



X
2015

BILLET D'ÉTAT

WEDNESDAY, 27th MAY, 2015

1. Education Department – Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site –
Post Review, p. 1062

BILLET D'ÉTAT

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE STATES OF THE ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

I hereby give notice pursuant to Rule 1(3) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation that the item contained in this Billet d'État which has been submitted for debate will be considered at the Meeting of the States of Deliberation already convened for **WEDNESDAY, the 27th MAY, 2015.**

R. J. COLLAS
Bailiff and Presiding Officer

The Royal Court House
Guernsey

21st April 2015

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

REDEVELOPING THE LA MARE DE CARTERET SCHOOLS' SITE - POST REVIEW

The Chief Minister
Policy Council
Sir Charles Frossard House
La Charroterie
St Peter Port

8th April 2015

Dear Sir

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The Education Department welcomes the recommendation by the Review Panel, appointed by the Treasury and Resources Department, to build a 600 place secondary school at the La Mare de Carteret site.
- 1.2 The Education Department, as requested by the Review Panel, has:
 - reviewed the impact of the 16% uplift on the design and area of St. Sampson's High School and Les Beaucamps High School;
 - reviewed the necessity of the 16% uplift on the Primary School;
 - reviewed the proposed facilities in the nursery, its location and its capacity;
 - reviewed the design and layout of the Communication and Autism Base;
 - reviewed the design and location of the community facilities;
 - reviewed the size of the La Mare de Carteret High School;
 - reviewed the design of the La Mare de Carteret High School; and
 - conducted an Options Appraisal and prepared a business case for the Sports facilities in partnership with the Culture and Leisure Department and the Guernsey Sports Commission.
- 1.3 The Education Department, in addition to seeking approval for the original Project, is also committing to consider a move from a four school secondary model to a three school model in accordance with the Review Panel's recommendation, ensuring that sufficient capacity for 11-16 year olds is maintained across the Island both now and in the future. The Education Department intends to consult with parents, the teaching profession and the wider community on possible options and how any change could be implemented successfully without adversely affecting our students' educational outcomes. The need for proper consideration and detailed planning is recognised by the Review Panel.

- 1.4 The Education Department is recommending the States to approve the proposed redevelopment of the La Mare de Carteret site. This includes the replacements of the High School, Primary School, Pre-School, Communication and Autism Base, Community facilities and enhanced sports facilities.

2. Introduction

- 2.1 The Education Department, having considered the Report from the Review Panel following the November 2014 debate, is seeking the approval of the States to invest an estimated £60.2 million (excluding inflation) to provide, rebuild and redevelop the existing La Mare de Carteret Schools' site (the "Project" – see Appendix A). The Project comprises:

- the replacement of the High School facilities for a five form entry school up to 600 11-16 age pupils with scope for expansion for up to 960 pupils;
- the replacement of two-form entry Primary School facilities for up to 420 4-11 age pupils;
- a replacement co-provisioned pre-school Nursery of up to 130m² adjacent to the Primary School for approximately 32 children aged 3-4 on a part-time attendance basis, allowing for groups of up to 16 children at any one time;
- club level competition indoor Sports Hall facilities within the schools' new sports facilities, focused on completing the federated approach to the provision of shared resources for sport within the States Secondary Education sector, the avoidance of unnecessary duplication and optimising efficient dual-use school/community provision for netball, basketball and volleyball, as advised by the Culture and Leisure Department and the Guernsey Sports Commission;
- the relocation of Communication and Autism Support Service facilities of up to 200m² placed between the two schools to provide a designated unit for up to 18 children in the Primary School and a designated unit for up to 18 children in the High School and to be the base for the provision of outreach services for Bailiwick school age children and for advice to pre-school providers;
- provision of community facilities for families and the older generation within the schools and sports buildings as a mix of a discrete access suite of rooms of 150m² as part of the Sports Building and through the sharing of school facilities; and
- the delivery of new schools for operation no later than the beginning of September 2018, with demolition of the old buildings and completion of the external areas no later than the beginning of April 2019.

- 2.2 This States Report sets out the Education Department's consideration of the Review Panel's recommendations. The original States Report in Billet d'État XXIV from the November 2014 meeting of the States of Deliberation sets out in detail:

- how the scope of the project fits strategically with the States' overarching policy objectives;
- how the brief was finalised and alternative options considered;
- how the projected cost compares with respect to value for money with other similar projects, both on and off island;
- the management and procurement processes by which the project will be delivered;
- the timescale for the completion of the project; and
- the benefits that will be realised.

2.3 This States Report was delayed by Policy Council to the May 2015 meeting of the States of Deliberation to allow more time for the Education Department and the Treasury and Resources Department to continue discussions and reach an agreement. Those negotiations, facilitated by the Chief Minister, have successfully narrowed the areas of disagreement between the two Departments down to the timing of the consideration of consolidating the Department's education estate and the size of the proposed La Mare de Carteret High School.

3. The Resolutions from the November 2014 Billet d'État

3.1 The Chief Minister and Deputy Chief Minister submitted an amendment at the November 2014 meeting of the States to defer a decision on the scale, scope and specification of the project until such time as an Independent Review of the Department's proposals had been completed. This Amendment was approved by the States of Deliberation and then subsequently amended by Deputy Brouard (seconded by Deputy Fallaize).

3.2 These amendments resulted in the following Resolutions being agreed by the States on 27th November, 2014: :

1. To approve in principle the La Mare de Carteret schools' redevelopment project ("the Project").
2. To direct the Treasury and Resources Department to provide further interim project funding up to the Full Business Case stage in order for the specialist project team to be retained.
3. To direct the Treasury and Resources Department, in consultation with the Education Department, to commission an independent review in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the Project, and to direct the Education Department to lay before the States by no later than 31st March, 2015 recommendations to fulfil the decision of the States to approve in principle the Project, having regard to the conclusions of the independent review, and for the avoidance of doubt, the independent review will be appended to the States Report.

4. To direct the Treasury and Resources and Education Departments, following the independent review in Proposition 3 to undertake a formal value management exercise involving independent and appropriately qualified facilitators and the project team in order to ensure that the Project meets the recommended and approved scale, scope and specification and represents best value to the States.
- 3.3 On 9th December, 2014 the Treasury and Resources Department appointed four members to the Review Panel which comprised Mr. C. Nicholls, Mrs. L. Fraser, Mrs. S. Archer and Mr. A. Mahon.
 - 3.4 The Review Panel was directed to report back to the Treasury and Resources Department by 31st January, 2015. In the event, the Review Panel presented its findings to the Treasury and Resources Board and two members of the Education Department on 27th January, 2015 and submitted a draft report for comments on factual accuracy on 2nd February, 2015. The final report was submitted on 18th February, 2015. A copy of the Review Panel's report is included as Appendix B to this States Report in accordance with Resolution 3.

4 The Review Panel's Summary Points and Recommendations

- 4.1 The Review Panel's summary points are extracted below for ease of reference and shown in *italics*, together with the Education Department's response to those issues which have been agreed with the Treasury and Resources Department.
 - a) *The LMDC primary school should be rebuilt as a 2 Form Entry primary school.*
The Education Department welcomes this conclusion.
 - b) *Given the differing versions of student number forecasts which have been produced for this review we recommend that the States agrees a base population forecast model which will be used as the basis for future decisions, including decisions as a result of this review, on school provision.*
The Education Department and the Treasury and Resources Department have agreed to use the Policy Council Population forecasts as the basis for student population numbers.
 - c) *The current model of delivering secondary education with four small schools and surplus spaces in the system is expensive in both staffing and building running costs. It is harder and more expensive to deliver a broad and dynamic curriculum in smaller schools.*
The Education Department and the Treasury and Resources Department agree with this conclusion. The introduction of the Guernsey Federation of Secondary Schools is one way in which the Education Department is seeking to address this feature of the Bailiwick's education system.

- d) *We question the wisdom of building a secondary school for less than 600 pupils and do not recommend this option although it would reduce the number of surplus spaces in the system. The LMDC site probably provides the best flexibility to meet future changes.*

The Education Department and the Treasury and Resources Department agree with this conclusion.

- e) *Our preferred option is to provide a 600 place secondary school at the LMDC site and for the States to consider the opportunities for optimising the use of its estate and rationalising educational provision, including Further Education, taking into account the optimal size, number and location of schools required to deliver a broad and balanced curriculum.*

The Education Department and the Treasury and Resources Department agree with this conclusion. Section 5 of this States Report sets out how the Education Department proposes to address this issue.

- f) *Nursery. We fully support the provision of the nursery at LMDC but strongly recommend a review of the capacity of the nursery, particularly in the light of the new policy of provision for all pupils in the year before reception.*

The Education Department welcomes the support for the inclusion of the nursery at La Mare de Carteret and has reviewed its capacity. The Education Department's detailed response is provided in Appendix C.

- g) *Communication and Autism Unit. We fully support the replacement of the current poor accommodation for Primary pupils at Amherst. We fully concur with the educational, service and management benefits of co-locating the primary and secondary units with the High School and Primary School at the LMDC site.*

The Education Department welcomes the Review Panel's conclusion regarding the proposed Communication and Autism Base.

- h) *Enhanced sports facilities. While the enhanced sports facilities appear to be highly desirable in providing competition level facilities for the three key sports of netball, basketball and volleyball, the provision of such facilities on this site should be supported by an options appraisal and business case from the Culture and Leisure Department. Furthermore if it is to successfully function as an island wide facility as well as local community resource, as opposed to a school sports hall that is rented out of hours, there will need to be a clear management plan and funding for its operation.*

The Education Department, working in partnership with the Culture and Leisure Department, has undertaken an options appraisal and expanded business case, and this is included in Appendix D.

- i) *Community facilities. While the need for additional community facilities is supported by a range of indices and data indicating levels of deprivation, further work needs to be done in conjunction with stakeholders to determine*

the scope and purpose of these facilities taking into account current and planned community provision, and how they are to be managed.

The Education Department's response to this conclusion is contained in Appendix E.

- j) *The scheme for the Primary school at LMDC should go ahead as designed (BB99 plus 16% bonus) if reviewing it at this point would delay the overall LMDC project. If, however, the decision following this review is that there will be delay, the necessity for the 16% bonus should be formally reviewed to ensure it can be justified in terms of educational outcomes.*

The Education Department's response to this conclusion is provided in Appendix F.

- k) *The impact of the 16% uplift on the design and area of St. Sampson's and Les Beaucamps High Schools should be reviewed and evaluated to determine whether this improves educational outcomes or is required to successfully deliver a broad, balanced and modern curriculum before applying it to LMDC High School.*

The Education Department's response to this conclusion is set out in detail in Section 6 of this States Report.

- l) *We recommend a review of the proposed location of the nursery.*

The Education Department's detailed response is provided in Appendix C.

- m) *We recommend a review of the design and layout of the Autism and Communication Unit to ensure it fully meets the service users' requirements.*

The Education Department's review of the design and layout of the Communication and Autism Base is contained in Appendix G.

- n) *We recommend a review of the design and location of the community facilities following clarification from HSSD of their scope and purpose.*

The Education Department's response to this conclusion is contained in Appendix E.

- o) *The overall size of the LMDC development and the way the areas have been calculated should be reviewed. The current design appears over-sized for the High School but may be restricted elsewhere.*

The Education Department's response to this conclusion is contained in Section 6 of this States Report.

- p) *The design of the High School in particular should be reviewed to ensure it is sufficiently flexible and innovative to support effective teaching, learning and a modern and relevant curriculum in line with the Education Department's Vision Statement and Generic Design Brief.*

The Education Department's response to this conclusion is contained in Section 6 of this States Report.

4.2 In the same manner, the Review Panel's recommendations are extracted below for ease of reference.

- a) *A 600 place secondary school with the potential for expansion should be built subject to the comments above and in the context of consideration of the opportunities for rationalisation of educational provision and optimising the use of the educational estate.*

The Education Department welcomes the Review Panel's recommendation for a 600 place secondary school with the potential for expansion. Section 5 of this States Report sets out how the Education Department intends to consider the opportunities for the future rationalisation of educational provision and optimising the use of the educational estate.

- b) *A 2FE primary school should be built subject to the comments above.*

The Education Department welcomes the recognition that a two form primary school should be built. The Review Panel's other comments are addressed in Appendix F.

- c) *Co-located autism and nursery provision should be built subject to the comments above.*

The Education Department welcomes the recognition that co-located autism and nursery provision should be built. The Review Panel's other comments are addressed in Appendix G and C respectively.

- d) *The need for community facilities should be further discussed with stakeholders to determine their use and location on site.*

The Education Department's consideration of this point is set out in Appendix E.

- e) *Enhanced sports facilities are highly desirable, but an options appraisal and business case should be completed, a management plan agreed, and the design negotiated to reflect intended use.*

The Education Department has responded to this recommendation in Appendix D.

5 Consolidating the Education Estate

5.1 The Review Panel concludes by stating its "*preferred option is to provide a 600 place secondary school at the LMDC site and for the States to consider the opportunities for optimising the use of its estate and rationalising educational provision, including Further Education, taking into account the optimal size, number and location of schools required to deliver a broad and balanced curriculum.*"

5.2 This is based on the Review Panel's recommendation that the States "*consider the potential benefits, in the longer term, of moving from a four school model to a three school one.*" The Education Department concurs that a three school

model has attractions both in terms of potential educational outcomes and greater operating efficiencies.

- 5.3 It should be remembered that the Education Department is working to an extant States Resolution from 2001 when a successful amendment directed the Department to “*retain the Grammar School as an 11-18 institution incorporating a Sixth Form Centre, develop three new High Schools and develop an improved College of Further Education on its existing site, or such alternative site as that Council considers appropriate*”. Any change to this resolution will have to come back to the Assembly in due course with full consideration of the impact of any changes on all stakeholders.
- 5.4 The Review Panel also notes that “*We recognise that such a move would require very careful consideration by the States*” and that “*If it were approved there are then many factors which would influence when, and in particular how, such a move may be best implemented, not least the need for any move to be managed sensitively and in a way that which does not impact on educational outcomes during transition*”. The Education Department concurs with this view and further notes that the Review Panel acknowledges that this needs to be considered carefully and properly so that any transition is carefully managed to protect educational outcomes for our young people.
- 5.5 The Education Department has stated publicly that it is committed to reviewing the current system of selection at 11. As highlighted in the Education Vision, supported unanimously by the Assembly, the Education Department is committed to the development of firm, evidence-based proposals for the most effective structure of delivery of secondary education for all our students.
- 5.6 The Education Department will carry out both public and staff consultations which will begin later this year and will also need due consideration of issues such as any future admissions policy for secondary education and the future funding of the grant-aided Colleges, recognising the existing funding arrangements are in place until 2018. The Education Department will include within this consultation possible options for a three school model for secondary education in Guernsey with a preferred model. It is important to note that whatever the outcome of a review of selection, a three school model could include a grammar school.
- 5.7 Sections 2.2.9 – 2.2.15 of the November 2014 States Report on the LMDC project commenced an exploration of five scenarios “*to review the options which the Education Department has considered, should a decision be taken in the future by the States to change the Grammar School from being a selective entry institution. This scenario analysis was undertaken to ensure that the investment could be future proofed to allow flexibility dependent upon any future decision by the States of Deliberation on the issue of selection.*”

- 5.8 Following this initial analysis the Education Department concluded that there was a compelling case for the continuing requirement for the 600 pupil places to be located at the five-form entry LMDC High School and for up to 420 places for the two-form entry LMDC Primary School, and that the scenarios demonstrated that the rebuilding of the two schools would be “*selection neutral*” i.e. this investment could be recommended whatever the eventual outcome of the selection consultation and review.
- 5.9 The Education Department is firmly of a view that any consideration of a four to three model of secondary education requires a full public consultation. The Department believes that such an important change to the structure of education delivery on the Island requires the full engagement of all stakeholders, including professional staff, parents, students and the wider community. This is wholly consistent with the UK Independent Commission on Good Governance in Public Services which the States of Guernsey has also signed up to. Most specifically the final core Principle of Good Governance - ‘*Good Governance means engaging stakeholders and making accountability real*’ - is particularly pertinent.

6 Reviewing the size of the La Mare De Carteret High School

- 6.1 With respect to the specification of the High School redevelopment, the Review Panel reported that the impact of the 16% uplift on the design and area of St. Sampson’s and Les Beaucamps High Schools should be reviewed and evaluated to determine whether this improves educational outcomes or is required to successfully deliver a broad and balanced and modern curriculum before applying it to the La Mare de Carteret High School.
- 6.2 Similarly, the Review Panel has commented that the overall size of the La Mare de Carteret development and the way in which the areas have been calculated should be reviewed. They suggest that the current design appears over-sized for the High School but may be restricted elsewhere.
- 6.3 Finally, with respect to the High School, the Review Panel recommended that the design should be reviewed to ensure it is sufficiently flexible and innovative to support effective teaching, learning and a modern and relevant curriculum in line with the Education Department’s Vision Statement and Generic Design Brief.

Reviewing the Basis for the 16% Premium for the High School

- 6.4 The 16% uplift was agreed following an Independent Review commissioned by the Treasury and Resources Department in 2005. (Mrs Liz Fraser who was appointed to the Review Panel in December 2014 was also part of the 2005 Review Panel). The 2005 Panel acknowledged the following reasons for the uplift:

- the smaller class sizes and pupil: teacher ratio in Guernsey;
- the Education Development Plan's aims to ensure the new schools should be 'future proofed' for at least fifty years and be sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes in the curriculum, teaching styles, demographic trends and community needs;
- the impact of the generous pupil: teacher ratio and the smaller average group size on the accommodation;
- the impact of the high investment in ICT on all teaching areas;
- the impact of inclusion and an increase in the number of pupils with complex special educational needs including physical, emotional and behavioural problems in mainstream schools must be reflected in the quantity and quality of teaching and ancillary facilities, provision for visiting specialists and the design of circulation areas. The panel is persuaded that the bigger classrooms will facilitate the use of Guernsey's favourable staffing ratio to offer a flexibility to set by ability. We believe the schedules proposed generate adequate spaces for withdrawal and SEN support. The allowance generated for circulation should be sufficient to meet the many demands placed upon it; and
- the impact of increased community use of school premises for life-long learning and sport and recreation.

