



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 10th March 2016

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

Volume 5, No. 10

ISSN 2049-8284

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,
St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. © States of Guernsey, 2016*

Present:

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

Law Officers

H. E. Roberts Esq., Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)

People's Deputies

St Peter Port South

Deputies P. A. Harwood, J. Kuttelwascher, B. L. Brehaut,
R. Domaille, A. H. Langlois, R. A. Jones

St Peter Port North

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

St Sampson

Deputies G. A. St Pier, K. A. Stewart, P. L. Gillson,
P. R. Le Pelley, S. J. Ogier, L. S. Trott

The Vale

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, D. B. Jones, L. B. Queripel, M. M. Lowe,
A. R. Le Lièvre, A. Spruce, G. M. Collins

The Castel

Deputies D. J. Duquemin, C. J. Green, M. H. Dorey,
B. J. E. Paint, S. A. James, M. B. E., A. H. Adam

The West

Deputies R. A. Perrot, A. H. Brouard, A. M. Wilkie,
D. de G. De Lisle, Y. Burford, D. A. Inglis

The South-East

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, R. W. Sillars, P. A. Luxon,
M. G. O'Hara, F. W. Quin, M. P. J. Hadley

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean and S. D. G. McKinley, O. B. E.

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

A. J. Nicolle, Esq. (H.M. Deputy Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)
Deputy E. G. Bebb (*relevé à 9h 40*); Deputy J.P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 10h 02*)

Business transacted

Procedural – Continuation of States’ sitting.....	777
Billet d’État VII.....	778
I. The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education – Debate continued.....	778
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.28 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>811</i>
The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education – Debate continued	811
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 4.01 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 4.14 p.m.</i>	<i>830</i>
The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education – Debate continued	831
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.32 p.m.</i>	<i>848</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.35 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

Procedural – Continuation of States' sitting

The Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État VII, Article I – Education Department – the Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education, continuation.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, before we start today's business, can I just raise one
5 housekeeping matter. People have been asking me when I might be recommending that the
States should sit next week in order to complete the unfinished business, because it is quite clear
we are not going to finish this week.

Ultimately, that is a matter for States' Members to decide, and it will be when we finish –
whatever time it is – on Friday evening, that the States will agree when they are going to adjourn
10 to, but for the moment, I just want to warn people it seems to be very likely that we may need to
sit next Tuesday. That will be a matter for you, as I say, when we finish on Friday, but it may well
be that we will have to sit on Tuesday in order to have sufficient time next week to complete
whatever business is left over from this week, because we cannot continue the following week.

By then the election campaign will be underway, because nominations will have opened. So I
15 am just putting people on notice that we may well have to sit at 9.30 a.m. on Tuesday of next
week.

Deputy Bebb, do you wish to be *relevé*?

Deputy Bebb: Yes, please, sir. Thank you.

Billet d'État VII

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

I. The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education – Debate continued

20 **The Bailiff:** I apologise for the slightly late start this morning. That was to enable two amendments to be circulated.

There is an amendment to be proposed by Deputy Trott, seconded by Deputy Le Pelley and another one to be proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Stewart.

25 I was having some discussions as to what order they should be taken in. As presiding officer, I have decided I should apply the normal convention, which is that the more far-reaching amendment is taken first. Hence, we will start with debate on the amendment to be proposed by Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott.

Amendment:

To delete Proposition 1 and substitute:

'1. To agree:

a) that the current selective admission of students to States' secondary schools and the grant-aided Colleges shall be retained, but on the basis of a combination of progress tests and continuous assessment conducted during the final two years of a pupil's primary school education;

b) to direct the Education Department (and its successor Committee) to investigate the feasibility of using such an alternative selection process and to report back to the States by no later than December 2016 with the results of its investigations and appropriate recommendations.'

30 **Deputy Trott:** Thank you, sir.

In rising to propose it, may I ask that the Deputy Greffier reads it out.

The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir.

35 I shall be brief, because I am more interested to hear the views of others than to espouse my own particular view.

And that is why, sir, I am able to rise and tell you, this morning, that this is not *my* amendment – not my amendment. This amendment is the people of the Bailiwick of Guernsey's amendment.

40 **(Several Members:** Oh!) *(Interjections)* And that, sir, was unequivocally displayed in the responses to the consultation process that my friends and colleagues on the Education Department, sir, conveniently ignored. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Let's just explore that for a moment, and if there is going to be a whole load of 'shame', sir, then I shall make the speech longer, and I shall expose a larger of number of falsehoods that we heard yesterday. But I shall refrain from doing that if Members display the necessary courtesy. **(A**

45 **Member:** Shame!) *(Laughter)*

Sir, on page 1510 of the Billet, let us just remind ourselves of what the Education Department's own States' Report tells us. Let us look at paragraph 6.4. I do not think this can be laboured enough, because this is the reality of the situation we are in:

'61% of all respondents were against an all-ability system with no Grammar School, whilst 28% of respondents were in favour of an all-ability system;'

We know, from the fourth bullet point, that teachers were evenly split, because:

'48% were in favour of moving to an all-ability system, whilst 42% disagreed;'

50 But most importantly of all – and this point was laboured by the Education Department Minister and other members of his committee/department throughout yesterday's debate – in paragraph 6.5:

'70% of those who thought academic selection should be retained favoured introducing a different way of selecting children by attainment or potential academic ability.'

This amendment caters for that view precisely.

55 Now, sir, let us turn to another helpful document from our friends on Education: the Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education, Frequently Asked Questions. At the top of page 3, under the heading, 'What is unfair about our current system?' the Education Department summarise four concerns, and they are justified concerns, I accept.

Concern number one is:

'Pupils are selected based on a fixed test at a fixed point in time.'

60 This amendment deals with that problem, because Members will recall that it is based on a combination of progress tests and continuous assessment.

Secondly, they tell us that one of the bad things about the 11-plus exam is the anxiety caused by the 11-plus. There will be no anxiety as a consequence of this amendment, because of the manner in which this assessment is conducted over a couple of years.

65 Lastly, and probably the one that Members were the most concerned about, they were concerned about the impact of coaching by those who can afford it. Well, it does not matter how much coaching you do, sir, you cannot, surely, pull the wool over teachers' eyes when it comes to the continuous assessment of that child's development and progress. It cannot be done.

70 Sir, yesterday, we also heard reference to the secondary heads, and there was a suggestion that the secondary heads had come out strongly in favour of the Education Department's proposals. No, they did not. The wording of the letter sent from all secondary heads clearly does not support the abolition of selection or the board's proposals. It simply states that 'the heads could work in a new structure.' That is what it says.

That is enough from me, for now, sir. Let us hear the thoughts of others.

Thank you.

75

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley, do you formally second the amendment?

Deputy Le Pelley: I do, sir, and reserve my right to speak later.

80 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Sillars, do you wish to speak at this point?

Deputy Sillars: No, sir.

The Bailiff: No. Deputy Conder.

85

Deputy Conder: Thank you, sir.

Here we are again, and once again raising the whole issue of selection at 11.

90 Sir, my friend, Deputy Trott, made the case for continuous assessment over the two years prior to the pupils leaving primary school. I said in my speech yesterday that my experience of primary and secondary education was simply limited to my own experience and my children's, but I can

95 speak with some authority on continuous assessment at a much older age, and that of course is universities.

Be under no illusion, colleagues, continuous assessment puts enormous pressure on the students, on staff and, in the case of young children, their parents. Continuous assessment was introduced into universities when it was felt an end-of-year examination was too arbitrary and too dramatic a cut-off. What it resulted in, even with 18-, 19- and 20-year-olds, was continuous pressure throughout the three years of their degree, continuous stress and, yes, in some cases, a depression and mental stress, with very little evidence that it actually changed the outcomes. What it did do was change the whole nature of students' experience at university.

100 I would suggest, sir, that if we were to introduce a continuous assessment conducted during the final two years of pupils' primary school education, you will change the whole nature of primary education for those young people.

105 Being at primary school surely should be about experiencing life, interacting with peers, enjoying learning, exploring the world that you live in, being relatively free of pressure. That was what yesterday's debate was about. To introduce this now, in my opinion, would so dramatically change those last two years, to make it an experience for all of those involved: parents, children and teachers ... An experience which would take the joy – or some of the joy – out of those important years of a young person's life.

110 Having done that, if we were to introduce this, there is no sense ... We heard so eloquently from many colleagues yesterday. I think, of course, of Deputy Duquemin's speech early yesterday – he came just after me – and Deputy Le Clerc's, just before lunch, where they talked about failure ... We will still be selecting young people on the basis of tests and assessments. We will still be selecting them. We will still – and I am going to use the words I used yesterday – 'There will be no veracity in these tests; no veracity in terms of long-term predictions. We will still label and ghettoise those who are selected on the wrong side of the line' – because there will still be a line drawn of whether you have failed or passed these tests. 'Whether those selected are perceived or perceive themselves as a failure, even if that epithet only applies to a minority of those so selected, it has implications for them, their teachers and society as a whole, as we and they struggle to cope with the consequences of labelling some of our young people early in the second decade of their lives.' Those are just the words I used yesterday.

120 Sir, we know that teachers do not want this. Our teachers do not want to be involved in this assessment. They want to teach and nurture and lead their young people. The relationship and the dynamic between themselves and that crucial relationship with parents will significantly change.

125 I come now, sir, to the possibility – and forgive me if I am out of line – we know, because it has been tabled, there is an amendment on setting, which is the proper way of enabling children to flourish in their particular subjects. We know that will be coming up and this Education board will unanimously support that amendment. That is the right way to help children to flourish in particular subjects in which they have particular abilities, not to tell them, at some stage, at 11, 'This is where you are going; this is where you will be streamed; this is who you will be working with.'

130 Sir, this is just another way of categorising and labelling young people, marking them for life, possibly facilitating their own belief in how good they are or how bad they are or whether they are a failure or whether they are successful; introducing anxiety into those critically important two years of their lives.

135 Reject this amendment, colleagues. It is backward-looking. It changes the nature of the relationship between the parent, the teacher and pupil. The teachers do not want it and we should not condemn our young people to two years of continuous stress and pressure, which this amendment would impose upon them.

140 Reject this amendment, colleagues.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

145 The policy letter states that the Department is aware of the flaws of the current selection system and the desire of some people to have a different, better selection system. It also states that they do not believe a better system exists, so I spent some time leading up to this debate looking into this very issue.

