What the Committee will need to do is provide parents and children with some clarity about the admission arrangements and other logistical arrangements for secondary education from September 2020 and for the next few years until the new but as yet unknown model of secondary education can be established. The Committee believes it is best placed to undertake this work swiftly.
- 11.6 A further consideration is the proximity of the general election and the end of the States' term. At the time of writing there are only three scheduled States' meetings remaining before the end of the term and the last of these is in only eight weeks' time. There are fewer than 100 days until the general election.
- 11.7 However, in view of the recent decision of the States to pause a substantial policy of the Committee and to direct a review of other secondary education

models, the Committee cannot credibly continue in office to commence the review and carry out all aspects of its mandate without the renewed authority of the States. Therefore, the Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached include asking the States to agree that the present Committee shall remain in place until the normal end of its term of office on the 30th of June.

12 Timeline for review and next steps

- 12.1 The Resolutions made by the States on the 3rd of March envisage two distinct stages to the work ahead. First, the present Committee would complete a review of secondary education models and prepare a report thereon before the end of this States' term. Then the Committee elected in July would prepare a Policy Letter for consideration by the States before the end of 2020, which to meet that deadline would need to be submitted by the Committee not later than the 9th of November, which will be only 17 weeks after that Committee has been elected and only nine weeks after the States have resumed business after the summer recess.
- 12.2 This timeline has two problems. First, it does not provide for the findings of the review to be owned by the next Committee which must present the States with the final proposals for the future structure of secondary education. Second, it is not realistic to expect a newly-elected Committee to submit what will inevitably be one of the most important Policy Letters of the four-year term just a few weeks after they have taken office and begun meaningful work after the summer recess. This is setting up the new Committee to fail to meet the deadline set for it.
- 12.3 The Committee proposes that the review and the Policy Letter which will follow the review should be seen as a single item of work and that the Committee elected after the general election should be provided with a more realistic period of time to submit such an important Policy Letter. The Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached include asking the States to require the review of secondary education models to be commenced immediately and to require the next Committee's Policy Letter setting out recommendations for the future structure of secondary education to be submitted to Her Majesty's Greffier in time for it to be included on the 'Schedule for Future Business' not later than the meeting of the States which will start on the 28th of April 2021. There would be nothing to preclude the new Committee from submitting the Policy Letter sooner if it felt able to do so.

13 Stakeholder engagement

- 13.1 The Committee appreciates that the engagement of stakeholders will be an

important factor in the success of the review and of any proposals emerging from the review. In the time available since the recent States' debate – which is approximately one week – it has not been possible to formulate specific plans for stakeholder engagement. The Committee intends to address this at a very early stage of the review and will wish to consider how best to engage with a broad range of stakeholders.

- 13.2 Since the debate the Committee has met with union representatives of teachers and support staff in schools to share with them the reasons for this Policy Letter and broadly the proposals it contains. As part of stakeholder engagement, the Committee is particularly keen to work with employee representative bodies, not least because their concerns and representations clearly weighed heavily on the minds of States' members during the recent debate and inevitably will do so again when the future structure of secondary education is considered early in the life of the next States.

14 Financial implications

- 14.1 The Resolutions made by the States will incur various costs which were not identified in the Requête which led to those Resolutions. The development of the 11-18 Colleges was paused on the final day for submitting tenders for the construction contracts. Compensation will now be paid to the bidding companies. Further compensation will be due to other companies in relation to matters concerning the creation of 'one school' (see section 3) in the event that Proposition 1 is rejected. The Committee has also considered the additional costs of carrying out the review of various models of secondary education. Finally, efficiency savings in annual revenue costs which would have been generated by retaining the original timeline for the development of the 11-18 Colleges will now be delayed at best.
- 14.2 The scope of the review will inevitably affect how much it costs, e.g. the number of models to be reviewed, the level of detail required of each model, the extent of stakeholder consultation and the timeline for the review. Taking into account each of the matters referred to above, the Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached include asking the States to approve additional expenditure up to £2.5million. This amount is consistent with the Rule 4(3) Requête impact assessment which the Committee provided to the States before their recent debate.
- 14.3 Should the States make Resolutions which alter the scope of the review compared with the proposals of the Committee then an alternative budget would need to be established. In accordance with Rule 4(3) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation, the Office *of the* Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture would be pleased to provide alternative budget

estimates to any Members of the States who may be considering laying amendments to alter the scope of the review.