6.5 The Education Department maintains that the reasoning agreed by the Review Panel in 2005 still applies today, although flexible grouping of pupils can be put in place for many reasons and not only for setting by ability.

6.6 In reviewing this matter the Education Department has noted that the justifications given by the 2005 Review Panel for recommending a 16% Guernsey premium be applied to all three High Schools including La Mare de Carteret High School were not educational outcome based or outcome dependent, but focused on compensating for the differences in curriculum organisation, policy objectives and resource levels between the Guernsey and English education systems. Having considered this further, the Education Department firmly believes that these differences continue to exist and, if anything, are even more marked today.

6.7 At the outset the Education Department's view is that the most important asset in any school is the quality of teaching and learning and hence the contribution of the Headteacher, teachers and all staff are critically important factors to enable students to realise their full potential. Quality of buildings and facilities are secondary in this regard, but will play an important factor in being able to attract staff and also impact on students' sense of worth and esteem. Educational outcomes, in terms of both progress and attainment, will be determined by many factors and it is impossible to try to attribute improved educational outcomes simply to building improvements. However, Key Stage 4 (5 A*-C GCSE

including English and Maths) results for St. Sampson's High School and Les Beaucamps High School¹ from 2009 to 2013/14 in comparison to La Mare de Carteret are shown in the table below.

Key Stage 4 (5 A*-C GCSEs including English and Maths) from 2009-2014

| School % | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 3 year average 2012-14 | 6 year average 2009-14 |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| LBHS | 31.6 | 39.8 | 36.3 | 51.5 | 40.8 | 53.8 | 48.7 | 42.3 |
| SSH | 35.9 | 23.8 | 20.5 | 43.0 | 33.1 | 52.2 | 42.8 | 34.8 |
| LMDC | 25.0 | 24.0 | 11.5 | 42.0 | 23.4 | 40.6 | 35.3 | 27.8 |

- 6.8 Attempting to interpret these figures is fraught with difficulties. It could be argued that last year's figures at St. Sampson's High School (its best ever) were produced by the first cohort to 'travel' through the school benefitting from the new build from year 7 to year 11.
- 6.9 Likewise, it could be argued that Les Beaucamps High School students experienced an 'uplift' in results partly due to enhanced facilities. A drop in the previous year could be attributed to the transfer across from the old building. Results in both schools are more 'stable' now (i.e. less volatile) although it would be misleading to attribute this stability in results wholly down to the facilities.
- 6.10 In contrast, La Mare de Carteret High School struggles with 'stability' and the results are more likely to fluctuate for a number of reasons (e.g. cohort characteristics, such as attendance). The Education Department is aware of the view of many parents (and learners) that Les Beaucamps High School and St Sampson's High School must be better because they look better than La Mare de Carteret High School and this can also be linked to aspirations and mindset of the learners and their parents.
- 6.11 As noted above, attempting to attribute enhanced educational outcomes to new facilities is problematic because of the number of variables that contribute to educational attainment and progress. Shown below is a summary of key findings (with emphasis added) from US research² on the impact of school facilities on students and teachers which is based on a far wider population than Guernsey's two new High Schools.

¹ It should be noted that Les Beaucamps High School has only had one cohort of students since the opening of the new facilities in 2013/14.

² Research on the Impact of School Facilities on Students and Teachers - A Summary of Studies Published Since 2000 Outcomes

- a) 4-9% difference between students in schools in worst/best condition; 5-9% difference between students in oldest/newest schools; 4% difference in graduation rates between students in schools in worst/best condition and between students in oldest/newest schools.
- b) Higher suspension rates (2-9%), lower attendance rates in middle and high school (2-3%), lower test scores (~5%).
- c) The quality of school infrastructure has a significant effect on school attendance and drop-out rates. Students are less likely to attend schools in need of structural repair, schools that use temporary structures, and schools that have understaffed janitorial services.
- d) Changing from worst to best Overall Environmental Compliance Rating leads on average to a 36 point increase in a school's API (Academic Performance Index).
- e) Approximately 5% more teachers are likely to stay in a building in "A" condition vs. "F" condition.
- f) Percentage of students passing SOL (Standard of Learning) tests was 2.2-3.9% higher in English, mathematics and science in standard buildings than it was in substandard buildings.
- g) Approximately one-third of schools indicated that there was at least one factor that interfered with their ability to deliver instruction to at least a moderate extent (32 percent with regard to permanent buildings, and 35 percent with regard to portable buildings). Across the 9 factors, 6-16% of schools reported that each factor interfered with instruction.
- h) In schools with poor facilities, students attended less days on average and therefore had lower grades in ELA (English Language/Arts) and Math standardized tests. Attendance was found to be a full mediator for grades in ELA and a partial mediator for grades in Math.
- i) Teachers in schools in satisfactory conditions are significantly more likely to express positive attitudes about their classrooms than teachers in unsatisfactory buildings (across a wide range of indicators, but limited sample prevents causal inferences).
- j) Many positive correlations between building design variables and student achievement were reported.
- k) Results based on multilevel logistic and linear regressions indicate that students are sensitive to schools' ambience and that the association of various aspects of the school's physical environment with students' problem behaviours is positive for all students and greater for 10th-grade students than for 8th- and 12th-grade students.
- l) Significant relationships for facility measures explained 10-15% of the differences in student test scores across schools after controlling for student demographics.
- m) Poor facilities affect the health and productivity (attendance) of teachers and make retention of teachers difficult (especially for schools with a condition grade of "C" or less). On the academic side, a shift from the best facilities to the worst decreases student test performance by ~3% (in DC this is for both math and reading, in Chicago for % of students performing at/above grade level).

- n) The condition of school facilities has a measurable effect over and above socioeconomic conditions on student achievement and teacher experience/turnover. Most significantly, for every 10% reduction in the percent of portable facility sf/student, test scores increased by 11 points and for every 10% increase in deferred maintenance, average test scores decreased by 0.61 points.
- o) There is a significant relationship between building condition and test scores. Additionally, at least 75% of principals indicated that the adequacy of the school facility impacted teacher attitudes, teacher recruitment and retention, student behaviour, and parent and community attitudes and support.
- p) Significant relationships were found between high scores on all three design elements and test score results.

6.12 The Education Department believes that this comprehensive dataset of US empirical research clearly demonstrates the impact of quality of buildings on educational outcomes.

Reviewing the Overall Size of the High School

6.13 At the outset it is important to set the context by establishing the High School gross area as currently defined and this is shown in the table below:

| | m² |
|---|----------------------|
| High School including Sports (school use) | 6,883.7 |
| Community and Enhanced Sports | 1,751.9 |
| Communication and Autism Unit | 183.6 |
| Community Suite | 146.4 |
| Total Gross Area | 8,965.5 |

6.14 The proposed Gross Area of 8,966m² compares with the current High School area of 5,998m²

6.15 BB98 are non-statutory area guidelines for secondary school buildings. The process requires the authority to check that the number, size and type of rooms in new designs are at least that recommended for the six categories of usable space. Every mainstream school is expected to need at least the total net area recommended. The brief has to include a schedule of accommodation with the right number and type of teaching spaces to suit the school's curriculum.

6.16 BB98 strictly enforced in Guernsey would mean that the school would not be able to deliver its current curriculum. With regards to organisation, a 600 school in England would be four form entry whereas in Guernsey it is five form entry. BB98 allows that schools may then have further supplementary area over and above this minimum level. In this context, the supplementary areas include those areas which have been enlarged:

- to enhance school facilities for use by others than the school population;

- to accommodate extra support facilities; and
- to provide non-school provision not normally available to the school.

6.17 On this basis, the disaggregation of the proposed redevelopment of the High School is shown in the table below:

| | Calculation | M ² |
|---------------------------------|---|----------------|
| BB98 High School Net area | 1300 + 4.7 x 618 | 4,204.6 |
| BB98 High School Gross area (A) | 4,204.6 x 145% | 6,096.7 |
| Supplementary Net areas | | 1,435.8 |
| Supplementary Gross area (B) | 1,435.8 x 145% | 2,081.9 |
| Total Gross Area (C) | A+B | 8,178.6 |
| Designed Gross Area (D) | | 8,965.6 |
| Guernsey Premium (E) | Designed Gross (D) less Total Gross Area (C) | 787 |
| Actual % Premium | E/A | 12.9% |

- 6.18 The Education Department does not agree with the approach adopted by the Review Panel and does not accept that the High School is oversized by 27%. Most importantly, a reduction of 27% would have the effect of the High School not being able to offer the current curriculum and compromising the ability for adding any additional students in the future, if the States decides to move to three schools in the secondary phase.
- 6.19 The Education Department further notes that the Review Panel states that the La Mare de Carteret site *“also offers an opportunity in the longer term to increase the size of the school, should changes in policies result in the need for additional capacity. It should be designed therefore with the capacity to do this”*. The proposed redevelopment of the High School has been designed to enable it to be increased to a capacity of 960 in the future. A reduction of 27% as suggested by the Review Panel would compromise this potential expansion and hence the Department maintains that the current design is appropriate.

Reviewing the Flexibility of Design

- 6.20 Finally, the Education Department turns to consider, as requested by the Review Panel, whether the current design is sufficiently flexible or imaginative to meet the aims of the Education Department’s Vision for Education. The Review Panel cites as an example that a run of equally sized maths classrooms lined along one side of a corridor, may not meet the challenges of a changing and modern curriculum, support ‘personalised and engaging education’ or provide a particularly flexible or adaptable suite of spaces.
- 6.21 The Education Department has reviewed the design of the school and notes that the Design Brief has followed the exemplar baseline designs for schools now recommended by the English educational authorities as the epitome of fit for purpose, modern school buildings. The example given by the Review Panel of a

run of standard size classrooms is consistent with the baseline designs, as it is one of the most efficient and cost effective ways of delivering a curriculum and, where the classroom is the basic and most prevalent unit of accommodation in a school, it would be very difficult to avoid a run of classrooms, even if it were desirable to do so.

- 6.22 The Education Department has been advised by its cost consultants, Gardiner and Theobald (G&T), that many of the school designs built in England during the last 10 years of the Building Schools for the Future Programme (BSFP) have now been discredited. This has been borne out by the publication of the two James Reports commissioned by the UK Government as a Review of Education Capital³. The Guernsey schools rebuilds have never followed the BSFP route, being always primarily focused on function allied to good design, so that the stakeholder groups and the general community not only benefit from the facilities but also generally approve of the buildings.
- 6.23 In developing the La Mare de Carteret High School design, the Education Department has always considered value for money first and foremost but has also taken into account stakeholder feedback on the previous High School rebuilds and adopted modern baseline design principles. This includes: efficient wall to floor ratios; orthogonal forms with no curves or ‘faceted’ curves; maximising stacking where possible (e.g. uniformity of block height; and adherence to structural grid as much as possible to minimise transfer structures).
- 6.24 The design of the High School has been developed in anticipation of likely changes and to satisfy the key design principles of functionality, health and safety, a standardised approach and sustainability.
- 6.25 Having reviewed the design of the High School, the Education Department is able to reaffirm its belief that the design of the school will meet the challenges of a changing and modern curriculum, support personalised and engaging education and provide a flexible and an adaptable suite of spaces.

Summary

- 6.26 The Education Department, having reviewed the basis of the 16% premium for the High School, remains confident that it is appropriate for the La Mare de Carteret High School and does not wish now for Guernsey to start making the mistakes of the English approach to school rebuilds.
- 6.27 The Education Department is confident that the design is sufficiently flexible and innovative to support effective teaching, learning and a modern and relevant

³ Review of Education Capital” April 2011 and “Review of Education Capital: Progress Update” December 2013.

curriculum in line with the Education Department's Vision Statement and Generic Design Brief.

7 Financial Implications, Affordability and Benefits Register

Financial Implications

- 7.1 As highlighted in the Review Panel's Terms of Reference, the Treasury and Resources Department has responsibility for ensuring that projects deliver best value in respect of the required resources. The States of Deliberation supported the Amendment to the Education Department's States Report in November 2014 on the basis of seeking reassurances that the States would be realising value for money for this significant investment.
- 7.2 Whilst the Review Panel has made no recommendations regarding the redesign, scale and scope of the development, the Education Department has requested its cost consultants, Gardiner and Theobald (G&T), to estimate the financial implications of possible changes that might arise following the findings of the further reviews recommended by the Review Panel.
- 7.3 By way of background, G&T is an independent global consultancy offering a range of services to the construction and property industry. G&T provides project, cost and construction management for clients throughout the world with over 800 dedicated employees working on projects across the world with expertise in many sectors. The company provides assurance to clients in the public, private and third sectors.
- 7.4 G&T are accredited framework suppliers and members of key governmental advisory boards offering construction, property and facilities management advice, assurance, audits and reviews. Their team includes independent consultants, gateway reviewers and active project and cost managers. They work together to share experience and knowledge, benchmarking and analysing data across a wide variety of sectors for the benefit of their clients. In the Education sector, G&T's expertise is in advising and guiding clients through all project stages in order to deliver value for money.
- 7.5 G&T's knowledge sector and service specialists are at the forefront of developments within the education sector. In the past the company had considerable Building Schools for the Future (BSF) and Academies framework experience, all of which involved the delivery of schools within strict financial constraints and tight timescales. More recently they have been directly involved with the Education Funding Agency (EFA) on the development of baseline exemplar school designs. The EFA currently sets the standard for the specification and cost guidelines for primary and secondary schools in the UK. This has provided them with a comprehensive understanding and appreciation of the issues facing schools and a detailed insight into where school design will be moving in the next few years.

- 7.6 G&T are also appointed by the EFA to their technical advisors framework for the delivery of the Government's free schools programme. In order to achieve this, G&T had to demonstrate how it was able to manage cost and project risks within the very considerable financial constraints of the Government's Free School Programme. G&T are committed to supporting the aim of Education Sector clients to create the best learning environments to enable pupils to reach their potential. They do this by providing focused and relevant services to assist in achieving these objectives and helping education sector clients to achieve best value and the right quality at an acceptable price.
- 7.7 G&T's illustration of the potential cost and programme length impact on the Project is summarised in the following table and compared with the original cost plan for the programme recommended for adoption by the States in the November 2014 States Report. In the absence of precise definition in the Review Panel report of where areas might be reduced in the schools, the illustration takes three indicative scenarios of a reduction in areas starting with an approximate nominal removal of 950m² from the project and then considering the impact on cost if lesser reductions in areas were to be agreed.

Illustration of Financial Implications of Redesign Costs

| Programme | Total cost to completion | Additional cost above cost plan allowance | Cost to project above Programme A delay cost |
|--|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | |
| Current Cost Plan | £64,520,000 | £0 | £0 |
| Programme A – delay to April 2019 but no redesign | £66,130,000 | £1,610,000 | £0 |
| Programme B – 950m ² reduction in area and programme delay to Dec. 2019 | £66,060,000 | £1,540,000 | -£70,000 saving |
| Programme B1 – as Programme B but 75% of target area reduction achieved (713m ²) | £67,260,000 | £2,740,000 | £1,130,000 additional cost |
| Programme B2 – as Programme B but 50% of target area reduction achieved (475m ²) | £68,120,000 | £3,600,000 | £1,990,000 additional cost |

- 7.8 The dates shown in the table above refer, in each case, to full project completion, i.e. after the old schools have been demolished and all the external sports facilities, play areas, parking and landscaping are completed, not the opening dates for the schools:
- current cost plan : schools would have opened in **September 2017**
 - Programme A : schools will open **September 2018**
 - Programme B, B1 and B2 : schools can open **April 2019** – although there is a high education risk with a summer term opening should delays impact on public examinations.
- 7.9 In summary, as a result of the delays to the project and possible redesign costs, depending on the outcome of any further review the States of Guernsey, will incur additional costs of between £1.54m and £3.60m. The reduction in size of 960m² in the maximum illustrative example B shown above would generate a reduction in operating costs of c. £45,000 pa, with correspondingly less reduction in revenue costs in the Programmes B1 and B2.
- 7.10 The Education Department is fearful that with further delays the States of Guernsey will eventually end up paying more for less than what was originally proposed in November 2014.
- 7.11 The Education Department further notes the likelihood of redundancies in the local construction sector which were announced in the first week in February 2015 are fuelled, in part, by the lack of large States construction contracts. The Education Department raised the possibility of this economic contraction during the November States debate based on communications and feedback from the local Construction Industry Forum.

Affordability

- 7.12 The additional ongoing revenue costs for the Project were included in the final Outline Business Case (OBC) which was provided to the Treasury and Resources Department. The relevant extract from the OBC is shown below:

“It is estimated that based on the whole life costs of the investment provided by Gardiner & Theobald that the additional operating costs of the new schools and facilities will increase annual general revenue expenditure by £140,000 per annum. However the increase in expenditure may be mitigated by the growth in income generation activities from the recreational and community use of the school.”⁴

⁴ Note that the additional operating costs would be reduced by c. £40k pa if the illustrative redesign was chosen.

- 7.13 It should be noted that the ongoing revenue costs have been reduced by £100,000 per annum by the exclusion of a swimming pool at the site and these forecasts will continue to be refined and analysed as the project moves to the Final Business Case stage.
- 7.14 The Education Department expects that these additional operating costs will be mitigated by additional income generation, but any shortfall will have to be either absorbed within the Department's cash limit or additional income requested in future budgets.

Benefit Register

- 7.15 The Education Department recognises that the one of the key objectives of the Treasury and Resources Department in establishing the States Capital Investment Portfolio was that an increased focus was given to the identification of project benefits at an early stage so that the delivery of these can be monitored. The Benefit Register for this project was included in the OBC and to assist States members is now included as Appendix H to this States Report. This articulates the benefits and will allow them to be monitored and measured, in order to measure the overall success of the project in the future.