150 Certainly, many of the remaining areas in the UK with grammar schools have also come up against this. Whether they have two tests or seven tests, whether they include maths or English, there is a near universal acceptance that the 11-plus favours those families who have the ability or money to coach their children and, as a result, social class and ability to pay is the main determiner of whether a child goes to grammar school or not.

155 Certainly, no one claims that they have found a tutor-proof test. The best description is 'less-coachable'. Buckinghamshire introduced such a test produced by the Centre for Evaluation and Monitoring. Since implementation, a detailed analysis of pass rates and family backgrounds of pupils who took the test suggests that, if anything, the new test may have actually made things worse in terms of social mobility. The test was devised by a team from Durham University who have said,

'We use the best available research to try to minimise the impact of tutoring and broaden access to grammar schools, but we never claim it is tutor-proof.'

Indeed, papers for these tests are available on the internet.

160 We all know that practice makes perfect. This is not rocket science, but rather a universal rule applicable to the learning of most, if not all, tasks, skills and knowledge.

Tutors International, a tuition agency which provides full-time private tutors to ultra-high-net-worth individuals, say that:

'Despite attempts to develop an 11-plus exam to foil the practice of coaching by private tutors, it is simply not possible to tutor-proof an exam.'

165 The other suggestion being made in this amendment is that Year 5 and Year 6 teachers could provide a continuous assessment of the child's work and attainment during the last year or two of primary school to determine which children go to Grammar. Under such a system, I would venture to suggest that recruiting anyone to teach in Years 5 and 6 would promptly become almost impossible. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

170 As some here will know, Year 6 teachers do provide an assessment on the likelihood of a child passing the 11-plus, based on their knowledge of the child and the work that they have done, both at the start of Year 6 and half way through. The assessment, which is non-binding in any way, is designed to assist parents in deciding whether to enter their child for the 11-plus. There are three grades, which I very loosely paraphrase: 'Your child is best suited to the high school', 'Your child could cope with Grammar, but probably will not pass' or 'Your child is expected to pass'.

175 I do not know the statistics for accuracy of these predictions, but I do know of children who were predicted to fail the 11-plus and who subsequently passed it. So even if teachers were prepared to be the ones who decreed the fate of a child for the next five years – which is highly unlikely – the system would be no fairer. It is also quite common for children's grades to change between these two assessments.

180 In this speech I am not arguing for or against selection, but I am arguing strongly that the selection method we already have is no better or worse than any other, which damns them all with very faint praise indeed.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

185

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

That was a rousing introduction to the amendment; I had to prick myself. I had to try and get my bearing as to where I was. I thought for a moment I was at the St Sampson's hustings or the West for that matter – but that is not my call; that is Deputy Trott's.

190 I wonder whether the proposer and the seconder of the amendment sat through the debate we had yesterday? Were they present? Did they listen to the powerful and emotional speeches that overturned a decision, that removed selection. Even before ... Probably in the time it took me to get home yesterday, this amendment was drafted and circulated. **(A Member:** Before then!) Well okay, before then.

195 At the beginning of this debate, 1,000 years ago, whenever we started, Deputy Trott said ... He gave Deputy Quin as the example as to why he thought Deputy Quin believed this was potentially the worse States ever – or words to that effect – or the most indecisive. The reason some members of the public have that view of us is because we appear to flip-flop, and we are doing exactly that now, today. We should not do it.

200 I would be horrified, distraught, if this amendment got any traction whatsoever. This is a far more regressive system than the one we removed yesterday. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) Children who are in primary school – what age will it be, six, seven, eight? They will be getting tutoring because they will know that the next term the test papers, the assessments, were being done. How much more time do you want to rob from children? Because education at that age is about
205 emotional, social and academic, and why introduce the latter so early on? Why put such rigid barriers in for children? Why separate them out, or attempt to, at even a younger age? As I say, it will hold more and more children back.

I do not like the term 'no-brainer'. I am even sorry I have said it. Perhaps while I am on my feet I can think of another way to describe it. When I was younger, my gran used to read us a poem
210 called, 'Father William' and it ends with the words: 'In my youth,' said his father, 'I took to the law, as I feared it might injure my brain, but now that I'm perfectly sure I have none, why, I do this again and again.'

Do not do this, please. Throw out this amendment.

215 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Duquemin.

Deputy Duquemin: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

If you forgive the pun, I am going to trot out that well-worn phrase. In this and presumably every term of the States, Members will often say, 'This amendment may be well intentioned, but
220 there are unintended consequences.' I think, in this instance, there may even be unintended consequences that the proposers may be unaware of.

Sir, I will speak only for a couple of minutes and provide evidence and emotion – not mine – to hopefully convince Members that whichever way they voted on the original A1 and A2 amendments there are huge unintended consequences and this is a car crash compromise.

225 Members will remember yesterday I said that the emotional, mental pressure that we put our students through is intolerable and now, Mr Bailiff, we want to do the same for teachers. We want to put our teachers through intolerable, emotional mental pressure, and teachers are our most precious, important asset in all of this – not systems, not buildings. I said just that in my manifesto four years ago and I am even more convinced of that 48 months later.

230 Sir, overnight, I contacted one experienced head teacher in our primary sector and asked them to text me their reaction to this amendment that we were faced with today. The head teacher did not text me. They emailed me, because they had a lot to say.

Before I share with Members what that head teacher had to say, let me tell you that the reason I stood to ask Deputy Brouard to give way yesterday was that I took great exception to his claim
235 that the head teachers were just mouthpieces for their employers. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) In my opinion – and I have got close to many in the last few years – they most certainly are not. Many head teachers are, like me, parents too, whose children go through the same system that ours do.

Sir, the email I received reads, and I quote – unattributable, but heartfelt; you could not write this –

‘As we heads meet today to discuss our curriculum with the four pillars of successful learners, responsible citizens, effective contributors and confident individuals, with mindset and wellbeing at its core, a proposal is placed to narrow the curriculum, extend the stress to pupils, parents and teachers and is based on the most fixed of mindsets. No one will want to work in Years 5 and 6; many teachers already refuse to work in Year 6 because of the pressure. What will the cost be, financially, emotionally and academically?’

240 It continues:

‘If this passes through, rip up the Vision, as it is meaningless. I do not know how I would feel leading a school with the principles of fixed mindset, narrow curriculum and narrow measures dictating the last two years of our children’s primary experience.’

Sir, that was the email from the head teacher, the industry professional.

Mr Bailiff, I know many of the Deputies will have spent time in their head master’s office doing lines; repeating the same sentence over and over again – and it is no coincidence that I look across to Deputy Quin. (*Laughter*)

245 I will repeat one line and I will limit myself to three times.

‘No one will want to work in Years 5 and 6; many teachers already refuse to work in Year 6 because of the pressure.’

‘No one will want to work in Years 5 and 6; many teachers already refuse to work in Year 6 because of the pressure.’

I hope you are listening.

‘No one will want to work in Years 5 and 6; many teachers already refuse to work in Year 6 because of the pressure.’

Mr Bailiff, I repeat that whichever way Members voted on the original A1 and A2 amendments, this is most certainly not the correct answer. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Please vote accordingly and avoid all those drastically dreadful, unavoidable, unintended consequences.

250 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Chief Minister, you wish to be *relevé*?

The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq): Thank you, sir.

255

The Bailiff: Deputy Rob Jones.

Deputy Robert Jones: Thank you, sir.

260 Twenty six of us voted yesterday in favour of A1. The reason I voted was because I had that choice between selection or non-selection. I was not interested in the methodology behind either. The concept of selection was something, for me, that had to go and my vote represented the views of many, many people that contacted me. I would be very surprised if any of the 26 that voted yesterday were to change their mind today and I look forward to hearing from anybody in that 26 that are likely to change their mind and the reasons for that.

265 For me, the methodology makes no difference. All the measures – whether we choose an 11-plus exam or this method of continued assessment – do nothing.

I thank Deputy Burford for her speech and that resonates with me.

270 Whatever we choose, whatever measure we take, it closes down pathways for children at 11 years old – whatever we choose. I will not be changing my vote and I urge others that are a little bit shaky not to do the same. Please, please reject this amendment.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dave Jones.

275 **Deputy David Jones:** Now from the sensible Jones. (*Laughter*) (**A Member:** Now, now!)

Going back to something that Deputy Brehaut said; one of the reasons that this particular States, I think, has had this label that it is probably 'the worst States' – we have heard it at every States, but this one in particular – is because the charge is that, 'They do not listen to the people'. Education did not even listen to its own consultation process. It cherry-picked the bits it wanted from it, cobbled together a Billet to present to the States and then argued its way through that process. The fact of the matter is that I thought that many of the States' Members who wanted to get rid of the snapshot view at 11 would welcome a chance to have a longer assessment process.

280 As for this business about the teachers and junior teachers and all the rest of it, they already do a school report on every pupil, every year. What is that, if that is not a yearly assessment of the progress of that pupil? What is so difficult?

285 The other thing I find incredulous is that we are saying that this is going to cause trauma to the pupils. Why would the pupils know that the assessment is taking place? (**A Member:** Yes!) What are they going to do, sit down and say, 'Well you have not done very well this week and of course your assessment is in 18 months' time'? That is not how we envisage this working at all. It is an assessment from the teacher who, as I say, does a yearly report on that pupil anyway, every year. I used to read my children's reports with increasing incredulity at times. That happens already, so I do not believe that these children will be traumatised by the fact that this assessment is going on, because half the time they will not know that it is going on. It will be an assessment of their performance through those last two years of junior school.

290 The biggest reason, I think, that this amendment has come forward is because the thought of losing the one centre of excellence – or a centre of excellence, not the one – (**A Member:** Shameful!) Why is that shameful? What is the matter with you people? No, I will not give way, Deputy Bebb. (*Laughter*) I might have done if you had got here on time!

300 Why is that shameful to say that? It is one of the centres of excellence in our education system and that, by yesterday's vote, will be destroyed. It is no good saying that we have no intention of getting rid of the Grammar School or we are just going to have a different version of the Grammar School because, to my mind, that is just semantics. The Grammar School in all intents and purposes will disappear and we will have a one-size-fits-all, four site/three site.

305 Something yesterday really unnerved me in the Treasury Minister's speech. It suddenly clicked with me and became clear, that they will never build La Mare – that this three-school site option will now be pushed forward. La Mare will never be built, because if La Mare is built – and they want the three-school option – they will have to close down, probably, one of the other recently built schools, with the public backlash and the taxpayer backlash that will bring. So the simplest way out of that is to not build La Mare. That, to me, is a betrayal of those people, (**Several Member:** Hear, hear.) those children and those parents who have suffered that school for decades.