- 14.4 These costs do not include the costs of developing a different model of secondary education to the stage of a Full Business Case, which would be required should the review of models result in the next States directing the introduction of a model other than the model now paused.
- 14.5 The Programme Business Case for the Transforming Education Programme, which was published before the States' meeting in September 2019, identified that introducing the new model of secondary education which is now paused would have generated efficiency savings of approximately £750,000 per year compared with the costs of the current 'four school model'. These savings, which took into account anticipated growth in the student population over the next few years, were intended to make a significant contribution to the Committee's outstanding savings plan. Clearly, these savings will not be realised in the period anticipated, if indeed they are realised at all.
- 14.6 The Programme Business Case also identified that the development of The Guernsey Institute would improve the Committee's revenue budget position by approximately £1.2million per year. While this can still be achieved if the States approve the Committee's Proposition to allow the development of The Guernsey Institute to continue unhindered by the review of secondary education models, the uncertainty which now exists in relation to the timeline for fully developing The Guernsey Institute may result in previously unforeseen delay in the improved revenue budget position.
- 14.7 The savings deferred or foregone as a result of the Resolutions made by the States on the 3rd of March require further analysis. The Propositions attached to this Policy Letter include asking the States to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to pay particular attention to this challenge when recommending the annual cash limit of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture in future years and when assessing the success or otherwise of the Committee's savings plan.

15 Admission arrangements for September 2020 and beyond

- 15.1 In October 2018 parents and children were advised of the transition plan for children during the move from four secondary schools to one school in two colleges, i.e. which school sites they would attend in each year from September 2019 onwards. The transition plan was informed by advice from school leaders.
- 15.2 Under the transition plan, 88% of students would not have needed to move sites from the time they entered secondary school in Year 7 until they

completed their GCSEs at the end of Year 11. The transition plan provided for all students who will start secondary school in September 2021 and thereafter to start on the sites where they would have remained until the end of their secondary education (whether after Year 11 or after sixth form studies). All students required to move sites would have done so together in the summer of 2022.

- 15.3 This transition plan is no longer viable for two reasons. First, because construction work cannot commence in the summer 2020 as planned, it will not be possible for the extensions at St Sampson's and Les Beaucamps to be completed by 2022. Second, there is no longer certainty about what the final model of secondary education will be and across how many sites it will be provided. This second point makes it impossible for the time being to have a coherent transition plan for children: this will be possible again only once the next States have decided on the future structure of secondary education and established a timeline for introducing that future structure.
- 15.4 However, parents and children will rightly want as much clarity as can be provided at the present time, even if it will take longer to provide certainty about each child's journey through their years of secondary education. The Committee, officials and school leaders spent considerable time in 2018 studying various potential transition plans and have a good understanding of the issues which need to be taken into account.
- 15.5 The Year 7 admission arrangements for September 2020 do not need to be altered. They will remain as parents and children were advised in October 2018. The Committee has already written to parents to provide this clarity. That letter is reproduced in Appendix 3 of this Policy Letter. The 'partner primary school' arrangements for September 2020 will remain as follows:
- St Sampson's – Hautes Capelles, St Mary & St Michael and Vale;
 - Les Varendes – Amherst and Notre Dame;
 - Les Beaucamps – Castel, Forest and St Martin's; and
 - La Mare de Carteret – La Houquette, La Mare de Carteret and Vauvert.
- 15.6 Following the recent decision of the States to pause the reforms agreed in 2018 and 2019 and to require a review of various other models of secondary education, some children entering secondary school in September 2021 (the current Year 5) and possibly further year groups below them will now have different admission arrangements and different routes through their secondary school years than those published in October 2018. The necessary changes require further thought, not least because the end point of the transition period (i.e. the future structure of secondary education) is now uncertain. The Committee has written to parents to explain this and has made a commitment to write to them again soon to provide as much information as is currently

possible in relation to admission and transition arrangements for their children from September 2021 onwards.

15.7 For clarification, the position at the time of writing is set out below by year group:

- Admission to secondary school in September 2020 for the current Year 6 will be as planned within the feeder primary school model published in October 2018. Any subsequent site moves required for any child in this year group will have to be published once the future model of secondary education has been confirmed by the next States;
- Admission to secondary school in September 2021 for the current Year 5, which will require considerable revision, will be published soon. Any subsequent site moves required for any child in this year group will have to be published once the future model of secondary education has been confirmed by the next States;
- Admission to secondary school from September 2022 onwards for the current Year 4 and below and any subsequent site moves required for any child in these year groups will have to be published once the future model of secondary education has been confirmed by the next States; and
- Any site moves required for any child already at secondary school (i.e. the current Year 7 and above) will have to be published once the future model of secondary education has been confirmed by the next States.