8 Consultation and Good Governance

- 8.1 The Law Officers have been consulted about the proposals and have not identified any legal difficulties with the recommendations.
- 8.2 The Education Department has consulted with the Culture and Leisure and Treasury and Resources Departments in the preparation of this States Report. The Education Department will continue to work with the Treasury and Resources Department to explain the need for the space premium prior to the States Debate. The Sports Commission has also been consulted in preparing the options appraisal and business case for the sports facilities and their comments are reflected in Appendix D.
- 8.3 In preparing this Report, the Education Department has been mindful of the States Resolution to adopt the six core principles of good governance defined by the UK Independent Commission on Good Governance in Public Services (Billet d'État IV of 2011). The Education Department believes that the proposals in this Report comply with those principles.

9. Recommendations

- 9.1 Having considered the Review Panel's Report and recommendations the Education Department recommends the States:
1. To approve the Education Department progressing to tender for the construction of the La Mare de Carteret Schools project comprising of:

- a) the replacement of the High School facilities for a five-form entry school for up to 600 students with scope for expansion for up to 960 students;
 - b) the replacement of two-form entry Primary School facilities for up to 420 pupils;
 - c) a replacement co-provisioned pre-school Nursery of up to 130m² adjacent to the Primary School for approximately 32 children aged 3-4 on a part-time attendance basis, allowing for groups of up to 16 children at any one time;
 - d) club level competition indoor Sports Hall facilities within the schools' new sports facilities, focused on completing the federated approach to the provision of shared resources for sport within the States secondary education sector, the avoidance of unnecessary duplication and optimising efficient dual-use school/community provision for netball, basketball and volleyball, as advised by the Culture and Leisure Department and the Guernsey Sports Commission;
 - e) the relocation of a Communication and Autism Base of up to 200m² placed between the two schools to provide a designated unit for up to 18 children in the Primary School and a designated unit for up to 18 children in the High School and to be the base for the provision of outreach services for Bailiwick school age children and for advice to pre-school providers; and
 - f) provision of community facilities for families and the older generation within the schools and sports buildings as a mix of a discrete access suite of rooms of 150m² as part of the Sports Building and through the sharing of school facilities.
2. To delegate authority to the Treasury and Resources Department to approve a capital vote, charged to the Capital Reserve, of a maximum amount of £60.2 million (excluding inflation) to fund the La Mare de Carteret Redevelopment project subject to satisfactory completion and review of the Full Business Case to ensure that the project represents value for money for the States.
3. To agree that there is a strong case for rationalising the education estate and to direct the Education Department:
- (a) to consult with all stakeholders, and
 - (b) to submit a report to the States by no later than March 2016 containing:
 - (i) recommendations regarding the optimal size, number and location of secondary schools to deliver a broad and balanced curriculum, and

- (ii) at least one option for moving from four to three secondary age schools.

Yours faithfully

R W Sillars
Minister

A R Le Lievre
Deputy Minister

R Conder
C J Green
P A Sherbourne

Appendices

- A The Brief for the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site
- B Review Panel Report
- C Nursery
- D Enhanced Sports Facilities
- E Community Facilities
- F Primary School
- G Communication and Autism Base
- H Benefit Register

APPENDIX A: The Brief for the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site

Description, purpose, area and construction cost (based on Stage 3 Cost Plan issued December 2014)

A.1 High School and Primary School

- A.2 Replacement five-form entry High School facilities for up to 600 11-16 age pupils, with scope for expansion to eight-form entry for 960 pupils and replacement two-form entry Primary School facilities for up to 420 4-11 age pupils.
- A.3 Purpose: to enhance the opportunities for pupils in both schools to receive excellent teaching and learning and provide equality of educational opportunity. The planned scope for the schools will meet the SED's educational drivers of curriculum and organisation, teaching and pedagogy, behaviour and pastoral care, special educational needs and disabilities and health and well-being. At its most fundamental level, replacement is essential because the condition of the present buildings renders them no longer fit for purpose and because there will be a continuing "basic need" for pupil places to be met.
- A.4 Area and cost: the High School will have a gross internal area of 6547m², which has been calculated using the States approved Education area standards as applied for St. Sampson's High School and Les Beaucamps High School. The construction cost of the High School is estimated to be £19,780,000. The Primary School will have a gross internal area of 2565m². This area has been calculated by applying the same locational uplift standards approved for the Guernsey secondary schools, and cross referenced with the area per pupil standards in the other States' Primary Schools in Guernsey. The construction cost of the Primary School is estimated to be £8,780,000.

Pre-school Nursery

- A.5 A replacement pre-school nursery adjacent to the LMDC Primary school, to replace the Happy Days Nursery currently funded by the Social Security Department, for approximately 30 children aged 3-4 on a part-time attendance basis, allowing for groups of up to 16 children at any one time.
- A.6 Purpose: to be part of the strategic provision of pre-school services described in the Education Department's States Report "The Introduction of a Universal Entitlement to Pre-school Education" May 2014. The Education Department's report to the States was to support pre-school education by making available States funding for up to 15 hours per week of attendance for 3 and 4 year olds within a pre-school setting generally provided by the private sector or other agencies. A part of these proposals was to provide accommodation within two or three primary school sites for pre-school facilities for up to 32 children on a maximum 16 per session part time attendance in partnership with other agencies. LMDC Primary currently provides such facilities for the Happy Days Nursery on its site in association with Social Security and other agencies, and these new

replacement facilities are intended to improve on this accommodation and to contribute to the development of the use of the LMDC facilities as an “all through” education environment.

- A.7 Area and cost: the nursery will have a gross internal area of 130m². The construction cost is estimated at £443,000.

Sports Facilities

- A.8 Club competition level indoor sports facilities within the schools’ new Sports Building allowing provision of a larger sports hall with spectator seating for school and inter- school tournaments, club league level indoor sports tournaments, and utilising shared access to an integral community suite of rooms (see below) and relevant associated schools facilities such as the High School’s cafeteria, reception areas, function rooms and parking.
- A.9 Purpose: to be focused on optimising efficient dual-use school/community provision for netball, basketball and volleyball, as advised by the Culture and Leisure Department and the Guernsey Sports Commission. The Education Department has established a federated approach to the sharing of facilities and staff within the secondary sector of Education. The LMDC schools’ site will be the only States maintained schools site in Guernsey able to provide a venue for competitions and tournaments at school, club and inter-insular level on match play sized courts with accommodation for sizeable number of spectators (up to 270 in fixed seating in a tiered gallery above the sports hall and reached from the main school building, and up to 500 with the addition of tiered staging for larger events).
- A.10 This facility, supporting both the schools’ competitive sports agenda as well as the community sports associations requirements, will make LMDC the Island focus for indoor sporting competition and will complement the competitive swimming and Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) facilities at St Sampson’s High School and the Outdoor Activities sports facilities at Les Beaucamps.
- A.11 Establishing the LMDC site as the focus for year round indoor sports training and competition is only affordable because of the decision not to include a school swimming pool as provided at the other two high schools and the Grammar School, in view of the sufficiency of pools already available within the education estate. It is consistent with the concept of a federated approach to the provision of sporting facilities within the Island’s secondary sector schools and the strategic vision set out by the Sports Commission for sharing the responsibility for providing a comprehensive range of sporting facilities without duplication between relevant States Departments and the private sector in a number of venues.

- A.12 It will support the concept of local centres in the Island having multi-use community facilities as well as potentially generating income for the sports tourism hospitality sector. The hall space with its associated external infrastructure of level access, parking facilities and public transport links will also be able to host other events such as exhibitions, concerts and Island gatherings as well as providing a large enough Assembly space for the whole school should it expand to 960 pupils.
- A.13 Area and cost: The Sports Building at Les Beaucamps had a total gross internal area of 2427m² and cost £7.54m uplifted for inflation. By not including a swimming pool at LMDC and rationalising the other sports facilities areas in the building, the Education Department has been able to use the gained area to provide, within the same overall area as at Les Beaucamps, facilities for competitive match play, a Communication and Autism Centre and a community suite of rooms.
- A.14 The LMDC Sports building has a total gross internal area of 2078m² of which 557m² provides for the larger Sports Hall and spectator and match play facilities. The overall cost of the Sports Building without the additional 557m² is £5,295,000. The additional cost for the enhanced facilities is £1,935,000. This total cost for the sports building facilities of £7,230,000 compares with the LBHS cost uplifted for inflation for its sports building at current cost but excluding external works, fees, inflation moving forward.

Communication and Autism Service Unit

- A.15 A relocated Communication and Autism Support Service unit in a building linking the High School and the Primary School to provide a bases for up to 18 children in the Primary School and for up to 18 children in the Secondary phase and to be the satellite base for the provision of outreach services for Bailiwick school age children and advice to pre-school providers. The Outreach Service currently has over 150 children on its case load. The base will provide a classroom each for the primary and secondary age children with associated soft rooms, sensory rooms and small group rooms. The children in the bases will be formally registered on the rolls of the two LMDC schools and will be able to participate as fully as possible with the other school pupils in the daily activities of the mainstream schools, whilst still having access to specialised facilities and care.
- A.16 Purpose: relocating the two units from their individual bases in two other schools where the accommodation is cramped, inadequate and with few small rooms for individualised support for the children will enable the creation of a centre of excellence within the context of a co-located schools environment. Increases in productivity and better quality of service to Guernsey's young people are expected in this area. The ongoing running costs of the Communication and Autism Service are not anticipated to increase as a result of

the co-location, but there may also be some benefits arising from the opportunity cost of vacating the current premises in the two schools.

- A.17 Area and cost: the Communication and Autism Service Unit will have a gross internal area of 200m². The construction cost is estimated at £840,000.

Community and Social Facilities Suite of rooms

- A.18 Community facilities for families and the older generation within the schools and sports buildings through provision of a small suite of rooms of 150m² which will occupy a corner of the Sports Building at the heart of the site and through the sharing of school facilities within the schools buildings and grounds, sometimes within school hours but also for evenings, weekends and school holiday use.
- A.19 Purpose: to align functionally with the use of the schools and the provision of a pre-school nursery to provide a site maximising its facilities for community use by families and the elderly. The suite would be part of general community access to the facilities provided in the two schools. This has received initial support from the Housing Department and the Health and Social Services Department and is currently being further evaluated.
- A.20 There is a shortage of community meeting facilities in the local centre of Cobo. The redevelopment of St. Matthew's Church Hall is now underway and the Education Department has met with the trustees of the new facility and confirmed that the redevelopment of the La Mare de Carteret schools will offer different but complementary facilities for the community. The great advantage of the LMDC site for its use by the local community - of families, the elderly, and those with disabilities - is its level access, the pedestrian only routes to the site, parking availability and its proximity to local housing estates, social housing, other local facilities and the "local node", as outlined in the "Analysis of Potential Local Centres" document 2013 published by the Environment Department.
- A.21 This document describes Cobo as a "well established compact centre with a variety of uses serving the surrounding area, including convenience shopping, petrol station, pub, café, takeaway and restaurant, bank, hairdressers and GP flat terrain aids walkability of centre good network of pedestrian only routes adds to the distinctive character of the centre and connects Cobo with Saumarez Park adequately served by buses with connections to St. Peter Port and St. Sampson's presence of strong green wedge around the school providing access to open space."
- A.22 The LMDC site design allows for a mixture of discrete and shared facilities within the schools and sports buildings for families and the elderly, so that access is securely provided without compromise to the security of staff and pupils, and so that schools facilities can be utilised, for example by access to

libraries, ICT, workshops, and catering facilities, outside of school hours, as well by the provision of meeting spaces with basic refreshment facilities so that outreach services can have a secure base for meetings and activities. This may also generate some income revenue from hirers. A reference example is the shared community and HSSD facilities provided at St Martin's Community Centre.

- A.23 Initial talks have taken place with the Guille-Allès Library for community use of the libraries in both the Primary and High Schools and it is expected that other agencies will wish to use the community suite for occasional drop-in sessions and small meetings once the buildings are opened.
- A.24 Area and cost: the Community suite will have a gross internal area of 150m². The construction cost is estimated at £525,000.
- A.25 Total gross building area. Up to 11,670m² (the High School (including the sports Building the Community suite and the Communication and Autism Service Unit) at 8,974m² and the Primary School (including the Pre-school Nursery) at 2,695.5m².

Summary breakdown of areas and costs:

| Areas | £ | m ² |
|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|
| High School | 19,780,000 | 6547 |
| Sports Building | 5,295,000 | 1521 |
| Sports Hall Matchplay facilities | 1,935,000 | 557 |
| Total Sports | 7,230,000 | 2078 |
| Community Suite | 525,000 | 150 |
| Communication and Autism Centre | 840,000 | 200 |
| Primary School | 8,780,000 | 2565 |
| Pre-school Nursery | 443,000 | 130 |
| Total | 37,598,000 | 11670 |
| External Works | 12,495,000 | |
| Fees | 4,715,000 | |
| FFE/ ICT /AV | 2,945,000 | |
| Total | 57,753,000 | |
| Central Costs | 2,077,000 | |
| TOTAL | 59,830,000 | EXCLUDES INFLATION |

Note figures include contingency.

| Areas | Cost Plan | | 360 Expansion | | 240 Expansion | | Total Expansion 360 + 240 | |
|--------------------------|------------|-------|------------------|-------|------------------|-------|---------------------------------|-------|
| | £ | m² | £ | m² | £ | m² | m² | m² |
| High School | 19,780,000 | 6,547 | 12,990,000 | 3,924 | 8,650,000 | 2,616 | 21,640,000 | 6,540 |
| Sports Building | 5,295,000 | 1,521 | | | | | | |
| Sports Hall Matchplay | 1,935,000 | 557 | | | | | | |
| Total Sports | 7,230,000 | 2,078 | | | | | | |
| Community Suite | 525,000 | 150 | | | | | | |
| Communication and Autism | 840,000 | 200 | | | | | | |
| Primary School | 8,780,000 | 2,565 | | | | | | |
| Pre-school Nursery | 443,000 | 130 | | | | | | |
| Total | 37,598,000 | 11670 | 11,840,000 | 3,924 | 7,940,000 | 2,616 | 19,780,000 | 6,540 |
| External Works | 12,495,000 | | 3,600,000 | | 2,400,000 | | 6,000,000 | |
| Fees | 4,715,000 | | 1,700,000 | | 1,150,000 | | 2,850,000 | |
| FFE/ ICT /AV | 2,945,000 | | 1,040,000 | | 700,000 | | 1,740,000 | |
| Total | 57,753,000 | | 18,180,000 | | 12,190,000 | | 30,370,000 | |
| Central Costs | 2,077,000 | | | | | | | |
| T | 59,830,000 | | | | | | | |

Note figures include contingency.

Note figures exclude inflation.

APPENDIX B

LA MARE DE CARTERET SCHOOLS PROJECT

INDEPENDENT REVIEW

FINAL REPORT

February 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Section | Page |
|---|------|
| 1 Introduction | 3 |
| 2 Terms of Reference..... | 3 |
| 3 The Independent Review Panel..... | 3 |
| 4 Approach..... | 3 |
| 5 Scope and Scale | 4 |
| 6 Specification | 12 |
| 7 Life span and proposed build specification | 15 |
| 8 Other issues relevant to ensuring best value..... | 15 |
| 9 Conclusions and recommendations | 16 |
| Appendix 1: Terms of reference..... | 17 |
| Appendix 2: Documentation received | 20 |
| Appendix 3: List of meetings and visits..... | 23 |

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report is a summary of the findings from the Independent Review Panel commissioned by the Treasury and Resources (T&R) Department to make recommendations as to the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the La Mare de Carteret (LMDC) schools project, in light of the Education Department's proposals for the redevelopment of the site and the need to demonstrate best value for the States overall.

2 Terms of Reference

- 2.1 Specifically, the review is to address:

- 2.1.1 Scope and scale of the proposed schools and additional facilities

- Pupil capacity requirements
- Resultant size of the schools
- The need for additional facilities within the Guernsey context

- 2.1.2 Specification

- Space guidelines appropriate for classrooms and other school areas for the delivery of the Guernsey curriculum
- Life span and the proposed build specifications for the project considering the whole life cost in the context of seeking overall best value

- 2.1.3 General

- Any other issues considered by the panel to be relevant to ensuring best value for the project

- 2.2 The full Terms of Reference for the review are included at Appendix 1.

3 The Independent Review Panel

- 3.1 The Review Panel comprised the following:

Dr Chris Nicholls CBE (Chair) – Educationalist
 Sue Archer - Gleeds Advisory Ltd, chartered surveyor specialising in education construction
 Liz Fraser - Architect specialising in education design
 Andy Mahon - BDO LLP, management consultant and accountant specialising in public sector procurement of schools and other major capital projects

4 Approach

- 4.1 The Review Panel was first convened on 10 December 2014 when they met the Education Minister and the Treasury and Resources (T & R) Minister amongst others. The Panel subsequently had meetings with a wide range of stakeholders over the course of five days on site in Guernsey (7-9 January and 14-15 January) and reviewed a substantial library of documentation provided by T&R and Education officials. A list of the meetings we have had and the key documentation which we have received and reviewed is included at Appendices 2 and 3.

- 4.2 We would like to thank all that met with us and shared their views on the review. We are very grateful for their time given so willingly to us.
- 4.3 We recognise that there are a significant number of States policy decisions which have guided and shaped the proposed scope and scale of the project, including the Education Development Plan which dates back to 2002. Whilst we have sought to understand these policies, our review has focused on the needs of the project as they are today. If we believe that an existing policy would benefit from challenge and potential review, then we have raised the matter in our report.

5 Scope and Scale

- 5.1 Alongside ensuring strategic fit with current States policies, key business drivers for the need to re-build the LMDC primary and secondary schools are stated as:
- Condition of the schools
 - Basic need (pupil places)
- 5.2 We have visited both schools and concur with the view that the condition of the school buildings is such that they are no longer suitable and that this needs to be addressed in some way.