310 So, you can call 'shame' – I do not think the vote will change very much, but I am glad Deputy Trott has brought this amendment. It needs to be said. It gives States' Members the opportunity to reflect on the fact that the Grammar School will be no more. For those who did not like the snapshot, there is an alternative for Members, for selection.

315 All this hand-wringing about the trauma that it will cause pupils, and the fact that junior school teachers will not want to do it, to me is nonsensical. I thought, actually, the teachers worked for us. I was not aware – (*Interjections*) Well, I am sorry, but the States makes policy and it is carried out by the servants of the States who work in that system.

320 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

325 The supporters of selection are quite obviously intent on turning this into a war of attrition, and I would say to those Members who voted yesterday against selection, just be aware of that,

because this amendment could go through. We ought not to be complacent, because it would only take, I think, three Members to change their vote and for Deputy Le Pelley who presumably this time will vote on an amendment he is seconding, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) to vote and it would change the outcome.

330

So if we have to go through all of today, and if we have to go through all of tomorrow, having exactly the same arguments that we had yesterday, well I am prepared to stay here to do it and we will do it all next week as well if it comes to that. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

I thought the States had accepted yesterday that the first task in this debate was to decide the policy of the States on selection or non-selection. This amendment runs counter to that, because the amendment asks the States to agree that the current selective admission will be retained based on a combination of progress tests and continuous assessment. It asks the States to agree that, and (b) asks the Education Department to investigate the 'feasibility of using such an alternative means of selection'.

335

Well, is that not the wrong way around? What we are being presented here with is a proposal that asks the States to agree to a system of selection, and then the Education Department is meant to go away and investigate the feasibility of that system. That is no basis upon which to determine education policy. It is a finger in the air. Deputy Trott is saying, 'This must be the policy we establish, based on continuous assessment and progress tests, in advance of the Education Department investigating the feasibility of doing that.' It is a complete nonsense.

340

345

The amendment is presented as being in tune with public opinion. Those Members who are desperate to place themselves on the side of public opinion, as they see it, have not placed all that much weight on the 28 focus groups that were carried out, which on the question of the removal of the 11-plus, but the retention of selection – so in other words an alternative means of selection – there were more parents opposed than in favour in the focus groups. That is attached to the policy letter.

350

On the question of teacher assessment determining admission at secondary level, 90% of parents – or the group identified as parents and community groups – were opposed to selection being based on teacher assessment. When Deputy Trott says that he is speaking on behalf of the amendment is laid 'on behalf of the people of the Bailiwick', what about the last debate the States had on selection? Deputy Trott was in the States. He was presented with research carried out on behalf of the Education Council by the National Foundation for Educational Research: 4,589 questionnaires were returned to that organisation from the people of Guernsey; 55% of respondents were in favour of a non-selective system of secondary education; and 42% were in favour of retaining selection. And a few months later, Deputy Trott voted in favour of retaining selection.

355

360

So he comes here now and says that he is laying an amendment on behalf of the people of the Bailiwick of Guernsey simply because on this occasion he has found the results of a questionnaire or a consultation which support selection, but he was not saying that the last time the States debated it. He and many others, including some others who are still in the States, were saying, 'You should place weight on the results of the consultation exercise, but it was not a referendum. It should not be the determining factor.' That is what they were saying then and now he has changed his mind. Perhaps he could explain why he has changed his mind on that.

365

Deputy Le Pelley, when he was talking on the media this morning, said that this was, 'an amendment which represented compromise.' No it does not! It does not represent compromise at all. This is a binary choice: selection at 11. Yes, there are different ways of organising selection, of course there are, but there is a simple binary choice: either we have a selective system or a non-selective system. This amendment is not a compromise; this amendment is unequivocally for a selective system of secondary education, and it is based on a false premise that the main problem with selection is the 11-plus – that the main problem is the means of selection.

370

375

Now, it is a bit odd, because this amendment – irrespective of the names of the proposer and seconder – has clearly involved other Members, and although now they are coming forward with an amendment which says, 'Okay, we accept that the real problem here is the means of selection;

380 the real problem is the 11-plus', at 5.30 p.m. yesterday they voted in favour of an amendment to
keep the 11-plus. I know Deputy Le Pelley did not, but Deputy Trott did and other Members who
have been involved in this amendment voted to keep the 11-plus.

Now, I do not like the 11-plus. I think it is imperfect, but the 11-plus is not the main problem
here. That is the not the main problem in the transfer from primary phase to the secondary phase
of education. The main problem is not the means of selection; the main problem is the concept of
385 selection at 11. This amendment does absolutely nothing to address most of the problems ...
Almost all of the problems of selection at 11, that the States recognised yesterday, are retained in
this amendment.

There will still be a sense of pass or fail. It does not matter what the means of selection are, at
some point a child is going to have to be told – or receive a letter or however it is going to be
390 done – that says, 'You have been selected for a Grammar School education' or 'You have been
selected for a high school education.' It is that which engenders the sense of pass or fail. It does
not depend on the means of selection. It is the concept of selection that causes that.

It still assesses a child's aptitude at a fixed point in time. Yes, okay, it is over a longer point in
time, but between the age of, say, nine and 16, it still takes a snapshot over a period of two years.
395 It does not allow for continuous assessment post-11. It does not allow for children developing at
different paces. It does not allow for late developers. It does not allow for early developers. It still
imposes a judgement on a child at the age of 9 or the age of 10.

And it has been tried. This is a phase that everywhere that has got rid of the 11-plus,
everywhere that has got rid of selection at 11, has had to go through: this holy grail of, 'Well,
400 there must be a way of doing it without having the 11-plus.' Local education authorities in the UK
have spent years trying to devise different ways of selecting children and they have, almost all of
them, the overwhelming majority reached the same conclusion, that the problem is not the means
of selection, it is selection itself.

The Education Department has tried to come up with different ways: having more tests, having
405 fewer tests, involving an element of teacher assessment, not involving an element of teacher
assessment, but the problem remains with the concept of selection.

There is no reliable, robust method of predicting, at the age of 9 or 10, a child's potential for
the next five or six years of education. That is the problem: there is no reliable method. The
concept of being able to predict aptitude and potential has been discredited, decades ago.

410 In fact, it could be argued, I think, that this would be worse than doing it through the 11-plus
because, if the 11-plus has any advantage at all, it is that it presents relatively controlled
conditions in which to carry out a test.

Selection divides children quite arbitrarily. It requires a judgement to be made of every single
10- or 11-year old; to be told, 'You are suited to an academic education' and 'You are not suited
415 to an academic education.' Whatever the means of selection is, it requires that judgement to be
made. The problem remains: what if a child is skilled in one area and needs a lot more support in
another area? This approach set out in this amendment does not provide a means of dealing with
that. What is needed is a sophisticated approach to responding to children developing at different
phases, to children who have different abilities in different subjects. Making an arbitrary
420 judgement and putting every child in one or two categories at the age of 10 does not allow for
that. The only system that allows for that is to have all-ability schools with rigorous setting,
subject by subject. Then you can allow for children's level of attainment, their ability changing
over the secondary phase of education. You can allow for them having different skills in different
sets of subjects.

425 This amendment preserves a selective system developed in the 1940s for a completely
different economy and a completely different society. We are no longer looking for 25% of the
population to be the professional class and everybody else to be manual labourers or working in
the heavy industries of the time. That is what the system of selection, of division, of segregation at
11, was devised to produce. This amendment perpetuates that thinking. We are living in a
430 completely different economy and a completely different society, and this amendment produces a

system which completely contradicts the advice of every single head teacher in the primary and secondary phase.

435 Deputy Trott is very keen in presenting this amendment to contrast his amendment with the Education Department's specific proposals, but that is not ... His amendment is, 'to delete Proposition 1'. Well, Proposition 1 is to adopt a non-selective system of secondary education. It has nothing to do with all the stuff about whether you have one school and four sites, or you have a federation, or you build this school or you do not build that school. Proposition 1 has nothing to do with that. Proposition 1 is about selection or non-selection. And the advice of every single head teacher in the primary phase and the secondary phase is to remove selection at 11.

440 The amendment introduces the new problem of turning the whole of Year 5 and Year 6 into one giant test. My son, in September, will go into Year 5. What I hope he will be doing in Year 5 is learning and developing. I do not want him to go into Year 5 and have to be told, 'Look, from September, for the next two years, you have to be sure that you are going to be assessed on the work that you are carrying out.'

445 Deputy Brouard looks at me in puzzlement. The point is, as soon as you set a test; as soon as parents know the test has been set and, if you get through it – whatever the means are – you get the Grammar School; if you do not get through it, you are not suitable for an academic education, you are only suitable for a vocational education. Immediately that creates the pressure on children. Inevitably, it will encourage parents to say to their children, 'You are being assessed from September.' Because of this 'golden opportunity' – as Deputy Bebb said yesterday. The teacher at St Martin's School, 'What a golden opportunity these children have: to be selected for an academic education and get to the Grammar School.' You cannot insert a judgement like that and then expect that children and parents are just going to behave as if it does not mean anything. Of course it means something.

455 When we go to the vote, we had better focus on the key issue of selection at 11. This may be a beguiling, seductive amendment presented as some kind of compromise, a happy medium: you do not have to put children through the anxiety of a couple of 11-plus tests, you can do it in this rather vague, flowery way; we can all leave it up to teachers; there does not need to be a test. This is about selection at 11 and it is a binary choice: either we are going to select at 11 and every child is going to be categorised either as suitable for an academic education or suitable for a vocational education or we are going to have a non-selective system which responds appropriately to children as they develop, subject by subject, from the age of 11.

460 Sir, I urge Members to reject this amendment.

465 **The Bailiff:** The Chief Minister.

The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq): Thank you, sir.

470 Sir, I will be brief, because Deputy Fallaize has, as usual, touched on everything that I was going to say, but I will just underline one particular thing. This amendment does look attractive, particularly, I think, to those who may not have been involved to a high degree in looking at how the 11-plus system has developed or how it works in practice – and I refer particularly to my time in Education and the effect that looking at the borderline issue had.

475 We have, in a sense, been here before. The 11-plus: the system has changed over years from being just a couple of exams – as others have mentioned, who are my peers here – as was the case when I took it, to a number of different assessments, because parents say it is not fair because of the snapshot of an exam: 'My child was not well' or whatever it might have been on the day. So Education have responded to that over the years and brought in all sorts of things. Teacher assessment has been involved. Okay, not over two years, but it has been involved in the past, along with other forms of test.