16 Compliance with Rule 4 of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees

- 16.1 In accordance with Rule 4(1), the Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached have been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal and constitutional implications.
- 16.2 In accordance with Rule 4(2), the Committee is requesting that the Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached be laid before the States using Rule 18: Urgent Propositions. The reasons for this are set out above in this Policy Letter.
- 16.3 In accordance with Rule 4(3), in this Policy Letter the Committee has set out an estimate of the financial implications of carrying into effect the Propositions to which it is attached together with, where known, any relevant consequential financial implications.

- 16.4 In accordance with Rule 4(4), it is confirmed that the Propositions to which this Policy Letter is attached are supported by all members of the Committee.
- 16.5 In accordance with Rule 4(5), this Policy Letter and the Propositions to which it is attached relate to the Committee's responsibility to *"advise the States [on]...secondary, further and higher education..."* and they contribute to maintaining as much momentum as possible in the Transforming Education Programme, which is one of the States' key strategic policies.

Yours faithfully,

Deputy M J Fallaize
President

Deputy R H Graham
Vice-President

Deputy M H Dorey
Deputy P J Roffey
Deputy R H Tooley

Professor R Conder
Non-voting Member

IN THE STATES OF THE ISLAND OF GUERNSEY
ON THE 3RD MARCH, 2020

Adjourned from the 26th February, 2020

The States resolved as follows concerning Billet d'État No V
dated 7th February, 2020

REQUÊTE

DETERMINING THE BEST MODEL FOR SECONDARY EDUCATION
P.2020/14

- X. After consideration of the Requête dated 28th January, 2020 they are of the opinion:-
1. To direct the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture not to enter into any contractual obligations on behalf of the States or continue with any associated procurement processes for implementation of any elements of the 1 school on 2 sites plan as approved by the States on 6th September 2019;
 2. To direct the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture to prepare a report before the end of the term of the current States, that must include a comprehensive comparison of the structure and implementation of the 1 school on 2 sites plan with other viable models of non-selective educational delivery in Guernsey previously presented to and considered by the Committee, for consideration by the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture as constituted after the 2020 General Election ("the newly constituted Committee") and to direct the newly constituted Committee to revert to the States before the end of 2020 with a Policy Letter and suitable Propositions to implement what it believes to be the best model for secondary education in Guernsey.
 3. To agree that any comparison or consideration of educational models must exclude models that involve selection by academic ability or aptitude.

J. TORODE
HER MAJESTY'S GREFFIER

**IN THE STATES OF THE ISLAND OF GUERNSEY
ON THE 6th DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2019**

Adjourned from the 4th September 2019

**The States resolved as follows concerning Billet d'État No XVI
dated 25th July, 2019**

COMMITTEE *FOR* EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

**TRANSFORMING EDUCATION PROGRAMME &
PUTTING INTO EFFECT THE POLICY DECISIONS MADE BY THE STATES IN 2018
P.2019/66**

V: After consideration of the Policy Letter entitled Transforming Education Programme & Putting Into Effect the Policy Decisions Made by the States in 2018, dated 5th July, 2019, of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture:

1. To note that the capital costs of the policy of organising secondary education in one 11-18 school operating in two colleges, which was agreed by the States on the 19th of January 2018, will be up to a maximum of £77.9 million; and to delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure up to a maximum of £77.9million charged to the Capital Reserve (in respect of the total project costs comprising building, transformation and transition, and the accommodation of services to children and their families which would benefit from working in closer partnership with the school and colleges) subject to the approval of appropriate business cases submitted by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture which must demonstrate that the financial resources requested for the construction and operation of the preferred option balance cost and outcomes and therefore represent value for money, in the development of the 11-18 school and colleges on the sites of the current Les Beaucamps High School and St Sampson's High School as part of the Transforming Education Programme.
2. To note that the capital costs of the policy of organising further and higher education in purpose-built facilities on a single site, which was agreed by the States on the 19th of January 2018, will be up to a maximum of £51.1 million; direct the Policy & Resources Committee to add this project to the capital portfolio 2021 – 2025; and delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure up to a maximum of £51.1 million charged to the Capital Reserve (in respect of the total project costs comprising building; transformation and transition) subject to the approval of appropriate business cases submitted by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture which must demonstrate that the financial resources requested for the construction and operation of the preferred option balance cost and outcomes and therefore

represent value for money in the development of The Guernsey Institute at Les Ozouets as part of the Transforming Education Programme.

3. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to exercise the authority delegated to it through rigorous review and challenge of the business cases presented and, in particular, an assessment as to whether the final proposals balance costs and benefits and therefore use public resources in a way that creates and maximises public value, including:
 - a. the full capital costs of the project consisting of transformation, transition and community co-location costs in addition to building costs;
 - b. a baseline costed staffing structure, appropriately benchmarked, and explaining any deviation from existing policies;
 - c. a cost benefit justification for any additional investment required to operate the proposed staffing structure for the preferred model;
 - d. a cost benefit justification for any increased space requirements above the agreed baseline;
 - e. a cost benefit justification for any proposed additional space above the baseline to accommodate any further projected increase in student numbers, including a justification as to why additional numbers cannot be accommodated within existing contingencies for student numbers;
 - f. a cost benefit justification for any repurposing and refurbishment works proposed at the Les Beaucamps High School and St Sampson's High School sites;
 - g. detail as to how the savings on revenue costs of operating the new model contribute to the "Balance of Budget Reduction" of £2.3million expected to be remaining for the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture after 2021;
 - h. 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.
4. To note that the capital costs of redeveloping La Mare de Carteret Primary School will be in the range of £13.4 million to £22.4 million; and to delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure, subject to the submission of appropriate business cases by the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, of up to £22.4 million, which may be drawn down over a period of two years from 2022, for the capital redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Primary School as part of the Transforming Education Programme; and to note

that the business cases associated with this project will include the results of a review of capacity in the primary phase across the Island.

5. To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve expenditure, subject to the submission of appropriate business cases by the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, of up to £5.8 million on the Digital Roadmap, which is intended significantly to improve digital services across the education estate as part of the Transforming Education Programme.
6.
 - a) To note that the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture 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 to the Les Ozouets Campus; and to agree that the Committee will work with the Committee *for* Health & Social Care and the States' Trading Supervisory Board to establish as expeditiously as possible the feasibility of using the Delancey Campus for a range of health, care and community services provided under the auspices of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care.
 - b) 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.
7. 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.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

SCHEDULE FOR FUTURE STATES' BUSINESS

P.2019/63

XI: 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.

J. TORODE

HER MAJESTY'S DEPUTY GREFFIER



Committee for
Education, Sport & Culture

Sir Charles Frossard House
La Charroterie
St Peter Port
Guernsey
GY1 1FH
+44 (0) 1481 733000
educationsportandculture@gov.gg
www.gov.gg

11 March 2020

Dear Parents/Carers,

As many of you will know, last week the States voted to pause the plans to introduce two 11-18 colleges. This pause is designed to allow time to compare different ways of organising secondary education before the States reconsider which approach is best for Guernsey.

We know that many of you will have questions or be concerned about what this pause means for your children. It will not be possible to establish the same level of certainty again until the next States (after the General Election) have agreed the future structure of secondary education. However, we are writing to let you know what arrangements we can confirm now and when we will be able to provide further information.

Current Year 7 and Year 8 students

We had previously let you know that, in September 2022, the Year 7 and Year 8 students currently studying at La Mare de Carteret High School would move to the new de Saumarez College (Les Beaucamps) and the Year 7 students currently at the Grammar School & Sixth Form Centre would move to Victor Hugo (St Sampson's) College. These moves are now not possible because of the States' decision last week to pause the plans to expand those two school buildings. For the time being these students will remain at their current schools, but this might need to be reconsidered when the next States have re-established more certainty about the long-term structure for secondary education.

Current Year 6

The current Year 6 students will move to the secondary schools they are currently expecting to attend based on the 'partner school' system previously advised, as follows:

Secondary	Partner Primary
St Sampson's	Hautes Capelles; St Mary & St Michael; Vale
Les Varendes	Amherst; Notre Dame
Les Beaucamps	Castel; Forest; St Martin's
La Mare de Carteret	La Houquette; La Mare de Carteret; Vauvert

Current Year 5 and younger students

For students who will start secondary school in September 2021 and in the years that follow (students currently in Year 5 and below), we need to review the secondary school admission arrangements. The States' decision to 'pause and review' means that, in September 2021, it will not be possible to accommodate all new Year 7 students at Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's as originally planned.

We are working to put in place secondary school admission plans for students currently in Year 5 and below. We will write to you again soon to let you know what these revised plans will be. But it is important to keep in mind that those admission arrangements may be temporary, depending on the next States' decision on the long-term structure for secondary education.

The Committee is seeking clarity from the States over various aspects of the decision to 'pause and review'. We hope to get that clarity next week.

If you have any questions, please email them to educationfuture@gov.gg - the team will be pleased to help you.

With kind regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M Fallaize', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Deputy Matt Fallaize

President

The Committee *for*

Education, Sport & Culture