Primary School

- 5.3 The business case for the primary school is for a two form entry (2FE) school for up to 420 pupils. However, the LMDC primary school is currently designated a Social Priority School, for which it is current States' Education Department policy to have maximum average class sizes of 25, rather than the usual 28. This means that, with the 14 classrooms proposed in the design, unless this policy changes, the maximum number of pupils in the school would actually be 350. This compares to a current roll of circa 281.
- 5.4 Providing a 2FE school will result in some spare capacity, even at forecast population peaks. We recognise, however, that any further work on primary school rationalisation may result in an increase in pupil numbers at LMDC. Also, a primary school at the LMDC site is an important community facility. A one form entry (1FE) school for 281 pupils would not be sufficient to meet current demand, as well as being unsatisfactory from an educational perspective. The Education Department's 'Transforming Primary Education, 2013' proposes 'moving to a policy of having 2 FE primary schools as far as possible to improve educational outcomes, increase efficiency and ensure greater consistency in performance'. We support, therefore, the proposals for a 2FE primary school at LMDC.

Secondary School

- 5.5 Population data and pupil place planning:

The current (January 2015) position in terms of places available and current capacity at Guernsey secondary schools is shown below.

| | Places available | Current pupils on roll | Excess capacity |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Colleges (private sector) 11-16 | 1000 | 867 | 133 |
| Grammar school (11-16) | 600 | 461 | 139 |
| St Sampson's | 720 | 698 | 22 |
| Les Beaucamps | 660 | 513 | 147 |
| La Mare de Carteret | 600 | 439 | 161 |
| Total | 3,580 | 2,978 | 602 |

5.6 The headline numbers above show significant excess capacity and bring into question the need for further build. We comment on this in detail later in the report.

5.7 The numbers on roll do show that Guernsey is operating small schools - only St Sampson's could be regarded as "medium" in size. We understand that this is a consequence of States' policy, and recognize the impact of geography and the overall size of the Guernsey community, but our view is that this may mean that the current system does not offer best value. There are no benefits of economies of scale, and it can be difficult to deliver the best educational opportunity, as a rich and varied curriculum becomes expensive (on a per pupil basis) to provide in small schools. In particular we highlight:

- Having four schools (including the Grammar) with a current total roll of 2,111 11-16 students (January 2015) means that the delivery of the Guernsey curriculum comes at a significant cost. We understand that Education policy is to have a teacher: pupil ratio of 1:15. From the information we have been given on current pupil numbers the teacher: pupil ratios at the three high schools are 1:11.3, 1:12.5, and 1:12.7. Whilst the Grammar School is a 'small' school in terms of 11-16 numbers on roll, it benefits from having the post-16 provision and the ability to share teaching resource across the two groups.
- The combination of running schools with excess capacity, combined with a building specification of BB98 plus 16% and the policy of maximum average class sizes of no more than 24 (whilst BB98 is based on class sizes of 30), means that space in the schools is likely to be under-utilised.

5.8 The Education Department's business case for the secondary school is for a five form entry (5FE) school for up to 600 pupils (based on a maximum average class size, as per Education policy, of 24 students). The business case bases this need on a pupil forecast model which shows a peak demand for secondary school places at the three State high schools (LMDC, Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's) plus the Grammar School of 2,471 places in 2026. [The business case added a 5% 'safety net' with which the potential number of students would peak at 2,594.] These figures compare with a capacity of 2,580 places, assuming the rebuild of 600 places at LMDC. In the years

leading up to, and then after that peak, there would be spare capacity in the system over the projected life span of the buildings.

- 5.9 During the course of this review, however, we have received two new sets of pupil forecasts:
- An updated version of the OBC model from the Education Department, updated to reflect current actual student numbers, 2014 Government Actuaries Department (GAD) forecasts and with some minor amendments to assumptions on movement to the independent sector.
 - An independent report commissioned by T&R and produced by Dorey Financial Modelling ('Guernsey School Population Risks').
- 5.10 Both forecasts are based on current student numbers and latest GAD data. However, they differ in terms of other assumptions made, most notably the likely levels of net inward migration. The forecast numbers therefore do differ. However, what is consistent is that:
- The shape of the 'curve' shows a rise in numbers to a peak in 2026/2027, followed by decline.
 - Even at peak numbers, the anticipated total number of students at the four schools is likely to be significantly lower than that forecast in the Outline Business Case (OBC) model and comfortably below the total maximum capacity if a 600 place school at LMDC is built as proposed. (Education's model shows a peak of 2,371 students against that capacity of 2,580 places). Beyond the peak, numbers decline steadily to a figure of 2,182 in 2042. Under Dorey's projections the expected decline is steeper, to a likely figure below 2,100 in 2040.
- 5.11 We appreciate that it may be prudent to retain some level of flexibility within the system (whilst recognising that it comes at a cost). On current forecasts, at peak, this would potentially be around 8%, but would then rise steadily to somewhere between 15% and 20% by 2040. Decisions on overall capacity requirements should also, however, consider factors which lie outside of those taken into account in the base forecasts referred to above, most notably:
- potential changes in States policy on selection. If selection is no longer applied, typical spare capacity in the Grammar School, created by capping the number of students selected each year, could be more readily filled.
 - potential policies to stimulate inward migration.
 - potential changes in the independent sector. Given the high proportion of students in the independent sector (just below 30%) any significant change in that sector could also have a significant impact on the number of places needed in the State sector.
- 5.12 It is recognised in the Dorey report that such factors could create a level of volatility in the population forecasts. Given this and given the differing versions of student number forecasts which have been produced for this review we strongly recommend that the States agrees a base population forecast model which will be used as the basis for future decisions, including decisions as a result of this review, on school provision.
- 5.13 In terms of planning for pupil capacity needs with any confidence it would have been beneficial for the States to have made a clear decision on the long term future of the selection policy and the Grammar School. Without such clarity, in considering the value for money of creating excess capacity in the system by providing 600 places at

LMDC, the States will need to consider carefully the likely long term requirements for such capacity.

- 5.14 Whilst recognising that it may be prudent to retain a level of flexibility in terms of overall capacity, we do not believe, on the evidence of the current population forecasts, that there is an absolutely clear case for creating a total capacity of 2,580 secondary places, which a rebuild of 600 places at LMDC would create. Even at peak demand, it would create 200 to 300 (depending on the version of population forecasts used) 'spare' places within the total State system and beyond that, significantly more. This excess capacity in terms of places is exacerbated by decisions made in terms of the total space available in the new schools at Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's and proposed school at LMDC, which we comment on later in the 'Specification' section.

Options which could be considered

- 5.15 There are a range of possible courses of action, all of which come with some associated risk and / or broader implications for States policy and States services. In considering them, we believe it is critical that the States does so in full understanding of the implications of each, and not just in cost terms. It is also critical that they are considered in the context of the current position in respect of education provision within the Bailiwick, which reflects the policy choices which have been made in previous years. In particular, under the current selection policy, it is unlikely that all of the places at the Grammar school will ever be filled (as the intake is 'capped' at the top 25% of students).

Option One:

- 5.16 A radical proposal would be to close LMDC High School.
- 5.17 This would maximise use of the existing asset base, and educationally, would provide larger school rolls and with them the ability to deliver the Guernsey curriculum more efficiently and effectively. There is however insufficient capacity (308 places, including the Grammar School) to house current numbers (439) and the problem would be exacerbated by the projected increase in school population. We understand that there is room to build 240 additional places at St Sampson's which would answer current need, but probably not future demand. The extent of the places shortfall might not be unmanageable however and would only apply in the peak years.
- 5.18 Having said this, such an approach would severely limit any future flexibility in capacity. We are of the opinion that there is no real opportunity to expand Les Beaucamps and we consider that further expansion at St Sampson's to deal with the volatility that might be caused by future policy shifts (eg on selection or migration) would also be problematic. Full occupation of the Grammar school would already require such policy change.
- 5.19 Most importantly, we note the huge negative impact on the local community, if no secondary school were built. It would also mean that the sports facilities which are proposed, and which will also benefit the wider community, are unlikely to be delivered on this site. We do not recommend this option.

Option two:

- 5.20 A second option would be to construct a smaller High school at LMDC (for example a 4FE 480 place school or a 3FE 360 place school).

- 5.21 This approach would help manage overall capacity in the system whilst also ensuring the local community has access to not only a high quality school building, but also to the sport and community facilities planned for the site.
- 5.22 Our view, however, is that a secondary school of this size, standing alone (although within the Federation as it is currently envisaged) would not be viable educationally and specifically in terms of delivering the Guernsey curriculum. This is also, we understand, the view of the Education Department.
- 5.23 Such a model might be more feasible were the Federation to become more integrated, for example, so that LMDC was less 'stand-alone' and, at least, sharing staff and management with other schools. The school could be designed as an all through school for pupils ages 5-16 to address some of the educational issues of such a small secondary school.
- 5.24 While this is another option the States could consider, we question the wisdom of building a secondary school for fewer than 600 pupils and so we do not recommend this option.

Option three:

- 5.25 A final option would be to rebuild LMDC, as planned, as a 600 capacity school.
- 5.26 Building as currently proposed would allow the wider social and community objectives of the project to be realised (subject to our comments elsewhere in this report on the justification, scope and scale for these proposed additional facilities). However, as highlighted above, providing a 600 place school does create some surplus capacity in the system both now and in the longer term. It does, however, ensure there is long term flexibility to cope with changes in policies on selection and migration and the LMDC site also offers an opportunity in the longer term to increase the size of the school, should changes in policies result in the need for additional capacity. It should be designed therefore with the capacity to do this.
- 5.27 We re-iterate the importance of the outcome of the debate on the future of selection to the model of education provision. However, the population forecasts indicate that school rolls will be such that, even with management of catchment areas and retention of selection, average numbers on roll will be 'small' (circa or just below 600 students). For the reasons we comment on earlier in the report, regarding the challenges of running a model of small schools, from both an educational and cost perspective, we would strongly recommend that the States consider the potential benefits, in the longer term, of moving from a four school model to a three school one, something which the flexibility offered by the LMDC project would help to facilitate. We recognise that such a move would require very careful consideration by the States, not least of the variables around student numbers which we comment on in the report. If it were approved, there are then many factors which would influence when, and in particular how, such a move may be best implemented, not least the need for any move to be managed sensitively and in a way which does not impact on educational outcomes during transition. Given the need for this to be properly and carefully considered, we take no view, therefore, as to how or when it could or should be achieved.
- 5.28 We are also aware of plans for significant capital expenditure on the future model for the Further Education (FE) College and, linked to the recommendation above, would pose the question as to whether there is an opportunity for the FE requirements to be met, in whole or in part, through the school accommodation portfolio, thus potentially saving significant amounts of future capital expenditure.

- 5.29 The rebuild of LMDC as a 600 capacity school, with the potential to expand in the medium to long term, therefore, is our recommended option with the proviso that the States should consider the longer term opportunities for rationalising educational provision and maximising the use of the full education estate.
- 5.30 Proceeding with this option without significant future increase in school population or rationalisation of current provision would, in our view, perpetuate uneconomic provision.

Summary:

- The LMDC primary school should be rebuilt as a 2 Form Entry primary school.
- Given the differing versions of student number forecasts which have been produced for this review we recommend that the States agrees a base population forecast model which will be used as the basis for future decisions, including decisions as a result of this review, on school provision.
- The current model of delivering secondary education with four small schools and surplus spaces in the system is expensive in both staffing and building running costs. It is harder and more expensive to deliver a broad and dynamic curriculum in smaller schools.
- We question the wisdom of building a secondary school for less than 600 pupils and do not recommend this option although it would reduce the number of surplus spaces in the system. The LMDC site probably provides the best flexibility to meet future changes.
- Our preferred option is to provide a 600 place secondary school at the LMDC site and for the States to consider the opportunities for optimising the use of its estate and rationalising educational provision, including Further Education, taking into account the optimal size, number and location of schools required to deliver a broad and balanced curriculum.

Additional facilities at LMDC

- 5.31 The LMDC project as defined includes four additional facilities which are linked to the primary and secondary school development. These are:
- A replacement co-provisioned nursery for up to 32 children (16 FTE) adjacent to and linked to the primary school. This is designed to be privately run and managed.
 - Relocated Communication and Autism Support Service facilities for up to 18 Primary and 18 Secondary children, linked to both the Primary and Secondary schools by a covered way.
 - Enhanced sports facilities to provide club level competition facilities for netball, volleyball and basketball, enabling regional competition as well as club level and community sport.
 - Community facilities for families and the elderly.
- 5.32 We consider each of these proposals in turn below:

Nursery provision

- 5.33 Given the level of social deprivation in the immediate locality (which emphasises the need for early intervention) and the contraction of supply in the area (the closure of two local nurseries), we strongly support the provision of the nursery at LMDC particularly in the light of the proposed policy of all pupils in the year prior to reception being offered 15 hours per week of funded early education from September 2016.
- 5.34 In light of this new policy, we have some reservations as to whether the proposed nursery provision at LMDC will be sufficiently large (in terms of capacity) to meet demand for places for all pupils in the year prior to reception, and may indeed significantly impact on the availability of spaces for younger children. We would suggest some further modelling of likely capacity requirements is undertaken before the scale of the development is confirmed. The offer of wraparound childcare provision may also be considered at the nursery to support the local community back into education and work. This could also impact on the scope, scale and location of the proposed nursery as we believe there may be considerable advantages in it being adjacent to the Primary School reception class whilst maintaining its independence.

Communication and Autism support services

- 5.35 We have visited the existing primary autism facility at Amherst. We agree that this facility, whilst providing an excellent service, is in sub-standard and unsuitable accommodation and should be replaced. Although it could, in principle, be located at one of a number of primary school sites, there are distinct economies of scale from building it alongside the new LMDC primary school.
- 5.36 The current secondary facility at St Sampson's is in relatively good quality accommodation. There are, however, educational, service delivery and management advantages benefits in having primary and secondary provision co-located, and, subject to the secondary school development going ahead, we would recommend that this plan is followed.
- 5.37 Given the overall school age population, the proposed capacity of up to 36 (18 Primary and 18 Secondary) students in total would seem appropriate. Co-locating the primary and secondary units allows for flexibility in the number of pupils at each stage within the overall total capacity.

Enhanced sports facilities

- 5.38 As part of this review we have met with representatives from the Culture and Leisure department, the Sports Commission and the Netball Association, and the case as presented orally in that meeting is a more persuasive one than that set out in the project documentation. We were particularly impressed with their aspiration for 'centres of excellence' for netball, basketball and volleyball.
- 5.39 The scale of the facility proposed - essentially to include a competition level sports hall and supporting changing and spectator facilities - will enable them to compete in regional level competition and, ultimately, achieve levels of success and participation that other sports on the island have been able to achieve through competing effectively at that level. The island's basketball team, for example, is unable to play fixtures at home and has to travel to Southampton to play home fixtures. Netball uses the court at Beau Sejour, but, when used, takes out the whole sports hall for up to three days, meaning significant levels of lost income from community use and a high cost to the Netball Association. Court markings are also confusing for players and, when temporary spectator seating is used, run-off areas are unsatisfactory.

- 5.40 There will almost certainly be a net ongoing cost to developing these additional facilities, as the income from the (relatively) infrequent use for major / regional competition will be unlikely to cover the additional capital and running costs (as borne out by the OBC projections). We are surprised, therefore, that this is coming forward as a proposal from the Education Department, rather than as a costed option appraisal and business case from the Culture and Leisure Department and the Sports Commission (an appraisal which would have included, for example options such as extending existing facilities at Beau Sejour, if only to evidence why those options may be less deliverable and poorer value than building at LMDC). We are aware that these two parties have been in close dialogue with Education throughout, but, from outside, it seems odd that this is an Education led project. As such, we would class these facilities as 'highly desirable' rather than 'essential'.
- 5.41 For the aims and aspirations of the Culture and Leisure Department and the Sports Commission to be met there will need to be a proper management plan for the facility, recognising that it will be an island facility and community resource, rather than a school sports hall that is rented out of hours.

Community facilities

- 5.42 The proposal is for a small suite of rooms to be used both during and outside school hours, for community use by families and the elderly.
- 5.43 In the OBC the suggestion is that this may allow the Kindred Centre on the Les Genats estate to transfer to these rooms and thus release two houses back into the social housing pool. Our understanding, however, is that this is not now likely, and these facilities will be additional to the existing Kindred Centre.
- 5.44 The need for additional community facilities is supported by a range of indices and data indicating levels of deprivation, for example the high number of pupils on the child protection register, children in receipt of school uniform bursaries and numbers in social housing.
- 5.45 High quality community facilities do make the local population feel valued, and have been proven through international research to have a positive impact on outcomes for children, as well as contributing to wider regeneration of deprived areas. We understand that provision of community facilities (as long as they have a clear purpose and function) is supported by States' Health and Social Services (HSSD).
- 5.46 We would, therefore, support the provision of community facilities within the proposed project. We do, however, have some concerns regarding the scope and specification of the facilities, especially as they are not now intended to replace the Kindred Centre. From our discussions the proposed use of the facilities and how they will relate to other current and future community provision remains unclear.

Summary:

- *Nursery.* We fully support the provision of the nursery at LMDC but strongly recommend a review of the capacity of the nursery, particularly in the light of the new policy of provision for all pupils in the year before reception.
- *Communication and Autism Unit.* We fully support the replacement of the current poor accommodation for Primary pupils at Amherst. We fully concur with the educational, service and management benefits of co-locating the primary and secondary units with the High School and Primary School at the LMDC site.

- *Enhanced sports facilities.* While the enhanced sports facilities appear to be highly desirable in providing competition level facilities for the three key sports of netball, basketball and volleyball, the provision of such facilities on this site should be supported by an options appraisal and business case from the Culture and Leisure Department. Furthermore if it is to successfully function as an island wide facility as well as local community resource, as opposed to a school sports hall that is rented out of hours, there will need to be a clear management plan and funding for its operation.
- *Community facilities.* While the need for additional community facilities is supported by a range of indices and data indicating levels of deprivation, further work needs to be done in conjunction with stakeholders to determine the scope and purpose of these facilities taking into account current and planned community provision, and how they are to be managed.

6 Specification

This part of the review considers the area standards and design of the Primary School and High school to support the delivery of the Guernsey curriculum as well as the other additional facilities on site.