480 As soon as you start doing that, then what happens is those same parents say, 'This is unfair, because of the teacher's involvement, there is too much bias on that.' or 'It should be just a simple

exam; there are far too many different tests that are happening.' 'It is not fair; there is too much pressure on the child.' So you go back to having just two simple verbal reasoning, IQ-type tests.

485 Sir, if you look at the normal distribution curve of ability, I would say that there are some children where a snapshot could be taken younger, perhaps 7% to 8%, who are bound to be good at nearly everything and they get through life in that way. If we were selecting 7% or 8% of children, maybe this sort of system would work, but we are not doing that. As soon as you start selecting 20% or more, you get into the normal distribution curve where it becomes very difficult and, quite frankly, very unfair to start segregating by that means, particularly at that age.

490 I do not believe – whilst we might be attracted by this amendment – this will solve it at all. All that will happen, if this was to pass, is that in a few years' time there would be a move to bring back simple exams again, a one-off, because people would say, 'It is not fair; my child is a late developer and you have included things from an earlier age now.' It just cannot be done.

495 I certainly know that teachers in Year 5 and Year 6 will not want to be involved in this sort of activity, because the pressure upon them to try and make a decision between one and the other ... How to assess properly and whether it is an average or whether you put more weight on the end of that two-year period or the beginning of that two-year period, it is virtually impossible to do, because we are effectively selecting too many, if we are going to keep that system.

500 I heard someone say, 'Well, the issue is, just increase the size of the Grammar School.' Yes, we could double the size of the Grammar School, but then that begs the question: why are we selecting in the first place? Because all this will do, if it works, is perhaps create a different cohort to go to the Grammar School than otherwise would have been selected under an 11-plus IQ test-type system.

505 So I do think it comes back down to this – and other Members have already alluded to it – we need to have schools where proper setting can take place, so there can be continuous selection and continuous assessment within the school, that is fair to all children as they develop differently in different skill-sets, different subject areas. That is the best form of selection, if you like. It gives the right opportunity for each child. Then, they can also rub shoulders – as I was saying yesterday – and socialise with people who have different skills, and learn what it is to be part of that sort of community. Guernsey is not inner London. If we were talking about inner London, I might have a different argument here.

510 I think there are plenty of reasons why this would be an expensive, timewasting way of trying to keep selection in some sort of form. I am speaking as one who has been converted from the other side, because I have seen what it is like. It is impossible to draw the line once you are talking about the numbers we are talking about. It just cannot be done, and it is impossible to do it – and fairly.

515 So, I urge Members, sir, to reject this amendment and to ensure that any other amendment coming forward – and I am sure the Education Minister will speak on this – that we have schools where proper setting can take place in subject areas.

520 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, thank you very much.

525 I shall be brief, as I always am. (*Interjections*)

I have some questions for Deputy Trott and Deputy Le Pelley and I look forward to their full and detailed answers when they address these questions. (*Interjection*) There are two things in particular that I want to ask about.

530 Yesterday, Deputy Trott complained that the Education policy letter that we have before us, sir, lacked real detail and insufficient detail to make a number of decisions. That was the point he made in debate yesterday, but where is the detail in this amendment? Because, if ever, sir, there was an amendment which is on the back of a fag packet, it must be this, because – and Deputy Fallaize made the point before – not only is this going to impose a wholly new system, it is also

535 going to direct the Education Department to go away and consider the feasibility of that same system.

It talks of a 'combination of progress tests'. Well, what exactly is a progress test? I hope Deputy Trott can aluminiate us on the specific detail of the progress test that he has in mind. It talks of a 'combination of those progress tests and continuous assessment'. Well, in what combination and how will that be administered?

540 But, to be honest, sir, these questions are probably not quite as important as the other question that I would like to ask Deputy Trott, and indeed Deputy Le Pelley, which is: why is this any more credible than the 11-plus system that we discussed so much yesterday? If anything, I would like to congratulate the proposer and seconder of this amendment, because actually they have managed to make the 11-plus look good (*Laughter*) compared to this. In those
545 circumstances, I hope that some serious answers to those questions can be given and some serious detail can be given, because there is not enough detail for Members to make a sensible decision on this sort of amendment.

As others have said, the problem is not the mechanism of selection or the means of selection, it is the idea of selection. I thought, sir, that we had debated this to death yesterday. I thought the
550 argument that had been made was that there was no robust system for gauging potential – and certainly not a reliable one. That is the issue and that is what Members should continue to have in the forefront of their minds in this debate as well.

The Bailiff: Deputy Domaille.

555

Deputy Domaille: Thank you, sir.

Like Deputy Green, I will be brief and, like Deputy Green, I have two questions. However, sir, through you, I would be very grateful if the Minister in his response could briefly outline whether or not the Department has considered the feasibility of the sort of proposals in this amendment in
560 its discussions on moving forward or whether or not the discussions centred on the principle of selection at 11? In other words, how much of the detail was considered?

The second – well actually it is not a question, but it is actually a request, I suppose – is could he outline for the Chamber the nature and extent of the assessment that is carried out at present, in the last two years of primary school?

565 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Jean.

Alderney Representative Jean: Thank you, sir.

570 I support this amendment, and nobody is going to tell me that I would be flip-flopping around. I will be consistent, sir. As I see it, Alderney would be far better catered for by this amendment.

Yesterday, I read to you all from the brochure presented at the St James' Chamber. Words like 'as far as possible' for inclusion. The small number of students were mentioned, who transfer to Guernsey. A small number of students they may be, but they are important to me. Just because
575 they are small in number, they should be included.

We in Alderney will have to explore the use of electronic technology. This means we at St Anne's School are an experiment. My own daughter's words meant a great deal to me; her actual experience of the system. The last paragraph in the brochure talks of 'creative solutions' to ensure inclusion of St Anne's students 'as far as possible'. I emphasise the words, 'as far as possible.'
580 These words really worry me.

I want to vote for the amendment. I am reminded of the day before yesterday and the words of Deputy Perrot – 'my belief'. This is *my* belief.

I have been told by my good friend, Deputy Peter Sherbourne, 'We expect you to vote with us, Louis.' But if I feel this is not in Alderney's or Guernsey's best interests. I cannot do that. (A

585 **Member:** Hear, hear.) Alderney should not be an experiment. I will not put those few students at risk.

I have to rack this up a bit. I have to get this view through. Some of you may wish to speak in a resigned sort of way, having made your decision yesterday. Not for me! It is not over!

590 **Deputy Sherbourne:** Can I have a point of correction on that claim, sir?

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

Alderney Representative Jean: Fine. I will give way to Deputy Sherbourne.

595

Deputy Sherbourne: No. I am not asking you to give way; just a point of correction. (**A Member:** Ooh!)

I would like to confirm that I asked Alderney Representative Jean to support Education. At no time have I said that he *has to* support us. I would suggest that is quite a reasonable request from me, especially bearing in mind my association with Alderney; the time that I have actually spent speaking to the population in Alderney and my membership on St Anne's School committee for the past four years.

Thank you.

605 **The Bailiff:** Alderney Representative Jean.

Alderney Representative Jean: Thank you.

I take the point from Deputy Sherbourne. I cannot entirely agree, but however we will have to agree to disagree.

610 Let me begin again. Alderney should not be an experiment and I will not put those few students at risk. It is not my place, coming here as one part of a management committee whose voice is weak and can hardly be heard. Back at St Anne's School, I may not be popular with what little remains of our management committee.

615 I may be all that is left of a voice for Alderney, but I *will* speak up – even if I pay a price – for those few students who I believe in. The words, 'as far as possible', I emphasise again, 'as far as possible', for me, just does not do it. It cannot do it and I am not happy. I am grateful, today, to Deputy Trott and Deputy Le Pelley for giving me this second opportunity.

I ask you to remember, two days ago, the excellent speech from Deputy Roger Perrot, and I think that absolutely sums it up. It does not do it for me and I have got to have something better for Alderney than what is on the table. I can be unpopular in both places if I have to. (*Laughter*)

620 But I really believe that and I am trying to inject a bit more passion into this. Let us get going and let us get some genuine feeling into it, not be sanguine about it.

Thank you.

625 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

Deputy Luxon: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

630 Sir, you and Members will be delighted that I did not speak yesterday or Tuesday afternoon, I am sure. The reason I stand now is just to share ... I remain torn over the matters that we are discussing today. I did have and do have a fundamental affection for the 11-plus and the Grammar School for a whole variety of reasons. But, sir, I also recognise that we were not put in this Assembly to indulge our personal and our preconceived ideas or prejudices. We are here to make the best decisions in the long-term interests of the entire community of Guernsey. I believe that is what we are here to do.

635 I have been listening, and I disagreed with Deputy Perrot yesterday when he said that, 'No changes would be made by any of the speeches and contributions.' I think he was wrong and I

certainly found myself moving from one position to another, and I believe I saw that in other Members in the Assembly.

640 What I have tried to do through the preparation for this debate in my own thinking and indeed over the last two days, is to try and sort the information flows that we have received and, sir, the Education Department is the Department with the specialist knowledge and inside understanding of educational matters. We do have four or five educationalists within this Assembly, but most of us are lay people when it comes to this matter – informed lay people. Sir. So I have to be influenced by what the 16 or so head teachers (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) say. How can we not, 645 when they are so directly involved, with far more intimate knowledge than we think we have as parents or as having been children through the education system ourselves?

Sir, I would like to ask – just to try and contextualise my comments – Deputy Trott and Le Pelley two very clear questions. Deputy Trott introduced this amendment as clearly being an amendment ‘on behalf of the people of the Bailiwick’. Now, we are allowed to use exaggeration in 650 this Assembly and we all do that often, but I just wanted to be clear, sir, isn’t the reality that the consultation that he was talking about, or that mandate that he referred to ...? Isn’t it right that the consultation group represents about 7% of our population? There are different numbers in Your Schools Your Choice data, but round about 7%. And, if there are a majority of those people who favoured selection, does that not mean it is about 3% or 3.5% of our population? I just 655 wanted to ask Deputy Trott, how does that give a mandate for the statement that this is an amendment clearly ‘on behalf of the Bailiwick of the Island’? So I just want to understand that point, please, from Deputy Trott.

The second one is: if this amendment is approved today, do we not need to meet next week? Presumably we might as well stop debating the rest of the policy letter, because this amendment 660 makes a decision – and I think I am building on the point Deputy Fallaize made ... But actually we are asking the Education Department to go away and come back by December this year to decide whether or not the decision we are making today can work. Doesn’t everything else revolve around this decision?

So I would really appreciate – in case I have completely got my thinking wrong – do we 665 actually terminate this debate if this amendment is passed on the basis that, how can we make any of the other decisions in this process, that we said we would apply in a logical order, to make sure we end up with the right decision for the wrong reasons with no intended consequences?

I apologise if I have got that wrong, but I do not see how we can continue the debate. I would really appreciate clarification.

670 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Langlois.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you, sir.

675 Time for some balance, I think! (*Laughter*)

We must accept that there are a range of opinions in this place and outside of this place, and I think to go into denial about that and assume that the whole world thinks the same way as each of us does is very silly.

680 A single decision on a very specific question yesterday has not changed that division of opinion. It does not do that. It was about a very particular question of a method that is currently being used and I doubt whether that decision – the wisdom of the States; the wisdom displayed by 26 Deputies – has suddenly swung a whole mass of the population across to agree with them.

This option must be explored properly in order to maintain our democratic integrity. If we did not look at this today, then we would be deficient as a Government.

685 In my opinion, this division outside is because both sides of the selection debate have got so many advantages and disadvantages. Whenever you present a proposition which is essentially a binary choice, then we all like to think that there must be a logical route to the right answer, but of course this is hugely complex, as we are beginning to hear.

690 Sir, the debate, I believe, as I am mentioned yesterday, has been held with mutual respect, and I hope that continues. I am getting a bit worried about the rising temperature this morning, but let us continue in the same spirit as we had throughout yesterday.

695 I am a little bit concerned, I have to say, about the apparent claim of all the moral high ground on knowledge and understanding of assessment learning and teaching that is being claimed uniquely by those who favour the comprehensive model and closure of the Grammar School. There has been a tendency to say, 'Well, we listen to the professionals, therefore, we must be right' and so on. I am sorry to do this, sir, but to remind people – probably the last time I made this bit of a speech was nearly eight years ago on a very different matter, which Deputy Fallaize will remember. I am a qualified teacher. I spent 15 years in the state sector of education in the UK and Guernsey. That teaching was across an age range from 14 upwards, up to quite an advanced age, if I remember some of my further education students who are present today. I was cofounder of a company that lasted 26 years, with a very strong theme of training, and that company also completed projects for the UK Government on setting assessment standards and examination systems across various theories of expertise for all four countries in the UK.

705 **A Member:** So it is your fault!

Deputy Langlois: Well, no – sorry, that comment is probably very pertinent to the next fact. I was also a member of the Education board for nine years. (*Interjections*) So there!

Sorry, sir.

710 So, together with others who will support this amendment, I believe that there is no monopoly of technical knowledge and expertise and all of these views have to be taken into account.

We are here debating, primarily, methods of assessment today. I fully accept, sir, Deputy Fallaize's point that, yes, it does correlate almost 100% with whether selection continues or not. That is the nature of the beast, but it is very much about methods of assessment, because assessment is a central component of learning and teaching. It always has been and it always will be. It is part of the learning cycle. Oh, goodness me, I am getting into lecturing mode – forgive me! But it is part of the learning cycle; it is part of the process.

720 Now, in the 14-19 age group, I saw the transition, many years ago, from tests and exams to systems of assessment, based primarily on continuous assessment. So, whereas before I went into the further education field, people used to – both day-release students and full-time students – work away all year and their entire future – at a very different age from the one we are talking about – was based on three-hour exams, which were marked independently and so on. I think we would all agree in this place, some of us are better at exams than others – and I mean the exam technique. I am not talking about academic standards; just the process of going in and sitting a three-hour exam is difficult for some people. Funnily enough, continuous assessment can be difficult, but there are ways of balancing that.

730 There is huge support in Guernsey for the continuation of the Grammar School, as I mentioned yesterday. Now, the point about continuous assessment ... Sorry, incidentally, the trend that I am talking about from exams towards continuous assessment has been very largely reversed recently by government decisions in the UK relating to GCSEs, so the pendulum does tend to swing.

735 One point about continuous assessment is that it is hard work for teachers and it is hard work for students. In fact, what we are actually talking about here is developing a higher level of trust in our excellent teachers and developing their professional judgement, to act together to make those assessments clearly and fairly. Nobody has more interest in making the assessment fair than the person who has related to a student over a number of years.

740 Teachers conduct assessments all the time. We talk about one question in a rather complex survey; we quote '90% of them are against teacher assessment.' I think that people answering that question were saying, 'Do you want your child's class teacher in Year 6 to be the person who says, "Pass/Fail" or whatever' – all that language which we deplore. But, 'Do you want that one person to make that one judgement about that one child?' And I think that is the way that question was

interpreted. What is being described in this amendment, in my view, is something far more involved and sophisticated than that.

745 The primary sector is already very and rightfully proud of a system called AFL: Assessment for Learning. And before anybody, on a technical matter, leaps to their feet and says, 'No, no, but that is very different, because it is assessment for learning', it is different but it is assessment. The whole sector is moving towards individual learning plans; tailoring to a student's needs. That will involve assessment. So let us not pretend that by getting rid of selection we can get rid of assessment – right! And the reason: you do not have to place pressure on individual teachers. This is a matter of teamwork amongst a set of professionals, making the judgement against all the
750 evidence that they have got.

There are, in my view, undoubted benefits to selection, as displayed by the overall excellence of Guernsey's education system. There is huge support for the continuation of the Grammar School. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

755 We have heard talk of proper setting. Now, again, over years of experience, my experience shows that proper setting works even better when the initial ability range within the institution is smaller – a point made by Deputy Soulsby yesterday.

So, sir, I agree that any chance of this amendment being accepted is very marginal. Most people, in my view, will probably stick by their judgement yesterday and go the same way. But the debate is valuable because it exposes an option that should remain on the table.

760 In my experience, continuous assessment works; it reduces pressures, it does not increase them, and it is a more reliable method of assessment. Assessment is part of life and part of learning.

So, sir, now for the surprise: for the avoidance of doubt, I will be supporting the amendment.

765 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

770 I would like to support Education over the next few days and I am. My view is perhaps different from the board papers that the Education Department have come up with this time, but I think most of us here all support Education and we are trying to give them the best steering we possibly can.

Now, I was not educated locally. I am not going to give you my story of seven years at a De La Salle boarding school, but it is different from most of yours who were on Island.

775 Deputy Conder mentioned something that it was almost like, 'How horrible, we were going to have a two-year continuous assessment.' 'How on earth could something as complicated and as difficult and as nasty as that possibly work?' I am very lucky at the moment, I have got my daughter going through university – something that I thought Deputy Conder would have known about. Apparently, it is a three-year course. The first year is a foundation and you get that general grounding in university life, and you do a few modules, but in the particular university she is at, it
780 is a two-year assessment for your final degree. Forty per cent of the degree is done in Year 2, with modules and examinations. The final year is 60% of your degree, again with modules and two and three-hour examinations. So there is a process that we are using – and she is not there just to do the degree; she is there to learn. So why is that so different when it is in our primary school? So there is a continual cycle of learning, examination and appraisal going on all the time.

785 She enjoys it. Although she knows it is happening, it is not as stressful as one would think. That is part of the university life. You know it is happening. And picking up the point that Deputy Brehaut was making, I do not think the children will notice that they are being assessed over a two-year period. I think that can be engineered that it is just part of the school life: that you have tests and you have this and you hand in homework and they look at their modules that they have
790 done.

Because, also, what I would like to hear from Education – I do not know the answer to this – if we do not have the selection that is being suggested by Deputy Trott and Deputy Le Pelley, what

are you going to have in the primary years? What goals are you going to be setting the primary schools? What levels of attainment and how will you do it and how will you assess that they have got there? Because you if are doing those stats anyway on those children, it is the same thing. You are just choosing not to look at them.

We had the thing: teachers do not want to have it, but I have got a – I do not know how long my computer is going to stay up but ... I would just like to read a very short extract from a note that has just come in from a recently retired primary teacher. And, surprise, surprise, this is what she says:

'Assessment is already a continual process in the primary schools. Teachers' reluctance to use this as part of the selection stems from the fact that they are in the frontline when facing disappointed parents once the results are known. That problem could easily be overcome by centralising the final selection process.'

Deputy Duquemin repeated something in his comments several times and I am going to repeat one of my comments several times. When you are in a hierarchical structure – and I think Deputy Trott's comments, as well, this morning on the letter from the primary teachers ... It was not an overwhelming support. When you are in a hierarchical structure, you have to be very brave sometimes to step well outside of the expected position.

Another point that Deputy Duquemin made – and I do not quite understand how this works: 'We will not get the best teachers if we have some form of selection.' 'We will not get the best teachers in our primary schools if we are going to have this continual assessment over those years.' But I have been told that we have got the best teachers in our primary schools now, as head teachers, under a selection system which the same people are saying they do not like. I do not get it. You cannot have your cake and eat it. (*Interjections*)

Deputy Fallaize said – again I love the naivety that he brings, but actually it beguiles a whole lot of very careful crafting below. 'You voted for so and so yesterday...'. Deputy Fallaize well knows that, in this States, many times, we are voting for the least-worst rather than necessarily what we would want, and if I could possibly write every single proposal that I would like to vote for, that would be great, but it is not always an ability that we have. We have to deal with the votes as they come, in the manner that they are proposed, and although I do not always like them, you do have to sometimes make some very awkward decisions to get to a place where you might want to be later.

The other part in Deputy Fallaize's speech ... I think what he is saying is, 'It is okay to select in a school, but it is not okay to select between schools.' So it is the same process, but it starts to become a bit nebulous when you start to have four campuses under one school. It all starts to get a bit – I do not quite know ... I cannot quite see the logic all the way through that.

Also, will it mean that I will now be picked for the football team, because by rights I have got as much right to play football as anybody else? But I am always the 13th or 14th man or the one cutting up the oranges. So is it in the new nirvana that some poor so and so is going to have some replica of me in years to come having to be stuck on the football team? That is just not how life is.