Primary school

- 6.1 The primary school has been designed to an area specification of the UK Building Bulletin (BB) 99 plus a 'Guernsey factor' of 16%.
- 6.2 This 16% enhancement comes from the findings of the Review of Secondary School standards undertaken in 2005 which, when introduced, was not intended to be applied to primary schools. As far as we are aware, this Guernsey bonus has never been specifically tested for its appropriateness in a primary context. The overall gross area of the proposed Primary School is, therefore, some 350 sq m larger than that which we would normally expect to see for a primary school of this capacity, (420 pupils).
- 6.3 BB99 area standards for the size of individual classrooms are based on an average class size of 30. The Guernsey policy of the lower maximum average class sizes of 25 for LMDC, which we support from an educational perspective, means that classroom space is generous. The area premium has been used to provide additional rooms and spaces. The design concept and layout closely mirror what is present in the existing school and the review team was extremely impressed with the way in which the available space in the school is used and the vibrancy of the environment created by the teaching staff. Having said this, reducing space to, or closer to, the standard BB99 levels would not, in our opinion, impact on the quality of the children's experience or educational outcomes.
- 6.4 We do understand that the gross area per pupil at the new school will, with the 16% bonus, be at the mid-point in terms of comparative areas of the other primary schools, and well below that provided at the most recently built school at Forest Primary. Forest Primary school provides the highest gross area per pupil at 9.3 sq m/pupil, a considerable premium over the next largest school at 7.9 sq m per pupil. La Houquette Primary is the lowest at 5.1 sq m, and LMDC is designed to 6.1 sq m/pupil.

- 6.5 These factors, together with the likely (relatively) marginal impact on the net capital cost of reducing the total area of the primary school at this stage, makes us minded to recommend that the total space specification is confirmed at BB99 plus 16% if reviewing it at this point would delay the overall LMDC project. If, however, the decision following this review is that there will be delay, the necessity for the 16% bonus should be formally reviewed to ensure it can be justified in terms of educational outcomes. In any event, neither the 16% bonus nor the gross areas per pupil at the other primary schools should be used to set a precedent for any future primary school projects without there having been a thorough review to establish the appropriate area standards required to deliver the Guernsey primary curriculum effectively.

Secondary school

- 6.6 The area standard for the secondary school has been set on the basis of the area formula approved on the Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's projects, which is BB98 plus a Guernsey factor of 16%. This was recommended by an independent review panel of the St Sampson's proposals in 2005. We are surprised that, as both of those schools are now operational, there has been no post-project evaluation to assess whether the additional capital and running costs of the 16% extra space has been justified in terms of the educational outcomes achieved, before making the decision to provide the same specification for the LMDC project.
- 6.7 We understand, and support, the underlying principle behind the LMDC proposals, which is that of 'equality of educational opportunity'. We are concerned, though, that in terms of the LMDC project 'equality' has been interpreted as 'same as' in terms of the buildings to be provided. Furthermore we understand the total target briefed area for the High School, community facilities, sports facilities and autism unit was derived from taking the area of Les Beaucamps including the swimming pool and sports facilities, and allocating areas to the various elements at LMDC to add up to this total. Thus it appears to us that decisions on the brief, area standards and the design have been influenced by an initial decision on what the total area of the project should be rather than a 'bottom up' design based on need and reflective of the operational experience at the other two schools.
- 6.8 The effect of adopting this top down 'same as' approach has been, in our view:
- The LMDC High school target brief, (for 600 pupils) omitting sports facilities is 6,547 sq m which is broadly the same as at Les Beaucamps (6,590sqm omitting sports and swimming pool). As Les Beaucamps was designed to cater for 660 students, compared to the 600 at LMDC, even allowing for some error at the margins in terms of our interpretation of the building plans, the area allowed for classrooms and other facilities excluding sport, is in excess of the area of a 600 place school designed to BB98 plus 16%. Precise comparisons are difficult, but our own calculations suggest that the enhancement may be as much as 27%.
 - By making the sports building, including the community facilities, plus the communication and autism facilities match the total area of Les Beaucamps sports facilities, there is a risk that the outcomes desired from those additional facilities will be compromised through design constraints which make the proposals sub-optimal. We have doubts about the sports facility having been designed with appropriate additional support facilities such as reception, storage, toilets and catering for matches. We are concerned that the function and purpose of the community facilities are unclear and indeed may not fully support the HSSD requirements or be in the most appropriate place on the site, and we feel some of the rooms in the autism unit are rather small.

- As mentioned above, BB98 standards are based on class sizes of 30 students for general subjects. Guernsey policy is for class sizes of a maximum average of 24 students for all subjects, which from an educational perspective we strongly support. It does mean, however, that, even before the 16% enhancement, space allocations are generous. With the proposed space allocation being in excess of the 16% uplift there is a likelihood that not only will it be an expensive school to run and maintain for the number of pupils, but that the school may struggle to create and maintain a vibrancy and 'buzz' that helps make a school an enjoyable place to be for both students and staff. Large, empty classrooms and small groups of pupils being taught in classrooms which could comfortably accommodate 30 pupils can be disadvantageous.

The Nursery

- 6.9 The Nursery has been designed to be 'stand-alone' although co-located with the primary school and with a link into the school.
- 6.10 In our view there can be considerable advantages in having the nursery and reception classes next to each other to support collaborative working and sharing of facilities, whilst maintaining the nursery as a stand-alone unit. This was a view shared by some of those with whom we spoke. For the nursery to be successfully located adjacent to the reception classes the design would need to ensure that the security of reception class and other pupils is not compromised by comings and goings during the school day and that teaching and learning is not compromised by disturbance. However this is a design issue which has been successfully resolved in a number of schools.

The Communication and Autism Unit

- 6.11 Some additional facilities to those in the proposed design might well be considered to ensure the accommodation fully meets the stated aim of providing improved facilities to enable better therapeutic and learning outcomes for pupils and support for their families as well as improving the efficiency and effectiveness for the operation of the service. The size of some of the proposed rooms appears rather small and the design may not be sufficiently flexible to support varied demand for primary and secondary places within the overall total capacity.

Community Facilities

- 6.12 Depending on the way HSSD envisage these facilities being used and by whom, it might be useful to ensure that the current proposed location remains the optimal location, or whether there could be some advantages in the community facilities being co-located with the Primary School and Nursery.

Summary:

- The scheme for the Primary school at LMDC should go ahead as designed (BB99 plus 16% bonus) if reviewing it at this point would delay the overall LMDC project. If, however, the decision following this review is that there will be delay, the necessity for the 16% bonus should be formally reviewed to ensure it can be justified in terms of educational outcomes.
- The impact of the 16% uplift on the design and area of St Sampson's and Les Beaucamps High Schools should be reviewed and evaluated to determine whether this improves educational outcomes or is required to successfully deliver a broad, balanced and modern curriculum before applying it to LMDC High School.

- We recommend a review of the proposed location of the nursery.
- We recommend a review of the design and layout of the Autism and Communication Unit to ensure it fully meets the service users' requirements.
- We recommend a review of the design and location of the community facilities following clarification from HSSD of their scope and purpose.
- The overall size of the LMDC development and the way the areas have been calculated should be reviewed. The current design appears over-sized for the High School but may be restricted elsewhere.

7 Life span and proposed build specification

- 7.1 We note that the proposal is for a building life of 60 years, and the build specification supports that proposal as well as taking the marine environment into account. We agree with the proposal that the school be built to a 60 year lifespan, assuming that the cost is affordable to the States. The whole life costs over 60 years will be significantly lower than those for a less well specified building with a shorter life which would need a major refurbishment or rebuild during that period. However we would also stress that an appropriate maintenance regime needs to be established to ensure the building remains in good condition throughout its life.

8 Other issues relevant to ensuring best value

Design

- 8.1 We have read with great interest the Education Department's Vision Paper 2013 'Today's Learners Tomorrow's World Vision' and the Generic Design Brief for LMDC schools, April 2014, v6. We fully endorse and support their ambitions and vision. We do, however, wonder if the current design is sufficiently flexible or imaginative to meet their aims.
- 8.2 For example the Generic Design Brief calls for 'Flexible teaching space in adaptable suites of spaces so that different needs can be accommodated... and various types of space will be available to a team of teachers should they require.' As an example, we feel that a run of equally sized maths classrooms lined along one side of a corridor is unlikely to meet the challenges of a changing and modern curriculum, support 'personalised and engaging education' or provide a particularly flexible or adaptable suite of spaces.

Process

- 8.3 The need for an independent review of the LMDC project suggests that either the processes in place to approve such a project are in themselves flawed or that they have been incorrectly followed. The Review team has not had sufficient time to research and therefore comment on these matters (process review did not form a central part of the remit). The States may wish to consider however what could be done to avoid a similar situation arising in future.

Summary:

- The design of the High School in particular should be reviewed to ensure it is sufficiently flexible and innovative to support effective teaching, learning and a modern and relevant curriculum in line with the Education Department's Vision Statement and Generic Design Brief.

9 Conclusions and recommendations

9.1 Our detailed recommendations are contained within the text above but key findings are:

- A 600 place secondary school with the potential for expansion should be built subject to the comments above and in the context of consideration of the opportunities for rationalisation of educational provision and optimising the use of the educational estate.
- A 2FE primary school should be built subject to the comments above.
- Co-located autism and nursery provision should be built subject to the comments above.
- The need for community facilities should be further discussed with stakeholders to determine their use and location on site.
- Enhanced sports facilities are highly desirable, but an options appraisal and business case should be completed, a management plan agreed, and the design negotiated to reflect intended use.

9.2 We are aware that the view of the Project Team is that any delay will mean that opening the new school in September 2017 cannot be achieved and that September 2018 will be the earliest date that a new school could open, adding additional cost to the project as well as impacting on students. We do not wholly concur with that assessment. Whilst, clearly, there will be additional project costs, re-visiting the proposals and design can be speedy, and there are many instances in the Review Team's experience where new schools have opened, successfully, during a school year. Getting it 'right' must be the over-riding objective.

Appendix 1: Terms of reference

La Mare De Carteret Schools Independent Review

Terms of Reference

Introduction

In July 2014, the States approved the Treasury and Resources Department's States Report entitled 'States Capital Investment Portfolio' (Billet d'État XVI), which set out the States agreed approach to the future development and review of capital investment projects.

The Treasury and Resources Department has responsibility for ensuring that projects deliver best value in respect of the required resources.

This paper sets out the terms of reference for the review of a major scheme within the portfolio - the Education Department's project for the redevelopment of the primary and secondary schools at La Mare de Carteret.

Background

The project has reached Outline Business Case stage and the Department has submitted a report for consideration and approval by the States of Deliberation to spend an estimated £65 million to provide, rebuild and redevelop the existing La Mare de Carteret Schools' site.

The project comprises of:

The Schools:

- the replacement of the High School facilities for up to 600 11-16 age pupils with scope for expansion for up to 960 pupils;
- the replacement of two-form entry Primary School facilities for up to 420 4- 11 age pupils; and

The additional facilities:

- a replacement co-provisioned pre-school Nursery of up to 130m² adjacent to the Primary School for approximately 30 children aged 3-4 on a part-time attendance basis, allowing for groups of up to 16 children at any one time;
- club level competition indoor Sports Hall facilities within the schools' new sports facilities, focused on completing the federated approach to the provision of shared resources for sport within the States secondary Education sector, the avoidance of unnecessary duplication and optimising efficient dual-use school/community provision for netball, basketball and volleyball, as advised by the Culture and Leisure Department and the Guernsey Sports Commission;
- the relocation of Communication and Autism Support Service facilities of up to 200m² placed between the two schools to provide a designated unit for up to 18 children in the Primary School and a designated unit for up to 18 children in the High School and to be the base for the provision of outreach services for Bailiwick school age children and for advice to pre-school providers;

- provision of community facilities for families and the older generation within the schools and sports buildings as a mix of a discrete access suite of rooms of 150m² as part of the Sports Building and through the sharing of school facilities;

On 26th of November 2014 an amendment proposed by Deputy A Brouard and Seconded by Deputy M Fallaize was approved by the States of deliberation which directed

- The Treasury and Resources Department, in consultation with the Education Department, to commission an independent review in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the Project.
- The Education Department to lay before the States by no later than 31st March 2015 recommendations to fulfil the decision of the States to approve in principle the Project, having regard to the conclusions of the independent review, and for the avoidance of doubt, the independent review will be appended to the States Report

Purpose of the review

To make recommendations as to the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the Project in light of the Education Department's proposals for the redevelopment of the site and the need to demonstrate best value for the States overall. Specifically in relation to the following:

Scope and Scale of the proposed Schools and additional facilities

- Pupil capacity requirements
- Resultant sizes of the schools
- The need for the additional facilities within the Guernsey context.

Specification:

- Space guidelines appropriate for classrooms and other school areas for the delivery of the Guernsey Curriculum
- Life span and the proposed build specifications for the project considering the whole life cost in the context of seeking overall best value

General:

- Any other issues considered by the panel to be relevant to ensuring best value for the project

Timeframe

The reviewers will report back to the Treasury and Resources Department by 31 January 2015.

Relevant Documentation

LMDC Capital prioritisation bid
 States Capital Investment Portfolio (SCIP) Reports
 SCIP Guidance
 Population projection data
 Strategic review report
 SOC and Project Assurance review (PAR) reports (Gateway and Value for Money)
 OBC and Project Assurance review (PAR) reports (Gateway and Value for Money)
 States Report and letter of comment
 Political correspondence between the Education and a Treasury and Resources Departments

Education Expert Review of Guernsey Benchmark Area Standards for Secondary School June 2005

The Education Departments Generic Design Brief

The Education Board's Vision July 2013 "Today's Learners Tomorrow's World"

Education Department States Report "Transforming Primary Education" October 2013

Other Project Documentation

The reviewers will have access to detailed project documentation as required

Composition of the review team

It is anticipated that members of the review team will have competence and capability in the following functions:

- Education planning
- Schools design and build
- Investment appraisal

Appendix 2: Documentation received

La Mare De Carteret Schools Independent Review

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Education Board | Minutes from Meeting with Education Dept. Board 15 th January 2015 |
| SEN Information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision for Learners with Autism/Communication and Interaction Difficulties - PowerPoint Presentation • Review of Primary And Secondary Phase Provision For Pupils With Communication And Interaction Difficulties Including Autism - March 2013 • Amended Version One CAS Base Plan (Physical Copy to Liz Fraser) |
| Primary Performance Presentation | 2014 Primary Performance |
| Design Team Documentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMDC Sports Correspondence • LMDC Plan • LMDC Issues Review - Pupil Capacity • LMDC Issues Review - Pupil Capacity 2 • LMDC Stage 3 (D) 1.0 Architecture • LMDC Stage 3 (D) 2.0 Landscape • LMDC Stage 3 (D) 3.0 Structures • LMDC Stage 3 (D) 4.0 Services • LMDC Stage 3 (D) 5.0 Fire • LMDC Stage 3 (D) 6.0 Acoustics • LMDC Stage 3 (D) 7.0 Transport |
| Options | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Sampson's High Options Blocks - Year 10 • Grammar School Options Block (email) • Grammar School Options Brochure • Additions to the Y9 Options offer • Guernsey Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre 2014 - 2016 • Grammar School Options Form 2014 • LMDC Options Book 2014 • KS2 to GCSE Y11 Cohort Options Plans |
| Population | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guernsey School Population Risks - Dorey Financial Modelling • Education Department Model and Presentation |
| Urban Regeneration | Meeting only |

| | |
|--|---|
| VfM | Meeting only |
| Accommodation Schedules | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMDC Area Schedule Summary 1320-8000 • LMDC Area Schedule Summary 1320-8001 • LMDC Area Schedule Summary 1320-8002 <p>Documents also sent in converted Excel Format</p> |
| Catchment Area Maps | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary School Catchment Map • High School Catchment Map <p>Plus links to interactive webpage</p> |
| LMDC Capital Prioritisation Bid | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMDC Capital Prioritisation Bid • LMDC Capital Prioritisation Bid - Plan |
| SCIP Portfolio Report | States Report |
| SCIP Guidance Notes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCIP Guidance Note 001 - General Guidance • SCIP Guidance Note 003 - Review Panel • SCIP Guidance Note 005 - Project Assurance Review and VfM |
| Strategic Outline Case | LMDC - SOC |
| Gateway 1 Review Report | LMDC GW1 Review Report |
| Outline Business Case | LMDC - OBC |
| Project Assurance Review 2 | LMDC -PAR2 Report |
| La Mare De Carteret States Report | LMDC States Report |
| Political Correspondence | Political Correspondence between Education and T&R |
| Review of Guernsey Benchmark Area Standards | Education Expert Review of Guernsey Benchmark Area Standards |
| La Mare De Carteret Generic Design Brief | LMDC Generic Design Brief |
| Today's Learners Tomorrow's World | Education Department Vision - Today's Learners Tomorrows World |
| Transforming Primary Education States Report | Education Department States Report - Transforming Primary Education |

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Curriculum | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four Purposes of the Bailiwick of Guernsey Curriculum • Curriculum Framework KS3.090121 • Curriculum Framework KS4.090121 • Curriculum Framework KS5.090121 • Curriculum Frameworks FS,KS1,KS2.090121 |
| Staffing / School Numbers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary School Staffing • Secondary School Teachers • Grant Aided Colleges • Primary Registration Group Statistics • Primary School Population Statistics • Secondary School Population Statistics • Special School Population Statistics • Final Primary Allocation • Le G Schools (Le Genats Estate Pupil School Locations) |
| Exam Results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Collation Summary 2014 Exam Day Version |
| Union Letter of Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter La Mare De Carteret |