I think it really comes down to the fundamental question ... I do not think Education have made the case to do away with the Grammar School and that is where the key ...? Although the selection is part of it and the 11-plus is part of it, the fundamental problem I have – and it is the one that Education, I think, need to address. And Deputy Fallaize knows this well; he was four years on Education. We want, almost, the four Grammar School model. I am frightened to lose the Grammar School. I do not know exactly why. I cannot always explain it so well, but I am frightened to lose the Grammar School. So, if Education could say why parents are so keen that their children go to Grammar School, and parents are not saying, 'Yes, I want to go to St. Sampson's High!' What is it they need to do to fix that? Rather than just taking away selection, what is that fundamental part? And that is the bit that I think is really behind all of this.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe has been waiting a long time.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

845 Sir, yesterday we were talking about the unfairness of the 11-plus; all about these two papers; all about the non-verbal reasoning and the verbal reasoning and how unfair it was; how unfair that youngsters decide their future, on which school they go to, on a non-verbal reasoning and maths and English, and all their other subjects were dismissed, and how unfair. And I agree with that. I do not think there are many people in this Assembly who actually supported the 11-plus
850 papers that I have got here. I think we all agree that.

In fact, if we go to the Billet again, on page 1510, which was referred to earlier on today by Deputy Trott, it says quite clearly here, as well, following the Department's questionnaire – and the answer came out exactly the same as what we are saying here. In fact, it finishes off by saying:

'whilst most respondents wanted to keep selection, the majority did not want to keep the 11-plus tests in the current format.'

855 And that is how the debate went yesterday. Time and time again, Members stood up and said how unfair it was.

Now, today, Members can change their vote, because this was not on the table yesterday. So there was that frustration, because it was made known to many Members yesterday morning, trying to get it out through various speeches, that an amendment was following; that because we already had two amendments in play – we all know that you cannot add one as you are going
860 along, because that it unfair to the proposer and seconder and the debate itself, because some had already spoken, and it makes it rather messy. So there is no criticism whatsoever, and I will support how it was handled yesterday by the presiding officer, because that is how the States works.

865 So States' Members voted yesterday on option A and option B that were before them, after their speeches saying about the frustration that they had because maths and English and other things were not part of the consideration of any child's future. Now, today, you have got that opportunity to put that right. This amendment actually addresses that. This amendment allows for two years of assessment – and it has been covered very clearly and ably by Deputy Langlois, how that happens. Others have actually said in here, it happens all the time in the primary schools now.

870 We are, unfortunately, following yesterday's debate, being criticised yet again by media, by phone calls, by social media, of 'the worst States ever' again, but hard-hitting inasmuch as, 'the States are wasting our money again', because we spent money going out to consultation, through a questionnaire and that has been ignored, again. And here we are: the vote out yesterday to reject that went down like a ton of bricks. Now, certainly from the emails that I had and on social
875 media – I am only on Twitter – 90% of those on Twitter were angry last night. They were angry at the States' decision yesterday. I then had an email saying to me – because I put some response on Twitter on that. Somebody sent me an email and said, 'We keep telling you to join Facebook; you should look at Facebook. If you think that people are angry, have a look at Facebook.' I am not on Facebook.

880 But that is the problem we have got here, we are not actually listening. Hence my sursis was to say, leave it as an election issue. There are people now saying yesterday – there are many points on here that I could read – 'We are not going to bother to go and vote; why should we?' 'Yet again they have not listened.' 'They have wasted our money.' Then others are saying, 'Why should I bother?' etc. This is not good. We are trying to engage the public and yet as soon as they give us
885 a response, we ignore it. Now, I accept you can only take that as a snapshot for all of these things, but when there have been questionnaires that have been sent out and when people have tried to make their views known, that should be taken, to a certain extent, into consideration with the evidence before us, and the evidence before us in that report from the Education did show that they wanted selection of some sort.

890 So we are now in this position where, as I said yesterday, we are designing an education system on the floor of this Assembly, because we did not have the report through from Education Department following through the outcome of the questionnaire. I mean, how bizarre is that?

Many have said, as well, that they are frightened to lose the Grammar School. That was said yesterday; that has been said as well by many publicly. But, to me, what has really hurt this morning and is really below the belt – and you heard it here first, one would hope, but no! Thankfully social media – and I thank Rob Moore of Channel Television for informing me as a Member of the States, with a direct question to the Treasury Minister, ‘If you wish to close one school, what would it be?’ ‘It will be La Mare.’ Now that is gutting to me. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We have gone out and we have had an inspector’s report. The school has picked itself up after three years (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) of knocks, of bad publicity; we have got a fantastic team in there; we have put a huge amount of resource in there, and if I am led to believe that –

Deputy Fallaize: Point of order, sir.

905 **Deputy Lowe:** – the question that has been asked –

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize has risen on a point of order. I think he is going to remind me that I should be reminding you to keep to the present amendment and not to stray into the amendments that have not yet been laid. And he has sat down again, so I think that was what he was going to say. (*Laughter and interjection*)

Deputy Lowe: Would you like to continue my speech, sir, if you know what I am going to say? That would be really good, because you could put it more eloquently than what I could. It is about selection. The amendment is about selection –

915 **The Bailiff:** It is, but it is not about closing schools.

Deputy Lowe: – and selection is actually on that, but I take your point, sir. Because it was – Deputy Jones was not stopped, sir – and I am not criticising you for that – but Deputy Jones did allude to it, about La Mare –

The Bailiff: I know. I did –

Deputy Lowe: – and all I am saying is that now it has been confirmed.

925 **The Bailiff:** I know. I almost did stop him, but if we are not careful I think we will have everybody.

Deputy Lowe: I thank you, sir.

930 That is my point that I wish to get across, and I think Members need to be aware. So when you are thinking about selection, be aware of this.

I do ask Members to remind themselves, yesterday there were only two amendments on the table and we had to make a decision one way or the other. You now have an amendment that actually complies and assists those that responded in the Education questionnaire.

935 I, therefore, urge Members to support this amendment and take it forward in the way that it should be, as yesterday did not give you that ability to be able to do so.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

940 **Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, I think this is quite a difficult area and I sympathise with people like Deputy Fallaize that have youngsters coming up through the primary school and about to ...

because it is not only the parents like Deputy Fallaize, but it is also the grandparents that become very involved also in the education of the youngsters in their family. So this is a very difficult area for a lot of people, and I sympathise with the pains that everybody is going through, actually, in terms of following this debate today and yesterday.

945 But getting back to the non-selective approach that Deputy Fallaize was bringing out, I think to a large degree what we have in this amendment is that there would be actually setting – and he talks about robust setting in the new secondary school for his children. It would be on the basis of a combination of progress tests and continuous assessment, because you see if you just take the situation from 10, where you have got the two schools: Amherst and Vauvert, feeding into the Grammar School, essentially under the new system that is being proposed ... Now you would have about 90 children, let's say, coming in through. We cannot just put them in the main hall – which you would do actually. They come into the main hall – and I am talking as a teacher, of course, of many years, both in the high schools, in the grammar schools, in the universities and so on, in Guernsey, in England and in Canada. The point that I am making here is that you have got the 90 in the hall. Now, they have to be divided out into their various sets, and that is done on that particular first day. Now you have to have something, some records, in order to do that and, of course, you ask the primary schools; the primary schools send in the records of the children. So you have got them in the secondary school at the beginning, so you know how they have been doing in the past. So you know how to set them for maths and for English, at least for those two subjects. So they are set accordingly.

955 Now, having set them, the schools will not wait until Years 8 and 9 in order to set, they do it right away in Year 7, and they set them into As, Bs and Cs. In the comprehensive school in London, of course, there are a lot more than 90 coming in; we had hundreds coming in on that year, in the Year 7. So it was A, B, C, D, E, F and so on, because of the great numbers that were coming in, because the school was 2,200 strong, in terms of population.

960 This is the problem that I see, and this is what always worried me with the comprehensive system ... In just taking the Guernsey situation where you just have the three sets, I would say: A B and C, it is the Grammar types, the people with greater ability, that will occupy probably the A-stream and the B-stream for maths or for English. The C-stream will be occupied by those that are less-able in maths and English. Now, the problem is that in the school then, that C child is blocked to some degree from the A and B streams.

975 **The Bailiff:** Are you debating streaming, which is the subject of another amendment that has not been laid?

Deputy De Lisle: I should be saying setting. Setting, yes.

980 **The Bailiff:** Well, setting. It is the subject of an amendment that has not yet been laid.

Deputy De Lisle: Right, well I just want to finish up on this if I may, sir? Just to say that in the current high school, that C child would be in the A-stream probably and therefore would have that feeling that they were in the top set and the top academic ability within that school. That is the difference; that is why I always was worried about that, because I just felt that some children were being blocked in the comprehensive system, particularly when you get into the very large comprehensives. They were being blocked from actually seeing a future for themselves, if you like, whereas in the current high school system that we have here, that ability is pushed, because they are the senior and top people in the school.

990 I also wanted to make the point, sir, that this type of assessment that is being touted here in the amendment is used currently by the Education board – this continuous assessment – in recent years anyway. It was used when I was on the Education board, in terms of marginal cases and borderline cases. We always had a group that, 'Well, should they go to the Grammar School or should they go to the high school?' There was that borderline group, and in order to deal with

995 that it went back to the teachers and they made an assessment. They went back to all the records
over the past year or so and determined which of those students in that borderline group would
go on to the Grammar School or to one of the high schools.

1000 Sir, the point is that the basis of these progress tests and the continuous assessment are
currently being used, and also that system will be used in the future in determining the sets that
the children go in as they move from the primary to the secondary school. I just wanted to bring
that out today so that people could see.

1005 There is an additional problem, though, that I have, because I would almost be recommending
then that we move from the west and we live in town because then we will access, perhaps, with
our grandchildren, the teachers that are currently in the Grammar School unless they are going to
be displaced and moved around. It would seem to me that perhaps they might – I am talking
about the A-children now – be forced a little more if they were going to the current Grammar
School location rather than perhaps one of the other locations, because the skills set with the
teachers is there to push the children a little more. That might be in the minds of some parents
and some grandparents. I think we have to bear all that in mind. I do not know how the Education
Department is going to deal with that particular situation, but some people would be inclined to
1010 move into that particular catchment area in order to be able to access that Grammar School
facility, despite the fact that it was a comprehensive now, because they would think that the
teachers were still there, that were forcing their children on at an earlier particular phase when
they had an older child, perhaps, going through that system.

1015 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gillson has been waiting a while.
Deputy Gillson.

Deputy Gillson: Thank you, sir.

1020 I have got a particular association with a primary school – it is well known – and in that
capacity I should welcome this amendment and I should welcome it with open arms because this
amendment, if it is passed, will create such stress and pressure on primary school teachers, we will
see an outflow of them from the state sector to the colleges. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1025 But I do not. I am going to vote against this, because it will create unreasonable pressure on
teachers. Teachers are going to have two years of parents asking them, 'Is my son/is my daughter
on track?' And, of course, it is going to be impossible for the teacher to answer that because they
do not know the wider classes and other schools. It will lead to parents questioning the amount of
time that the teachers are spending with their particular child. And when the results are
announced, then the parents are going to be questioning, 'Why didn't my son or daughter get
1030 through? How much time? Why didn't you spend more time? If you had told me, I would have
spent time teaching them. I would have coached them.' That would be what we would get there.

1035 I mentioned yesterday that I passed the 11-plus. What I did not say was the experience around
that, which was similar to this in a way, because in the term prior to the results being made public,
of the 11-plus, for the first time in my year, we were ranked on the basis of internal results, like
this assessment would be. I remember it well: the girl who was first in class went to Ladies'
College. The girl who was second went to Grammar School. The boys who were third and fourth
went to Grammar School, then five, six, seven, eight, nine and ten went to Beaucamps. I was 11th
equal with a good friend of mine. He went to Beaucamps; I want to Grammar School. Poor Mr
Goodhall, the head teacher, had a line of parents who were third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh,
1040 eighth, going to him, saying, 'Well, how come my child did better than Peter, but he is at
Beaucamps?' I remember the stories – poor chap. But that is going to happen. You are going to
have that. The pressure on teachers is just going to be ridiculous on this.

1045 Deputy Langlois and others have referred to trust in teachers, and it is true, but the parents are
going to have the lioness/lion cub syndrome of wanting to protect – and quite rightly – their
children and that pressure is going to be put on them.

Others have mentioned continual assessment at primary school and of course it happens. Assessment is needed, but it is what the assessment is used for; it is completely different to have a continual assessment which identifies that 'Little Jimmy needs a little bit of support on maths' or 'Another child needs support on English', and then your assessment is used to aid teaching; to focus teaching so that teachers are focused on helping (A Member: Hear, hear.) the best ones. It is completely different to an assessment which is then used to actually identify a school they go to. So, yes, we have assessment and it is needed and it is good. It is how it is used.

I take issue with the note on the amendment of Rule 15(2) where it says, 'No material financial implications to the States.' I think there will be. There will be because a whole new strata of management within education will be needed to moderate these assessments. So they will need to be moderated within a school, across classes, and then between schools they will be moderated. That will have to be very, very open, very transparent, to create any level of trust in the system. So it will be a number of people, I think, that will be employed to moderate. So there are significant financial implications for the States.

Sir, this, on the face of it, looks like one of the classic Guernsey compromise amendments which the Assembly tends to favour. But it is not a classic compromise. I think this will put unreasonable pressure on teachers and for that reason I urge people to please reject it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: Thank you, sir.

I got slightly emotional yesterday afternoon (*Interjection*) because I was actually hoping that this States would make a historic decision, which it did: a historic decision which should really have destined selection *at 11* to the dustbin of history.

I do not know whether Deputy Trott was actually in the room during my speech, because I am never quite sure whether he fully understood the implications of my explanation of the current assessments that take place: the tracking that does go on; the fact that every school will have a record of where every single child is at any particular time, so that it can, as Deputy Gillson explained extremely well, identify the needs of the child at any one time and adjust the provision.

Now, I did go to some length yesterday to try and explain that and also to explain that process continues post-11 and that the support that is given is actually identifying individuals' needs. I find it amazing that we are now going through the same debate again, because that is really what it is. It is a choice of whether you believe that selection is the right way forward for us to meet future challenges or whether a different model will fit Guernsey better for the future.

There are many people, I am sure, listening in today that are involved in the coaching industry in this Island, and I bet they are rubbing their hands with glee because, contrary to the suggestion that this will reduce the need for coaching, I would suggest that it will do the complete opposite. We will have a coaching industry growing at an incredible rate. We will have maths classes after school; English classes after school; weekends taken up with topping up, hoping our child – your children, not mine, my grandchildren – could possibly get a place in this centre of excellence.

Now, it is a good school. There is no doubt about that and I will be the last person to claim that it was not, but let us get a bit of reality to this. The recent report from La Mare de Carteret was as good as the validation of the Grammar School. Just dwell on that: it was as good. Its academic achievement was not and we know the reasons why, but its validation on the quality of teaching in the school was as good. I think you should really take note of that. Isn't La Mare De Carteret now a centre of excellence? That is why I jumped up when I heard Deputy Jones suggest that the only centre of excellence we have got is the Grammar School. That is rubbish. That is absolutely rubbish.

Our schools work within the context of the system we insist upon. They do their best. Every teacher in this Island does their best. I have had many, many years, as you know, experience of working in the high school sector. I have actually also worked at the Ladies' College, which a lot of you do not know about. I am aware of the differences. I am aware of the different challenges, and

it is one of the reasons why I take the line I do about wanting a more even playing field for our children.

1100 At 11, we know where they are at any one time. What benefit it is saying to a child, 'Well you have made this amount of progress now; we know you are doing really well. I think you are not making quite as much progress as Johnny or Jane, therefore, you cannot go to the Grammar School. You will go to the high school instead.' And the high school teachers will then obviously do their best to progress again. Our primary schools are making incredible progress. In the last
1105 three years, we have increased performance on national standards by between 20% and 26% depending on whether it is reading, writing, mathematics. We are moving along at a pace. We know where the children are; we can put intervention in.

This Assembly, actually, has made two brilliant decisions over this last year. It decided to introduce pre-school, which for a lot of our children ... Those that are struggling in secondary
1110 school started that process because they did not have pre-school provision. We have agreed between Education and HSSD, the Early Years – 1001 Days Initiative, Incredible Years initiatives that are going on; the support from industry through ECOF. We know we can improve and we can improve right the way through.

This debate today is a repeat of yesterday. (**A Member:** Exactly!) There is nothing different on
1115 the table other than another method. To suggest that Education, over the last 12 months, has not considered alternative ways of assessing our children – our children's *potential*, remember ... That is the reason the system was set up: based on a false notion that you can determine potential at 11. We know performance at 11. We can see it, we have the evidence, but we do not know what it is going to be. We have got an idea, but we do not know how that is going to pan out.

1120 There was a mention of English exam results from Peter: that we were 26th in the world – a snapshot at 15. What you seem to misunderstand – or not misunderstand; you probably have not read – by the time our youngsters get to KS4 and KS5, we are 6th in the world in performance. It is because we have ways of actually moving on. That snapshot at 15 – the international one – by the time our youngsters are in higher and further education – and remember the percentages are going up and up and up ...
1125

I started teaching in Guernsey in 1968. We had 35% of our children staying on to 16 – 35% – at St Peter Port School. We now have, throughout the Island, 85% of our youngsters staying on to 18, and a larger number – not as many as in the UK, but a larger number – going on to higher education and university. We have about 27%. The UK is over 30%; we are not as high, but there
1130 are special problems, being an island community, so I am not complaining.

But what I am trying to get across, and tried to get across yesterday, is it is a continuum, and we have got this stupidity of a gap in the middle, where you can suddenly say, 'Oh, no. That is the sort of school you need to go to; that is the sort of school you need to go to'. Then at 16 you bring them back together again.

1135 Maybe I am straying again, because I have a habit of doing that, but I am trying to just get across that what we are trying to propose will be almost destroyed. We will manage; we have managed for how many years? We would manage, if this went through, but it is not what our primary school teachers want. They do not want – and again other people have said this – the incredible pressure, through parents. We are living in a different world; people want more for their
1140 children. They are more politically savvy.

There is a wonderful quote from this book, which the Chief Minister mentioned yesterday, produced recently ... Actually; it was published in January, and I hope it is an appropriate statement, but it is relevant to this amendment, as it was relevant yesterday. I did not use it yesterday because of those emotional feelings I had, I missed it out; I thought, 'No. I have said
1145 enough' and sat down. But I will read it now as my final comment. In reality, the last few words of this wonderful little booklet spells out the history of secondary education in Guernsey and all the mistakes that have been made along the way. It is a narrative of that and it is well-worth – I think it should be compulsory reading for everyone in this room. Ideally, it should have been before we had the debate, because I am sure it might well have changed minds.

'In reality, there was a deeper reason for States' hostility to comprehensive education: a fear that in recasting the system forged by their past social counterparts, they might threaten their own current interests. Yet, no settlement is static. Guernsey's political life has been considerably democratised in the first two decades of the 21st century ...'

1150 I agree with that. People are beginning to wake up to reality; taking a part in the debates. That is great, and contrary to claims that I am not democratic, that is just totally untrue.

'The possibility thus remains the future decision-makers without prior allegiance of the institutions of the past may reverse historical settlements and install a system which serves the best interests for all their contemporaries.'

1155 That is the last comment from Rose-Marie Crossan PHD. It is the first, to my knowledge, authoritative evidence of the impact of decisions of previous States, and I am asking you to stand by your conviction which was expressed yesterday. Stand by it and throw out this ill-thought-out, back of the bag packet amendment. Throw it out of this Assembly.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy James.

1160

Deputy James: Thank you, sir.

This morning, my brain is feeling as if it is like a box of fireworks and someone has just thrown a match in. (*Laughter*) I do not know how other people's brains are faring this morning.

1165 We have heard massive amounts of arguments for and against those wanting to abolish the 11-plus, and much support and evidence was given to avoiding stress levels put on our children. So I see that, before you, what this amendment is to give you is an option to consider ongoing assessment as opposed to a one-off exam. Now, that may seem a reasonable alternative and I think that is why I voted for the St Pier A2 amendment yesterday, because I did not feel that this policy letter had a reasonable, acceptable alternative to abolishing the 11-plus. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1170

What has interested me this morning – unfortunately, Deputy Fallaize is not here now –

Several Members: He's behind you!

1175 **Deputy James:** He is behind me! (*Laughter*) Thank you, I am really pleased you are here. What Deputy Fallaize did this morning, he clearly articulated, for me, this in his opinion was not about abolishing – well, it was, sorry. That his view was that the 11-plus is morally wrong. That was his view and I have to respect that view.

1180 There are a number of questions that have arisen in my mind. We all know that life – we have heard from many speakers – is about choices, taking tests, having assessments, etc. I find myself wondering this morning, sir, when will this Assembly – five, ten years' time – come back and discuss about abolishing taking GCSEs and GCEs and then accessing to universities?