Appendix 3: List of meetings and visits

La Mare De Carteret Schools Independent Review

| Meeting Subject | Meeting Attendees | Notes |
|---|--|---|
| La Mare De Carteret Primary and High Schools Tour | Diane Hand, LMDC Primary School Head teacher; Vicky Godley, LMDC High School Head teacher Alan Brown, Director of Education; Derek Neale, Head of EDP Schools Projects; Ashley Dupre, Planning Manager (Schools) | Panel Member Sue Archer not present on Initial Visit but a second tour was arranged with Liz Fraser also attending. |
| St Sampson's High School Tour | Annabel Bolt, St Sampson's High Head Teacher; Alan Brown, Director of Education; Derek Neale, Head of EDP Schools Projects; Ashley Dupre, Planning Manager (Schools) | Sue Archer not present. |
| Les Beaucamps High School Tour | Sophie Roughsedge, Les Beaucamps High School Head Teacher; Alan Brown, Director of Education; Derek Neale, Head of EDP Schools Projects; Ashley Dupre, Planning Manager (Schools) | Sue Archer not present. |
| Education Department Political Board | Deputy Robert Sillars (Minister); Deputy Andrew Le Lievre; Deputy Richard Conder; Deputy Christopher Green; Deputy Peter Sherbourne; Jon Buckland, Chief Officer Education Dept; Alan Brown, Director of Education | Sue Archer not present. |
| Value for Money / PAR 2 Review | Alex Wakefield, Director - Northgate's Ltd; Geraint Ap Siôn, Portfolio Director | Sue Archer not present. |
| Treasury & Resources | Deputy Gavin St Pier (Minister); Deputy Tony Spruce; | Sue Archer not present. Deputy Jan Kuttelwascher unable to |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Department Political Board | Deputy Roger Perrot; Deputy Hunter Adam (TBC); Mr John Hollis (Non-Voting Member); Geraint Ap Siôn, Portfolio Director | attend. |
| Population | Martyn Dorey, Director - Dorey Financial Modelling | Sue Archer not present. |
| SEN / Autism, Autism Unit - Amherst Primary School | Zoe Grainger, Director of Inclusion and Support Services; Graham Fisher, Head of Communication and Autism Support Service | Sue Archer not present. |
| Early Years | Alan Brown, Director of Education; Nick Hynes, Head of Standards and Learning Effectiveness; Caroline Blondel from the Guernsey Pre-School Learning Alliance | Sue Archer not present. |
| Curriculum | Alan Brown, Director of Education | Sue Archer not present. |
| Project Design Team | Derek Neale, Head of EDP Schools Projects; Ashley Dupre, Planning Manager (Schools); Alan Brown, Director of Education; Simon Peacock, Project Manager; David Gausden, Design Engine Architects; Ian Ingram (and possibly David Dickinson) from Gardiner and Theobald | Sue Archer not present. |
| Forest Primary School and Le Rondin School Tour | Alan Brown, Director of Education | Chris Nicholls and Sue Archer only panel members present. |
| Sports Facilities | Natasha Keys, Principal Officer, Culture & Leisure Dept; Graham Chester, Sports Development Manager, Guernsey Sports Commission; Keith Gallienne, Director of Leisure Services; Julie Wright, Guernsey Netball Association | |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Population | Jon Buckland, Chief Officer, Education; Sarah Harvey, Strategy & Policy Officer; Alan Brown, Director of Education | |
| High School Area Calculation Methods | Derek Neale, Head of EDP Schools Projects; Ashley Dupre, Planning Manager (Schools) | Liz Fraser and Andy Mahon only panel members present. |
| Colleges | Mr Andrew Warren - Blanchelande College Principal; Mr George Hartley - Elizabeth College Principal; Mrs Ashley Clancy - Ladies College Principal | Chris Nicholls and Sue Archer only panel members present. |
| Inter-departmental working between Education/HSSD | Carol Tozer, Chief Officer of HSSD; Zoe Grainger, Director of Inclusion and Support Services at Education; Alan Brown, Director of Education | Andy Mahon not present. |
| Grammar School | Christine Watson, Head Teacher Grammar School & Sixth Form Centre | Chris Nicholls was the only panel member at this meeting. |
| Urban Regeneration | Damon Hackley, Strategic Planning Officer | Andy Mahon was the only panel member at this meeting. |
| Treasury & Resources | Bethan Haines, States Treasurer; Geraint Ap Siôn, Portfolio Director | |

APPENDIX C The Pre-School

- C.1 The Education Department welcomes the Review Panel's finding that it strongly supports the provision of the nursery at the La Mare de Carteret in the light of the States' approval of the introduction of a universal entitlement to Pre-School education from September 2016.
- C.2 The Review Panel recommends:
- a review of the capacity of the nursery; and
 - a review of the proposed facilities in the nursery and its location.
- C.3 Both of these recommendations are considered in turn below:
- C.4 The Education Department continues, as part of its ongoing workstreams, to model Island capacity for pre-school provision and forecast demand. This is part of the actions flowing from the May 2014 States Resolutions on the introduction of a universal entitlement to pre-school education. The proposed pre-school will have capacity for providing 15 hours per week for up to 32 children split up to 16 children per session. The Education Department is also cognisant that the Pre-School at La Mare de Carteret may not be part of the States provision and it could be operated by a private provider.
- C.5 The intention is that pre-school provision should be provided primarily by the private sector and not by the States' education system and this is reflected in the current design. The design allows it to be independently operated by a private provider whilst adjoined to the primary school for future proofing should this change. Because of the different start/finish times of the Pre-school and the Primary, and the internal accommodation requirements and external area requirements of the Primary, with regard to pupil flow around the school and to access management, its position on site allows those differences in arrival and departure times to exist without any disruption to the operation of the primary school.
- C.6 As the school's design evolved, options were explored to position the pre-school in different locations. However, these options resulted in a large increase in area which would have added cost and would have caused a ripple effect of compromising the way other areas of the school would have functioned. If it were to be positioned to the east of the new primary school by the Reception classrooms, where the Panel had suggested it could be located, it would be where the current primary school is located, so the Pre-school nursery could only be constructed after the demolition of the existing school buildings, which would add additional cost to the project.

APPENDIX D The Enhanced Sports Facilities

- D.1 The Review Panel has concluded that the provision of the enhanced sports facilities on the La Mare de Carteret site are highly desirable, but that these should be supported by a full options appraisal and business case from the Culture and Leisure Department. However, this must be considered in the context that for more than 10 years the Education Department and the Culture and Leisure Department (and previously the Recreation Committee) have been working together to attempt to provide this indoor sporting facility as part of the Schools Development Programme, knowing that to do so would provide the best value for money solution.
- D.2 It is important to note that, regardless of whether or not the enhanced sports facilities are provided, the High School will still require a sports hall and associated changing rooms etc. on the site for use by the schools and this would be sized as per Sport England guidelines. The full options appraisal and business case therefore has to focus on the additional facilities being proposed in the development at the La Mare de Carteret site.
- D.3 The Options Appraisal and a Business Case prepared by the Education Department and the Culture and Leisure Department working effectively in partnership are set out below.

Options Appraisal

- D.4 The Culture and Leisure Department has confirmed that it does not have the space within the Beau Sejour Leisure Centre complex, nor the capacity to extend the existing building for another facility of the size required. The Culture and Leisure Department has confirmed that were La Mare de Carteret not an option it would be recommending the States allocate the necessary capital for the equivalent "new build" provision at some point in the future. The argument remains that it would be more costly to build a new, separate structure, than to enhance facilities already being constructed at the La Mare de Carteret site.
- D.5 It is possible that the Culture and Leisure Department would be in a position to submit a capital prioritisation bid for additional facilities in the next SCIP process but when considered in the context of all other competing bids, the fact that the demand for infrastructure investment consistently exceeds the supply of funds, and that a separate standalone facility will be more costly than one integrated into another property, it is unlikely that such a bid would be given priority.
- D.6 The Review Panel concluded that *“an appraisal which would have included, for example, options such as extending existing facilities at Beau Sejour, if only to evidence why those options may be less deliverable and poorer value than building at La Mare.”* The Panel did suggest that a wall be knocked through in the Beau Sejour Sports Hall to build an extension to seat spectators, but that

would only solve one minor issue and would not fit on the site. The limited equipment storage area behind the North wall and the emergency access road immediately outside, coupled with the land dropping away to the North of the site prevent this from being a viable option.

- D.7 Having also worked closely with the Environment Department's Planning Section with respect to the development of sports facilities, the Culture and Leisure Department also believes that the Environment Department would be fully supportive of the recommended option shown in the table below. The Strategic Land Use Plan, agreed in 2011, states as part of Policy SLP10 that:

“The provision of adequate community, social and leisure facilities is fundamental to supporting sustainable local centres. The States Education and Health and Social Services Departments both have ongoing development programmes to improve current social and community infrastructure. Existing facilities should be permitted to develop and expand to meet the needs of the Island population.

A strategic approach to the provision of leisure services and facilities will be required by assessing need and demand. The Culture and Leisure Department's strategy for sport and leisure will identify the need for new services, but the continued and expanded use of school recreational facilities outside of school hours and full utilisation of existing leisure and recreational infrastructure will alleviate the need to develop entirely new stand alone facilities.”

- D.8 The options for the provision of enhanced sports facilities are shown in the table below:

Assessment of Options

| | Do Nothing | Provide facilities elsewhere | Enhance facilities at Beau Sejour | Recommended Proposal Enhance Facilities at LMDC Site |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Description | Do not provide facilities for volleyball, basketball and netball | Provide enhanced facilities at a different site instead of LMDC | Review Panel suggested building works at BSJ to provide facilities. | Build sports hall at LMDC with enhancements for volleyball, basketball and netball facilities. |
| Advantages | No capital expenditure and financial savings for the States. | Release capacity at BSJ to encourage additional leisure activities. Provides additional sporting facility for three popular and growing sports to develop. | Supports volleyball, basketball and netball for competition. Provides additional sporting facility for three popular and growing sports to develop. | Develop community centre in Castel Parish. Allows the school to be at the heart of the community with educational benefits. Release capacity at BSJ to encourage additional leisure activities. Provides additional sporting facility for three popular and growing sports to develop. |
| Disadvantages | Does not release capacity at BSJ for leisure activities | Availability of suitable sites. Capital cost of sports centre in addition to facilities. Does not create school site as a hub within Castel Parish. | C&L advise that this option is not feasible as insufficient space at BSJ. Does not create school site as a hub within Castel Parish. | Additional capital expenditure. |
| Financial Implications | No capital expenditure | Cost of replicating sports centre, and facilities and land. | Not costed as this option is not feasible. | £1.8m capital expenditure |

D.9 The Options appraisal summarised above is consistent with the Review Panel's view that this confirms that the La Mare de Carteret option is the best solution.

- D.10 Having worked together for more than 10 years to secure these much needed community indoor sports facilities as part of the Schools Development Programme, the Education Department and the Culture and Leisure Department agree that the current proposals are indeed the most deliverable and represent best value for money for the States of Guernsey.
- D.11 Both Departments are of the view that the current proposals demonstrate excellent partnership working between the Education and Culture and Leisure Departments and also the Guernsey Sports Commission. **By working collaboratively and not in isolation the two Departments are able to deliver key States policies and strategies working as one organisation, with one mission and one focus.**
- D.12 In particular the Sports Facilities at La Mare de Carteret will contribute towards the States objectives with respect to the:
- Obesity Strategy, by encouraging participation in sports and increasing the availability of sports facilities for the general public at Beau Sejour;
 - Disability Strategy, allowing the development of sports for disabled people; and
 - Children and Young People's Plan, by encouraging young people to be active, achieving and healthy.

- D.13 These strategic objectives are addressed in the Business Plan section below.

Business Plan

- D.14 Guernsey, like many developed countries, is facing an increase in physical inactivity. Children today are more physically inactive than ever before. The recent Guernsey and Alderney Healthy Lifestyles survey 2013 indicated that low physical inactivity was associated with those who reported being overweight or obese. Dr. Stephen Bridgman, Director of Public Health and Chief Medical Officer, commented:

'Of concern is that 52% of adults are classed as overweight or obese. Low physical activity was associated with overweight and obesity, and higher physical activity was associated with lower stress and greater mental well-being. Improving physical activity levels and nutrition, and controlling the levels of obesity, and its health consequences, remain a major priority and challenge for the island.'

- D.15 The facilities at La Mare de Carteret High School will provide an opportunity to address this issue and to reshape children's behaviour so that they acquire a lifelong appetite for sport and activity.
- D.16 The facilities will do this in three ways:

1. they will ensure that children's first experience of sports will take place in appropriate facilities. Evidence shows that the first experience is a key determinant in shaping a positive, long-term attitude to sport and physical activity. This is especially important in a world where young people are making many lifestyle and leisure choices. Sport and activity are finding it difficult to maintain, let alone build, its proportion of the leisure time activities of young people;
2. improved on-site facilities will greatly enhance the effectiveness of the delivery of sports provision by enabling students to participate in a range of sporting activities without losing valuable time by having to commute to other facilities. This will ensure that young people get more exposure to physical activity week by week which will improve fitness levels; and
3. they will give Guernsey's community every opportunity to continue to engage young people in sport and activity as they become adults. Young people between the ages of 16-24 years are increasingly at risk of ceasing to engage in sport. Research demonstrates that a range of factors impact on that drop-off and those factors include cost, accessibility, quality of provision. The establishment of a community hub on the west coast which is seeking to accommodate current and future, increased demand will be required to retain this vulnerable group in sport and activity.

D.17 Other factors that will make the establishment of these facilities encourage physical activity and a move away from inactivity include the following:

- the facilities have been designed so that they can accommodate changing requirements from those who undertake sporting activities. For example, there is an emerging trend toward more lifestyle related sports which reflect 'individualisation' and a demand for opportunities alongside more traditional sport offers. Trends change and the facilities have been constructed to accommodate these changes;
- the three sports that have been identified as being users of the new facility - netball, basketball and volleyball – have a shared philosophy that will impact positively on activity take-up:
 - all three sports are seeking to expand their current provision and have identified that they wish to develop opportunities for the population;
 - all three sports are seeking to develop at a national level. The impact of success on a national stage is that it inspires youngsters to attempt to emulate the local players who are competing at a higher, national level. Success also breeds success and sustained, national competition will result in increased participation at all levels;
 - Guernsey has a proud reputation of having a broad base of sporting opportunities. Some communities only focus on 2-3 sports. This restricts opportunities and fails to provide an experience for individuals who have a range of skillsets and interests. These facilities will complement the provision available across the rest of the Island. In particular it will enable Beau Sejour to support more sports by freeing up accessibility to its facilities.

- D.18 The Education Department's Vision focuses on ensuring that all children and young people can achieve their potential by removing barriers to learning. Evidence demonstrates that the quality of the life an individual accesses as an adult is affected by their success in school and the Education Department is committed to ensuring that all schools and educational settings are highly effective and able to deliver excellent outcomes for all our children and young people.
- D.19 Being active during childhood also helps children and young people develop a positive habit that becomes a way of life in to adulthood. An active life style has important and significant health benefits and, combined with a healthy diet, helps protect against diseases. Getting more active helps children and young people find a sport or activity they really enjoy and maybe can experience success in. Taking part can help them make new friends, be more confident, improve self-esteem and learn new skills which will all help them later in life.
- D.20 Exercise also has a positive impact on educational outcomes. The Youth Sport Trust in the UK states that inactivity is damaging children's lives. The negative impact stems from two sources. **Firstly, inactivity damages children's physical and emotional well-being.** One in three children in England and Wales who leave primary school is obese or overweight⁵. Inactive children also suffer increased risk of developing mental health problems such as depression and anxiety. They also suffer an increased risk of suffering chronic conditions such as cancer, type 2 diabetes and heart disease⁶. **Secondly, there is an impact on the ability of children experiencing physical inactivity to succeed at school and in life.** Low levels of physical inactivity and aerobic fitness are associated with declines in academic achievement, cognitive abilities, brain structure and brain function⁷. Research also shows an association between obesity at 11 years of age and poorer academic achievement in GCSE exams five years later, particularly in girls⁸.
- D.21 Not encouraging physical activity in our children and our community in general puts a significant strain on Guernsey's economy, health and social care services meaning our young people have a poorer quality of life in the longer term. In England alone the cost of inactivity among today's children is estimated to exceed £53billion over their lifetime⁹.

⁵ National Childhood Measurement Programme England 2012/13

⁶ Start Active Stay Active: A Report on Physical Activity from the Four Home Countries' Chief Medical Officers (2011) Department of Health

⁷ Chaddock L, Pontifex MB, Hillman CH et al (2011) A review of the relation of aerobic fitness and physical activity to brain structure and function in children, Journal of Neuropsychological Society, 17(6) pp975-85

⁸ Booth JN, Tomporowski PD et al Obesity impairs academic attainment in adolescence: findings from ALSPAC, a UK cohort, International Journal of Obesity, 38 pp1355-1342

⁹ The Inactivity Time Bomb The Economic cost of physical inactivity in young people (2014)

Why Netball, Basketball and Volleyball?

- D.22 The growth of netball, volleyball and basketball provide the Island with a great opportunity to prevent young people from disengaging with sporting activities, as well as the real potential for re-engaging people in sport at a later stage in life. The paragraphs below highlight the number of Islanders already involved in each of the sports concerned and the potential for further development.
- D.23 **Netball** – The Guernsey Netball Association (GNA) has some 300 plus senior members (age range 13 to 55 years) and has just embarked on a full junior league which currently has 80 members, aged 9 to 13. The GNA is currently participating in the England Netball, South Region League, Division 3. The team currently sits in 2nd place and is hoping to gain promotion to Division 2 next season. This will require the team to play games at home and away, with the need for the required standard home court, to the specifications of England Netball.
- D.24 On February 22nd 2015, the Sunday Times ran a full page article in its News section headlined “These Girls Can – As netball attracts thousands of new players and fans, the game is emerging as a crucial weapon in the battle to get more women to take up sport”.
- D.25 **Basketball** – Basketball is a popular growing sport from ages 6-15 and through the sport’s Future Stars Programme, and U15 league, the Guernsey Basketball Association (GBA) has 150 members (of which 27% are female). At the 16-18 year age group the Association has 50 members (of which 35% are female). There are a further 260 members (195 men and 65 women) who play in Men’s Division 1 & 2 and a Women’s Division. The GBA is also working closely with the Guernsey Sports Commission to provide wheelchair basketball.
- D.26 The GBA has already completed three seasons of National League for both Men and Women, but, without a local facility, all the games were played in the UK either at the opponents’ venues or from the clubs “home” venue in Southampton. That cost eventually became prohibitive, but these seasons were invaluable, giving players opportunities to compete at the highest level, to develop and improve and to give future players something to aim for. The GBA firmly believes that National League is the standard that all its teams, including juniors, should realistically be aiming for.
- D.27 **Volleyball** – Volleyball Guernsey’s league programme consists of four divisions, 24 teams and just over 200 registered players. The Volleyball club is a recently growing community with members ranging from 8 to 40 years. The Guernsey Volleyball Club could realistically compete at county and regional level, developing its players and officials using Volleyball England’s structure.

Summary

- D.28 Netball, basketball and volleyball, three popular and growing sports, require indoor court time on a regular basis and the proposed development at the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site would serve as a training, coaching and one-off match play venue. The requirements for the Leagues to which these sports realistically aspire are not able to be met within the Island's current facilities. The most important aspects required at the various League levels that are not feasible at any existing site are specified run-off areas and court-side spectator viewing. The changing facilities and hospitality provision within the existing design for the school are adequate.
- D.29 The Culture and Leisure Department, the Guernsey Sports Commission and each of the three sports recognise that to have a National League facility with National League teams able to compete regularly in Guernsey would raise achievement and aspiration levels, build a further sense of community and raise Guernsey's sporting profile both locally and off-Island. **If Guernsey wants to see local teams, for example, Netball's Guernsey Panthers, following the example of Guernsey's Green Lions in Football; and if we do not want to see our most successful teams continuing to have to play "home" games at UK venues, then facilities will need to be built which meet the required League standards.**
- D.30 As stated earlier, by providing these much needed community indoor sports facilities as part of the Schools Development Programme, the Education Department and the Culture and Leisure Department agree that the current proposals are indeed the most deliverable and represent best value for money for the States of Guernsey.
- D.31 Finally, the Review Panel also noted that *"if it is to successfully function as an island wide facility as well as a local community resource, as opposed to a school sports centre that is rented out of hours, there will need to be a clear management plan and funding for its operation."* The Education Department concurs with this view as it advised the Review Panel that it was already in discussions with the Culture and Leisure Department and Guernsey Sports Commission as to the management plan for the site. It is important to note that the project is still at Outline Business Case and not yet Final Business Case and the management plan would be developed in consultation and negotiation with key stakeholders in a timely manner.
- D.32 An economic appraisal of the enhanced sports facilities has been undertaken with input from the Guernsey Sports Commission on demand from the sports associations. Assumptions have been made regarding hours demanded per annum, charge rates, operating costs, incremental capital cost, asset life and the cost of capital. The appraisal shows that the enhanced sports facilities have a Net Present Value of between -£188k and £105k depending upon the charge rates assumed within the modelling. The appraisal excludes the incremental

effects of changes to Beau Sejour's income stream (i.e. lost revenue from sports hall use which will be offset by the release of capacity for other leisure users). The revenue impact for Beau Sejour has not been modelled because there remains a level of confidence that other sports will take up the capacity, but it would nonetheless be prudent to predict a modest fall in revenues.

APPENDIX E Community Facilities

- E.1 The Education Department welcomes the Review Panel's recognition for the need for community facilities within the proposed redevelopment of the La Mare de Carteret site. The Education Department agrees with the Review Panel that the Health and Social Services Department (HSSD) should continue to be involved in determining the scope and purpose of these facilities taking into account current and planned community provision, and how they are to be managed. Indeed the Education Department believes that there are other stakeholders, both within the States of Guernsey and outside, such as third sector organisations, who will have a role to play in determining the role and purpose of the facilities.
- E.2 The Review Panel recommends a review of the design and location of the community facilities following clarification from HSSD of their scope and purpose. Since the preparation of the Outline Business Case, HSSD has said it does not intend to relocate the Kindred Centre onto the site. The Education Department has continued discussions with key stakeholders about the use of the community facilities. In particular it is anticipated that the forthcoming consultation on HSSD's Children and Young People's Plan will illustrate how these facilities can successfully bring the community into the school environment with a greater emphasis on interdepartmental and third sector joint working.
- E.3 There are many potential uses for this facility which will deliver benefits such as:
- ideal location for a Parent Infant Partnership as part of a co-ordinated intervention by the States and the third sector as part of a 1001 Critical Days initiative;
 - parent workshops, and forums for feedback on school and its communication. The facility would be attractive as it could be more welcoming than a classroom and would help to develop relationships between the schools, staff and parents;
 - Incredible Years parenting classes (a programme for parents of young children);
 - a base for a Multi-Agency Safeguarding Team (first point of contact for new safeguarding concerns to improve the sharing of information between agencies, helping to protect the most vulnerable children and adults from harm, neglect and abuse);
 - coffee mornings for young families to encourage attendance and open communication supporting transition into the school;
 - support lifelong learning through working with the WEA (Workers Educational Association) and other providers and providing access to online courses for the local community; and
 - resource for use by HSSD and volunteer agencies, such as the Hub, for drop ins.

- E.4 The Education Department is confident that the proposals are fit for purpose and will provide an effective mechanism for bringing the community into the school environment with the scope to enhance student attendance and ultimately educational achievement.

APPENDIX F La Mare de Carteret Primary School

- F.1 **The Education Department welcomes the Review Panel’s endorsement of the proposals for a two form entry primary school at La Mare de Carteret.**
- F.2 The Review Panel was extremely impressed with the way in which the available space in the existing school is used and the vibrancy of the environment created by the teaching staff.
- F.3 The Education Department has considered the Review Panel’s recommendation that the 16% space premium should be reviewed if there is a delay to the Project.
- F.4 As part of its own internal review of the scope for reducing space to, or closer to, the standard BB99¹⁰ levels and whether or not this would impact on the quality of the pupils’ experience and their educational outcomes, the Education Department has sought the views of the States’ Primary Headteachers. The Headteachers are unanimous in supporting the need for the 16% premium in order to help deliver the Guernsey Curriculum effectively and give the necessary space for group and individual support provided by a wide range of services and volunteers.
- F.5 Guernsey schools have retained a flexible and innovative approach to curriculum delivery. All schools have an engaging and vibrant curriculum which encourages the development of a wide range of skills in addition to the key areas of Literacy and Numeracy. To successfully ensure the breadth of active, practical, collaborative teaching and learning approaches schools require flexible break out spaces for both large group and small group teaching.
- F.6 The Review Panel notes: *“The design concept and layout closely mirror what is present in the existing school and the review team was extremely impressed with the way in which the available space in the school is used and the vibrancy of the environment created by the teaching staff.”*
- F.7 The design concept and layout will enable this approach to continue in the new school for the benefit of all pupils. Any reduction would be inequitable and impact on the pupils’ experience and educational outcomes. The Education Department believes if it is to provide an excellent education service then it should listen to its educational leaders in the Primary Phase.
- F.8 The data below highlights the comparison of the new-build La Mare de Carteret Primary School areas with other Guernsey primary schools and also indicates that without the 16% uplift the school would actually be smaller than it is now.

¹⁰ BB99 is the UK Government’s Briefing Framework for primary school projects

Area per pupil comparison with the other Guernsey primary schools

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Forest Primary | 9.3m ² |
| Amherst Primary (social priority) | 7.9m ² |
| St. Mary and St. Michael Primary | 7.1m ² |
| Notre Dame Primary | 6.7m ² |
| St. Andrew's Primary | 6.7m ² |
| Vauvert Primary (social priority) | 6.6m ² |
| Hautes Capelles Primary | 6.6m ² |
| La Mare de Carteret Primary (social priority) new <u>including</u> 16% Guernsey factor | 6.1m² |
| Castel Primary | 5.9m ² |
| St. Sampson's Infants | 5.7m ² |
| La Mare de Carteret Primary (social priority) existing | 5.6m² |
| St Martin's Primary | 5.5m ² |
| La Mare de Carteret Primary (social priority) new <u>excluding</u> 16% Guernsey factor | 5.3m² |
| Vale Primary (additional building works underway not counted) | 5.2m ² |
| La Houquette Primary | 5.1m ² |

- F.9 The proposed gross internal area for LMDC Primary including the 16% uplift is 2,565m² excluding the area for the pre-school unit. This equates to 6.1m² per pupil. It sets the school mid-range in area in comparison with the other schools and is significantly lower than the area per pupil of the other two Social Priority schools.
- F.10 The gross internal area for LMDC Primary excluding the 16% uplift is 2,212m² excluding the area for the pre-school unit. This equates to 5.3 m² per pupil. It falls near to lowest in area per pupil in comparison with the other schools. It is significantly lower than the area per pupil of the other two Social Priority schools and is lower than the area of the existing Primary School.
- F.11 It is also relevant, as noted by the Review Panel, that the relative marginal impact on the net capital cost of reducing the total area of the primary school at this stage is minimal.

APPENDIX G Communication and Autism Base

- G.1 The Education Department welcomes that the Review Panel fully supports and concurs with the co-location of the Communication and Autism Base at the La Mare de Carteret site recognising the educational, service delivery and management benefits that this would realise. The Education Department further welcomes confirmation from the Review Panel that the proposed capacity of up to 32 students is appropriate.
- G.2 With respect to the specification of the Base, the Department notes the Review Panel's recommendation that the design and layout of the Autistic and Communication Base should be reviewed to ensure that it fully meets the service users' requirements. In light of this recommendation, the design and layout has been revisited. The needs of the users had been paramount in the design and layout of the Base and, in response to the Head of Service's request and evidence provided, the area had already been increased from 150m² to 200m². The Education Department remains of the view that the design and layout has been prepared in accordance with the needs of the service.

APPENDIX H – Benefit Register

| Benefits Criteria | Definition |
|---|--|
| 1) Provides for the “Basic Need” of school places in the primary and Secondary sectors | Is the solution consistent with the most up to date (i.e. 2014) School Places Forecasting Model? Will the solution permit future expansion of the numbers at the High School? |
| 2) Provides fit for purpose accommodation for the High School and the Primary School | Is the solution consistent with local strategies, guidelines and precedents? Does the solution provide a fit-for-purpose facility with appropriately functional internal and external layouts? |
| 3) Enhances the opportunities for High School and Primary School pupils to receive excellent teaching and learning and contributes to a better educated workforce and society for the next 50 years | Will the solution improve teaching and learning efficiency and effectiveness? Will the solution provide improved conditions for pupils, staff and other users? Will the solution increase enrolment applications for the schools? |
| 4) Complies with the strategic direction of the States and the Vision Statement of the Education Department to maximise the use of States assets, to engage with the third sector and commerce in the delivery of services and to concentrate services within local centres | Does the solution fit with current policies and strategies of the States and the Education Department and provide for shared use of the facilities by multiple users and in partnership with other providers in an appropriate location? Does the solution enhance the opportunities for effective partnerships for the delivery of services? |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>5) Improves the efficiency and operation of the Communication and Autism Service, a growing part of the Department's Inclusion and Support Division, by the provision of an all-through designated unit for children with communication and autistic spectrum difficulties. Enables the creation of a centre of excellence within the context of a co-located schools environment and provision of a more secure process of transition from primary to secondary education for these children.</p> | <p>Is the solution consistent with local strategies? Does the solution provide a fit-for-purpose facility with appropriately functional internal and external layouts? Will the solution improve the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the Service? Will the solution support better therapeutic and learning outcomes for the pupils? Will the solution increase productivity and lead to better quality of service for young people in the Bailiwick? Does the solution create capacity by relocation of facilities?</p> |
| <p>6) Enhances the community environment in the Cobo area by provision close to the local centre of accommodation for community services and the shared use of the schools' facilities in recognition of growing social needs for families, the elderly and the disabled. Allows the current Kindred Centre to revert to its original two houses designation.</p> | <p>Is the solution consistent with the strategic direction of the States of Guernsey? Does the solution improve facilities for local community stakeholder groups? Does the solution meet the needs of HSSD and the Social Security Department? Does the solution encourage the partnership between the States, commerce and the third sector in providing an improved range of "local node "services on the site? Will the solution improve the effectiveness of support for those in the supported living and ageing well categories? Will the solution release opportunities for accommodation gains elsewhere?</p> |
| <p>7) Increases the scope for pre-school nursery provision, provides fit for purpose accommodation and better transition to Primary education.</p> | <p>Is the solution consistent with Education Department and States' policies and strategies? Does the solution comply with national and local standards for provision of fit for purpose facilities? Will the solution improve the teaching and learning opportunities for children and staff? Does the solution improve the transition between nursery and primary education?</p> |

| <p>8) Provides league level competition indoor Sports Hall facilities within the schools' new sports facilities, optimising efficient dual-use school/community provision for netball, basketball and volleyball</p> <p>Enhances the status of the LMDC schools in the absence of a school swimming pool, as provided at the other two high schools and the Grammar School, by providing a comparable level of facilities to the other High Schools and Primary Schools for successive groups of children from age 4 to 16 who will be educated in the schools over their 60 year asset life.</p> | <p>Is the solution compliant with Sport England standards? Does the solution provide opportunities for income generation and the hospitality economy?</p> <p>Does the solution support the strategic objective of maximisation of states assets by multiple use of facilities?</p> <p>Will the solution optimise the opportunities for any future expansion of numbers at the High School?</p> <p>Does the solution enhance training and competition opportunities for local sports associations?</p> <p>Does the solution meet the requirements of the Culture and Leisure Department and the Guernsey Sports Commission?</p> |
|--|--|
| Other Benefits | |
| 9) Provides the opportunity cost of releasing routine maintenance to other sites within Education | |
| 10) Flood plain mitigation includes protection to surrounding housing | |
| 11) West link road improves traffic management for the area by reducing congestion in adjacent roads to the school | |
| 12) Supports biodiversity enhancement by improvements to the landscape and to the pond and watercourse | |
| 13) Renews and enhances external sports facilities for school and community use by provision of a floodlit synthetic pitch Multi Use Games Area and new tennis courts | |
| 14) Improves local power network to increase stability of the network for local community | |
| 15) Likely relocation of pumping station and drainage renewal improves drainage capacity for the neighbourhood | |

| Benefit reference 1,2,3,4 | |
|--|---|
| Full description of benefit | <p>High School and Primary School (ref 2.7 OBC) Replacement five-form entry High School facilities for up to 600 11-16 age pupils, with scope for expansion to eight-form entry for 960 pupils and replacement two-form entry Primary School facilities for up to 420 4-11 age pupils. <i>Purpose:</i> to enhance the opportunities for pupils in both schools to receive excellent teaching and learning. The planned scope for the schools will meet the SED's educational drivers of curriculum and organisation, teaching and pedagogy, behaviour and pastoral care, special educational needs and disabilities and health and well-being. At its most fundamental level, replacement is essential because the condition of the present buildings renders them no longer fit for purpose and because there will be a continuing basic need for pupil places to be met.</p> |
| Potential disbenefits | None |
| Actions necessary to realise benefits | The development of new build facilities on the La Mare de Carteret Schools site |
| Timescale | On completion of the scheme – September 2018 |
| How the benefits will be measured and monitored? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • capacity remains consistent with the School Places Forecasting Model • solution permits future expansion of the numbers at the High School • consistent with local strategies, guidelines and precedents • users and governance groups regard it as a fit-for-purpose facility with appropriately functional internal and external layouts • number of enrolment requests • Participation levels in the delivery of services from the business and Third Sector communities increase • satisfaction surveys conducted and targets met • energy targets are met |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil achievement targets are met and assessment conducted against Education KPIs |
| Lead officer responsible for delivering benefits | Director of EDP Schools Projects / Director Designate of EDP Schools Projects |
| Lead officer responsible for monitoring benefits | Director of Education <i>Service Leads:</i> Deputy Director of Education / Head of Standards, Learning and Effectiveness / Director of Inclusion and Support Services / Head of Resources / Head of BEST |
| Benefit reference 5 | |
| Full description of benefit | <p>Communication & Autism Service Unit (ref 2.7 OBC)</p> <p>A relocated Communication and Autism Support Service unit of up to 200m² linking the High School and the Primary School to provide a bases for up to 18 children in the Primary School and for up to 18 children in the Secondary phase and to be the base for the provision of outreach services for Bailiwick school age children and advice to pre-school providers.</p> <p><i>Purpose:</i> relocating the two units from their individual bases will enable the creation of a centre of excellence within the context of a co-located schools environment. Increases in productivity and better quality of service to Guernsey's young people are expected in this area. The ongoing running costs of the Communication and Autism Service are not anticipated to increase as a result of the co-location, but there may also be some benefits arising from the opportunity cost of vacating the current premises in the two schools</p> |
| Potential disbenefits | None |
| Actions necessary to realise benefits | The development of new build facilities on the La Mare de Carteret Schools site |
| Timescale | On completion of the scheme – September 2018 |
| How the benefits will be measured and monitored | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consistent with local strategies, guidelines and precedents • the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the Service and therapeutic and learning outcomes for the pupils are measured against pupil achievement targets and against Education KPIs • increased productivity and better quality of service for young people in the Bailiwick measured by periodic reviews |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • capacity and additional functionality provided in Amherst and St Sampson's by relocation of facilities • users and governance groups evaluations as a fit-for-purpose facility with appropriately functional internal and external layouts • satisfaction surveys conducted and targets set and met |
| Lead officer responsible for delivering benefits | Director of EDP Schools Projects / Director Designate of EDP Schools Projects |
| Lead officer responsible for monitoring benefits | Director of Education <i>Service Leads:</i> Deputy Director of Education / Head of Standards, Learning and Effectiveness / Director of Inclusion and Support Services / Head of Resources / Head of Communication and Autism Service |
| Benefit reference 6 | |
| Full description of benefit | <p>Community and Social Facilities (ref 2.7 OBC)</p> <p>Community facilities for families and the older generation within the schools and sports buildings through provision of a small suite of rooms of 150m² which will occupy a corner of the Sports Building at the heart of the site and through the sharing of school facilities within the schools buildings and grounds, sometimes within school hours but also for evenings, weekends and school holiday use.</p> <p><i>Purpose:</i> to align functionally with the use of the schools and the provision of a pre-school nursery to provide a site maximising its facilities for community use by families, the disabled and the elderly: this local centre concept may allow the Kindred Centre accommodation on the Les Genats housing estate to transfer to the Community Suite so that the two houses currently used could revert to housing units. The suite would be part of general community access to the facilities provided in the two schools.</p> |
| Potential disbenefits | None |
| Actions necessary to realise benefits | The development of new build facilities on the La Mare de Carteret Schools site |
| Timescale | On completion of the scheme – September 2018 |
| How the benefits will be measured and monitored | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consistent with the strategic direction of the States of Guernsey • local community stakeholder groups participation levels |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solution endorsed as meeting the business needs of HSSD and the Social Security Department • Partnerships established between the States, commerce and the Third Sector in providing an improved range of “local node” services on the site • Community participant groups confirm through satisfaction surveys and footfall surveys that the provision of services is effective, efficient and improved • Original Kindred Centre reverts to Housing accommodation • Users and governance groups regard it as a fit-for-purpose facility with appropriately functional internal and external layouts • Income generation analysis • Interaction levels between the schools and community groups monitored |
| Lead officer responsible for delivering benefits | Director of EDP Schools Projects / Director Designate of EDP Schools Projects |
| Lead officer responsible for monitoring benefits | Director of Education <i>Service Leads:</i> Deputy Director of Education / Director of Inclusion and Support Services / Head of Resources / Director of Finance and Resources / Lifelong Learning Manager / Head of BEST |
| Benefit reference 7 | Pre-school Nursery (ref 2.7 OBC) |
| Full description of benefit | <p>A replacement pre-school nursery of up to 130m² adjacent to the LMDC Primary school, to replace the Happy Days Nursery currently funded by the Social Security Department, for approximately 30 children aged 3-4 on a part-time attendance basis, allowing for groups of up to 16 children at any one time.</p> <p><i>Purpose:</i> to be part of the strategic provision of pre-school services described in the Education Department’s States Report “The Introduction of a Universal Entitlement to Pre-school Education” May 2014. The Education Department’s report to the States in May 2014 was to support pre-school education by making available States funding for up to 15 hours per week of attendance for 3 and 4 year olds within a pre-school setting generally provided by the private sector or other agencies. A part of these proposals was to provide accommodation within two or three primary school sites for pre-school facilities for up to 30</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | children on a maximum 16 per session part time attendance in partnership with other agencies. LMDC Primary currently provides such facilities for the Happy Days Nursery on its site in association with Social Security and other agencies, and these new replacement facilities are intended to improve on this accommodation and to contribute to the development of the use of the LMDC facilities as an “all through” education environment. |
| Potential disbenefits | None |
| Actions necessary to realise benefits | The development of new build facilities on the La Mare de Carteret Schools site |
| Timescale | On completion of the scheme – September 2018 |
| How the benefits will be measured and monitored | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checked for compliance with Education Department and States’ policies and strategies • Checked for compliance with national and local standards for provision of fit for purpose facilities • Reviews of the teaching and learning opportunities provided for children and staff • transition between nursery and primary education procedures evaluated • users and governance groups evaluation as a fit-for-purpose facility with appropriately functional internal and external layouts • satisfaction surveys conducted and targets set and met |
| Lead officer responsible for delivering benefits | Director of EDP Schools Projects / Director Designate of EDP Schools Projects |
| | Service Leads: Deputy Director of Education / Head of Standards, Learning and Effectiveness / Director of Inclusion and Support Services / Head of Resources |
| Benefit reference 8 | |
| Full description of benefit | <p>Sports Facilities (ref 2.7 OBC)</p> <p>Club league competition level indoor sports facilities within the schools’ new sports facilities allowing provision of an enlarged sports hall with spectator seating for league level indoor sports tournaments and utilising shared access to an integral community suite of rooms (see community facilities) and the schools’ facilities.</p> <p><i>Purpose:</i> to be focused on optimising efficient dual-use school/community provision for netball, basketball and volleyball, as advised by the Culture and Leisure Department and the Guernsey Sports Commission. The provision of competition level indoor sporting facilities</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | with matchplay and spectator facilities will enhance the status of the LMDC schools in the absence of a school swimming pool, as provided at the other two high schools and the Grammar School (see note in Appendix 8). It will support the concept of local centres in the Island having multi-use community facilities as well as potentially generating income for the sports tourism hospitality sector. |
| Potential disbenefits | None |
| Actions necessary to realise benefits | The development of new build facilities on the La Mare de Carteret Schools site |
| Timescale | On completion of the scheme – September 2018 |
| How the benefits will be measured and monitored | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checked for compliance with Sport England standards and national sports associations • Income generation and participation levels monitored by the schools and the Education Department • Maximisation of states assets by multiple use of facilities measured by footfall statistics • Opportunities for any future expansion of numbers at the High School re-evaluated • training and competition opportunities for local sports associations assessed by Local associations and Culture and Leisure and the Sports Commission • Users and governance groups evaluation as fit-for-purpose facilities with appropriately functional internal and external layouts • Satisfaction surveys conducted and targets set and met |
| Lead officer responsible for delivering benefits | Director of EDP Schools Projects / Director Designate of EDP Schools Projects |
| Lead officer responsible for monitoring benefits | Service Leads: Deputy Director of Education / Head of Standards, Learning and Effectiveness / Director of Inclusion and Support Services / Head of Resources/ C&L and Sports Commission |

(N.B. The Treasury and Resources Department has commented as follows:



Treasury and Resources
 Sir Charles Frossard House
 La Charroterie
 St Peter Port, Guernsey
 GY1 1FH
 Telephone +44 (0) 1481 717000
 Facsimile +44 (0) 1481 717321
www.gov.gg

The Chief Minister
 Policy Council
 Sir Charles Frossard House
 La Charroterie
 St Peter Port
 GUERNSEY
 GY1 1FH

16 April 2015

Dear Chief Minister

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT – REDEVELOPING THE LA MARE DE CARTERET SCHOOLS’ SITE – POST REVIEW

Introduction

In November 2014, the States directed the Treasury and Resources Department (“the Department”), in consultation with the Education Department, to commission an independent review in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools’ site. The report by the independent Review Panel has made numerous recommendations for consideration by the Education Department, the States and the community.

In its States Report, the Education Department has given some consideration to the Review Panel recommendations and has agreed that there is a “strong case for rationalising the education estate” (proposition 3) and has also recommended that a report is laid before the States no later than March 2016 containing “recommendations regarding the optimal size, number and location of secondary schools to deliver a broad and balanced curriculum” (proposition 3(b) (i)). The Department however cannot support a commitment of in excess of £60 million to construct a school with a 60 year life, *before* first carrying out the studies required to establish whether that capital investment is appropriate for the island’s education system.

It is the Department’s firm view that the States should not be asked to make a decision on the redevelopment of the La Mare de Carteret Schools’ site before key strategic decisions have been made in relation to the future of education in Guernsey including, for example: the role of selection at 11; the future organisation and delivery of post-16

education; and the rationalisation of the educational estate. However, if the States are minded to agree with the Education Department that a decision is required *now*, then it is the Department's view that such a decision must be conditional upon a rationalisation of the estate from four schools to three. In this event, the secondary school at the La Mare de Carteret site will consequentially need to be built for 960 pupils; and it is the Department's view that it will be considerably better value for taxpayers for a school of this size to be designed and built from the start in a single phase, rather than building one now for 600 and extending it later in a second phase, as is currently envisaged by the Education Department.

For the reasons further detailed below, the Department is unable to support the recommendations in the Education Department's States Report.

The need for pupil places

To ascertain the need for pupil places, the Review Panel considered up-to-date population data. The headline numbers are detailed in table 1 below:

Table 1

| | Places available | Current pupils on roll | Excess capacity |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Grammar School (11-16) | 600 | 461 | 139 |
| St Sampson's | 720 | 698 | 22 |
| Les Beaucamps | 660 | 513 | 147 |
| La Mare de Carteret | 600 | 439 | 161 |
| Sub total | 2,580 | 2,111 | 469 |
| | | | |
| Colleges (private sector) 11-16 | 1,000 | 867 | 133 |
| Total | 3,580 | 2,978 | 602 |

The Review Panel made the following observation: *"we do not believe, on the evidence of the current population forecasts, that there is an absolutely clear case for creating a total capacity of 2,580 secondary places, which a rebuild of 600 places at LMDC would create."*

The Department fully agrees with the Review Panel's findings that the data does not support the need to add a 600 pupil capacity school to the existing estate. It is clear that the Panel's preferred option to provide a 600 place secondary school at LMDC is conditional upon the total pupil capacity needs being accommodated at three school sites and not four. Consolidating or rationalising the existing educational estate because of the surplus capacity in the system now (469 spaces or

18%) and in the future, is inextricably linked to the recommendation to build the secondary school at the LMDC site.

The Review Panel also states that running with spare capacity in the system comes at a significant cost. In paragraph 5.7, the Review Panel highlights the inefficiencies which this creates including the teacher: pupil ratios currently operating below the Education Department's policy of 1:15. That alone costs the taxpayer over £2m in revenue costs per annum, or £120m over the life of the schools being proposed.

Ensuring excellent educational outcomes

The Review Panel has expressed concern, in paragraph 6.7 of its report, that the important concept of '*equality of educational opportunity*' has been interpreted by the Education Department as necessitating that the *same* size and standard of buildings be provided. The concluding sentence in the Review Panel's report is "getting it 'right' must be the over-riding objective." Getting the project 'right' should be based on ensuring that the staff and young people at the LMDC are provided with facilities which are appropriate for providing equal access to *excellent educational outcomes* and not simply the same space, design or facilities as those provided at either St Sampson's or Les Beaucamps High Schools.

Rebuilding the LMDC schools at this stage - without rationalisation of the estate as recommended by the Review Panel - would be committing the States to supporting a system which does not offer best value, with no benefits of economies of scale, and most importantly, does not deliver the best educational outcomes (because a rich and varied curriculum is expensive - on a per pupil basis - to provide in smaller schools.)

Impact of getting it 'right'

The extra area afforded to Guernsey schools over and above the UK standard guidelines is costly. The enhanced educational value and benefits for those Guernsey students who have experienced this additional space in previous projects, is unproven and is not evidenced in the States Report. The Department is not suggesting that the 'right' solution would necessarily be to build the High School 27% smaller or the Primary School 16% smaller. However, if it is possible to do so and spend less money whilst not impacting educational outcomes, then the value for the whole community will be improved. Improved value would not only benefit this project but also create the opportunity to re-allocate funds saved to other projects. This would benefit other members of our community, help other Departments deliver on their mandates and provide much needed work for the local construction industry.

While it is important that the Education Department's project team considers the inflationary impact of the timing of the project and any potential delays in its calculations, that is not an issue when viewed at a States' wide level. If the development were to take longer in order to ensure that it is the correct solution for the

whole community, the Capital Reserve funds would remain invested in the States General Investment Pool accruing further returns. The Department has used the same assumptions and costings provided by the Education Department's professional advisers to illustrate the potential financial impact of the options compared to the project as originally planned, which is summarised in the table 2 (below).

Table 2: Overall cost impact of options for LMDC Project

| | A Education Department Proposal £m | B Redesign with 16% less on Primary and 11% less on High School ¹ £m | C Redesign with 16% on Primary and 27% less on High School ² £m |
|--|---|--|--|
| Project Costs | 60.2 | 58.7 | 55.9 |
| Inflation (per original programme) | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Additional Inflation | 1.3 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Total Project Costs | 66.2 | 66.0 | 63.2 |
| Less: Increased investment return ³ | (3.1) | (5.2) | (5.2) |
| Capital Cost | 63.1 | 60.8 | 58.0 |
| Capital Saving Versus A | - | 2.3 | 5.1 |
| Whole Life Cost Savings to General Revenue ⁴ | - | 5.3 | 10.4 |
| Total Project Savings to General Revenue | - | 7.6 | 15.5 |

¹ This is the same as the option costed in the Education Department's States Report in the table below Paragraph 7.7

² This is in line with the Review Panel's estimate of additional space designed into the project

³ The return on the General Investment Pool over the year to 31 January 2015 was 6.34%. This rate has been used to illustrate the overall impact of investing this money later. Assumptions have been made regarding the timing of project cash flows.

⁴ These are approximate whole life cost savings because of differences in proposed gross floor area. The figures cover hard facilities' management, soft facilities' management, utilities and life cycle replacement costs as provided by the Education Department's cost consultants.

Once investment return is considered, Table 2 demonstrates that the redesign option costed by the Education Department (Column B) has the potential to save General Revenue some £8m. Column C has used the same costing assumptions to remove a total of 27% (current design) from the High School in line with the Review Panel's observation, which would result in a saving to the taxpayer of over £15m.

Holistic approach to the educational estate

The Department welcomes the Education Department's agreement that there is a strong case for rationalising the educational estate and believes that the consultation should immediately commence on *how* to achieve this rationalisation.

The Education Department also has plans for significant capital expenditure for the College of Further Education, another project in the States' portfolio, with an estimated value for all phases of some £50m. However, rationalising the educational estate would also see significant reductions in the investment required for the College of Further Education, thereby delivering further significant savings to taxpayers. This approach would also enable the sites freed up by the rationalisation to be put to alternative uses – including, potentially, much needed housing - or realised for the benefit of taxpayers.

Viewing the LMDC project in isolation would simply replicate past short-sightedness and will lead to significant waste of taxpayers' money. The Department believes that the States must take a fiscally responsible approach to all capital investment. This project must be viewed in the context of the entire educational estate (as recommended by the Review Panel) and alongside the numerous other priorities of the States. In doing so, this has the potential to save taxpayers in excess of £160m in capital and running costs over the 60 year life of the asset under consideration.

Conclusion

It is the Department's firm view that the States should not be asked to make a decision on the redevelopment of the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site before key strategic decisions have been made in relation to the future of education in Guernsey including, for example: the role of selection at 11; the future organisation and delivery of post-16 education; and the rationalisation of the educational estate.

However, if the States are minded to agree with the Education Department that a decision is required *now*, then it is the Department's view that such a decision must be conditional upon a rationalisation of the estate from four schools to three. In this event, the secondary school at the La Mare site will consequentially need to be built for 960 pupils; and it is the Department's view that it will be considerably better value for taxpayers for a school of this size to be designed and built from the start in a single phase, rather than building one now for 600 and extending it later in a second phase, as is currently envisaged by the Education Department.

The Department is unable to support the Education Department's Report or propositions and will be laying amendments consistent with the views set out in this letter of comment.

Yours sincerely



Gavin St Pier
Minister)

(N.B. The Policy Council is grateful for the independent analysis undertaken by the Review Panel. This has helpfully identified the key issues for the States to consider in deciding whether to approve the proposals put forward by the Education Department in relation to the building of the two new schools and their associated community facilities at La Mare de Carteret.

Given that some aspects of the Review Panel's report are contentious and far reaching, the Policy Council is satisfied that its decision to delay, by a month, the debate of this States Report, was appropriate, as it has enabled further discussions to take place between the Education and Treasury and Resources Departments. As a consequence of those discussions, two key issues remain; namely:

- (i) whether the approval of the project should be conditional upon a firm commitment by the Education Department to reduce the number of secondary schools from 4 to 3;**
- (ii) in line with that policy commitment, whether best value is obtained by investing additional monies to build a 960 place secondary school from the outset, rather than by extending it to that size at a later date.**

As the Treasury and Resources Department makes clear in its letter of comment, it believes that if the States are to make a decision to proceed now, then they should do so having also made firm decisions on both these matters, whereas the Education Department considers that they should first be fully investigated and consulted upon.

Arising from these differences in approach, the States has three options, each of which has their advantages and disadvantages:

- 1) to accept the proposals from the Education Department on the basis that there is greater urgency in providing students with better facilities as soon as possible, rather than in making a firm decision upon the rationalisation of its estate to maximise value for money;
- 2) to reject (or surmise) the Education Department's proposals until the States could be satisfied that both better educational outcomes and better value for money could be achieved through estate rationalisation;
- 3) to approve amended proposals along the lines of those suggested by the Treasury and Resources Department.

Finally, the Policy Council asks the States to note that the Review Panel has confirmed that its preferred option is not dependent upon a prior decision in respect of selection policy at age 11.)

The States are asked to decide:-

I.- Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 8th April, 2015, of the Education Department, they are of the opinion:-

1. To approve the Education Department progressing to tender for the construction of the La Mare de Carteret Schools project comprising of:
 - (a) the replacement of the High School facilities for a five-form entry school for up to 600 students with scope for expansion for up to 960 students;
 - (b) the replacement of two-form entry Primary School facilities for up to 420 pupils;
 - (c) a replacement co-provisioned pre-school Nursery of up to 130m² adjacent to the Primary School for approximately 32 children aged 3-4 on a part-time attendance basis, allowing for groups of up to 16 children at any one time;
 - (d) club level competition indoor Sports Hall facilities within the schools' new sports facilities, focused on completing the federated approach to the provision of shared resources for sport within the States secondary education sector, the avoidance of unnecessary duplication and optimising efficient dual-use school/community provision for netball, basketball and volleyball, as advised by the Culture and Leisure Department and the Guernsey Sports Commission;

- (e) the relocation of a Communication and Autism Base of up to 200m² placed between the two schools to provide a designated unit for up to 18 children in the Primary School and a designated unit for up to 18 children in the High School and to be the base for the provision of outreach services for Bailiwick school age children and for advice to pre-school providers; and
 - (f) provision of community facilities for families and the older generation within the schools and sports buildings as a mix of a discrete access suite of rooms of 150m² as part of the Sports Building and through the sharing of school facilities.
- 2. To delegate authority to the Treasury and Resources Department to approve a capital vote, charged to the Capital Reserve, of a maximum amount of £60.2 million (excluding inflation) to fund the La Mare de Carteret Redevelopment project subject to satisfactory completion and review of the Full Business Case to ensure that the project represents value for money for the States.
- 3. To agree that there is a strong case for rationalising the education estate and to direct the Education Department:
 - (a) to consult with all stakeholders, and
 - (b) to submit a report to the States by no later than March 2016 containing:
 - (i) recommendations regarding the optimal size, number and location of secondary schools to deliver a broad and balanced curriculum, and
 - (ii) at least one option for moving from four to three secondary age schools.