1185 I also recall a number a years ago schools wanting to ban sport. They did not want their children participating in races because they were labelled 'winners' and 'losers'. I think one of my questions that I would like the Minister, if he could, is to tell the Assembly at what age does he think that it is reasonable for children to undergo testing? Is it 12, 13, 14, 15? For me, that is a really important question.

1190 Another question I found myself wondering about this morning – and the Minister will not be able to answer this, but I pose it. My interpretation of what has gone on over the last few days: there are those that voted for the A1 amendment yesterday that did so on moral grounds, and I can accept that. But I am wondering in my head, how many of those 26 voted for A1 on financial grounds? Whether it was about reducing the amount of schools on the Island? That – and for fiscal reasons – does not sit comfortably with me.

1195 I do not see – I am sorry Deputy Trott – that this amendment will get through. I do not think that we will have changed people's views from yesterday, but again the light has gone on for me,

and I would like to know – never will – how many voted because they thought it was morally wrong or that it was in the best financial interests of Guernsey.

Thank you.

1200 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

Deputy Bebb: Thank you, Monsieur le Bailli.

1205 I found quite a few of these debating points a little bizarre. There are two basic questions in relation to the 11-plus or selection. The first question to ask is that test. The second part that nobody seems to be addressing is of course what is the benefit of segregation?

Now, if we look at the test to start with. This seems a little more sensible on the face of it. However, I would like to quote a former secondary school head teacher who has contacted me in relation to this amendment. I quote:

‘Continual assessment has been explored by the professionals on several occasions in the past and always rejected. The bottom line is that selection is a fatuous exercise in separating sheep from sheep and is not appropriate in modern education.’

1210 I have to say, I did enjoy quoting that because the word ‘fatuous’, I think, is quite appropriate when we look at some of the argument.

1215 Continuous assessment sounds pleasing, but let us question why is it that continuous assessment makes a better decision about whether people are segregated into schools? What is this great desire to keep the Grammar? Now, I realise that, as I said yesterday, there are certain *faux pas* that one can make in debating education on the Island, but I will actually commit another *faux pas* today and that is to explain what is already happening in relation to what Deputy David De Lisle was talking about earlier on.

1220 People who try the 11-plus and do not pass, and therefore fail the 11-plus, who live in the West are not likely, under a comprehensive system, to move into town. They already make the decision to spend money to send their children to colleges which, if I may suggest, is a slightly cheaper option, probably, than moving house simply for the purpose of education. It already happens in the West, that parents decide that they would rather not send their children to La Mare de Carteret and actually spend the money on sending their children to the various colleges. So this is something that is already happening within the system, and to suggest that people would start moving houses in order to access certain schools is a little bizarre when they generally

1225 already make the choice, and in financial terms they send their children to the colleges.

When I hear the arguments in favour of the Grammar School, the other thing that springs to mind is a friend of mine who has two children and I asked him, ‘What is the great benefit of sending your children to Ladies’ College?’ And he unashamedly said, ‘I do not think it is right that I am such a snob, I do not want my children playing with others. I want them to be in a nice school, with nice children and I think it is perfectly right for me to spend money to do that.’ I have to ask, is that the motive of some in saying that they would like to keep the Grammar? Because it is all about keeping the Grammar, but nobody is talking about keeping the secondary schools, the high schools. Why is the focus on keeping one system against keeping the other half? Nobody has said that we want to keep the centre of excellences of the secondary schools. I have to ask, is it that

1230 snobbery, without the actual honesty? I do not know, and I fear that that is part of it.

1235

Now, once again we come to the question that when we talk about assessment and so forth, to my mind, as Deputy Le Tocq said, it is perfectly reasonable within a comprehensive system that assessment continues and certain children will reach the top set because they are good in one subject but they may not be good in all subjects and therefore they will not be in the top set and will receive greater support in another set. That seems perfectly reasonable. Assessment which is

1240 being asked for in this amendment, of course, will continue through the whole of the secondary education if it is a comprehensive one. But, somehow, it seems to suggest that assessment should

stop at 11 because you have already determined where children will go, and that seems truly bizarre.

1245 Deputy Fallaize was quite right and I agree with Deputy Luxon's view: if this amendment is accepted, I do think that the debate has to stop, because I see no point in asking Education to go away to find out if this system is feasible and then continue with debate about the rest of this policy letter before us. We really do need to decide what system do we want.

1250 And for Deputy James' point of view: how many decided to actually do this on financial grounds? Well, I have to say, it is well-known that I have not been an advocate of rebuilding La Mare de Carteret, but that does not mean in any way that I voted yesterday to end the 11-plus because of financial reasons. I voted to end the 11-plus because I fundamentally believe that it does not function here in Guernsey. That is the basis of that decision. The 11-plus does not function well here in Guernsey. I have had my mind changed and, just as any old convert, you
1255 become slightly more evangelical and persuaded in your view when you have been converted.

I have to say that nobody is explaining to me why segregating children is the right choice. Why is it that someone who might be exceptional in maths, but exceptionally poor in English should be in a secondary school as opposed to the Grammar, or indeed at the Grammar as opposed to the secondary? What is it about this idea of taking the top 25% of children, putting them all into one
1260 school, imagining that they are all excellent in all of the subjects that they do? What is it that makes us think that those who are excellent at certain subjects, but really struggle with others should all be sent into the secondary schools? It is illogical. Surely the right decision is to try and have a larger school where setting can happen so that children can be set in subjects according to their ability?

1265 Strangely enough, from having a comprehensive education – I know that Deputy Sillars asked us not to refer to it – I am rather convinced of the fact that this holds true today: when children are set in schools, they do move from one class to the other, because as they progress they may well develop in certain subjects much more and therefore qualify either being in a higher set, or really find themselves struggling in the higher set and move to a lower set. I do not see this
1270 disruption, in changing one class over changing an entire school, because moving a child from one school to the other is disruptive. It is not the end of the world, but it is disruptive and, once again, if someone is failing in English but is excellent in maths, is that a reason to take them out of the Grammar? I do not believe that it is.

So once again the question before us focuses on that question of the exam, but no one has given me an explanation of why the system is actually the right system. Nobody can justify, it
1275 would seem, why it is right to simply segregate children regardless of whatever their ability is in certain individual subjects, just based on the overall. That, I think, is what is missing and that is why I think this amendment – which is a bit ridiculous in its wording anyway: to decide on a system and then send Education away in order to justify it. I have never heard of such nonsense! It
1280 really does beggar belief! It does feel like a back of a fag packet-type amendment, and I would suggest that, same as a back of a fag packet these days, we have a non-smoking policy. It deserves to be consigned to the bin.

Thank you, Members.

1285 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: It was not written on the back of my fag packet, I have to say. *(Laughter)*

I am definitely feeling very flip-floppy and as wishy-washy as a piece of old-fashioned
1290 blackboard duster, because although I wish to be consistent and therefore support this amendment, I would agree with some of the speakers that there is work to do on the policy and the amendment. You can see that it has been written quickly, because I quote *sic* from it that it actually says:

'...that the current selective admission of students to States' secondary schools and the *granted*-aided Colleges...'

Well that is not quite good English or grammar and it is not permission granted exactly – never mind.

1295 The problem is, I was a member of one of the focus groups that I see in Your Schools Your Choice, that a colleague has out. Perhaps I did not focus very well, but I remember disagreeing with Deputy Ogier and some others Members, because I had a different vision of the way I wanted to go and I still do. I do not particular like the word 'selection' at all. If you look carefully at the amendment, it says, 'continuous assessment'. I agree with Deputy Conder, continuous assessment
1300 can be very hard. I passed a fair number of examinations and I can think of a lot of continuous assessment courses I started and pulled out of.

'A combination of progress tests': well those progress tests could, of course, be very varied. This really is a generalist amendment allowing – as Deputy Trott said at the opening – ideas to come forward. I do not think it seeks to be particular prescriptive.

1305 I really base my view on where I think education should go, neither on the *status quo* that we have heard so much about – which I agree is failing in some areas – or on the Education proposals. I thought we should start with a clean sheet of paper and look at the areas like academies, specialist schools, free schools. They do exist in the UK and elsewhere and they have some form of selection, but maybe that selection will be more about choice, more about a
1310 process, more about aptitude and less about either a conventional 11-plus or verbal reasoning test or whatever. I believe most tests are culturally specific. We know – history tells us – that when migrants move to a community, they often underperform initially because they do not necessarily have the linguistic or social norms to perform. Therefore, any test, even if it is cleverly written, relies upon certain aptitudes of socialisation within the background.

1315 I would challenge Members who condemned the coaching industry to think about it from another perspective. Imagine we do go for the brave new world of three or four new secondary schools; we no longer have an 11-plus; we no longer have an assessment; the only selection between 11 and 14 is based upon your geographical area ... I would not go as far as Deputy De Lisle to suggest people will move around, but it could well be that one area, if we have a rather
1320 rigid catchment area policy – which I also oppose – would over time develop a different norm.

The problem I see there is that I was, as I said yesterday, a pupil who started in the set 1 and moved downwards and that can be depressing and despondent as well, because of course you lose friends. and it is a form of failure in a sense. My point is, if you start to fall behind in a subject and you are streamed or, more realistically, set, in English, Maths, Science.

1325

The Bailiff: Are you moving on to the setting amendment rather than dealing with the current one on continuous assessment?

1330 **Deputy Gollop:** Well my point is that children who are set, as distinct from selected, will also use coaches extensively and so the idea (*Interjections*) ... I would say that an acknowledged failure of the existing system is the lack of social mobility, but how will that social mobility be transformed without extra resources to compensate for some parents who will coach or not.

1335 Therefore, within this framework, we can overcome some of this by a broader process which does involve teachers and parents and maybe the Education Department as well, but can look at how you can choose children or choose families who could benefit from a school that offered a slightly different curriculum from the age of 11. It would be an 11-plus system, but not the one we currently have.

1340 Unfortunately, that option is not on the table, so I am torn between a rather scrappy amendment and a *status quo* or a new vision that is not fully developed. Therefore, I have a difficult dilemma with this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Spruce.

Deputy Spruce: Thank you, sir.

1345 I had not intended to speak today in the debate in the hope that we could have a shorter debate, but the level of exaggeration being offered by those that are anti-selection is unbelievable. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1350 Today it is all about stress on teachers, not the stress on children. Anyway, what really brought me to my feet was Deputy Green's series of pointed questions to Deputy Trott and Deputy Le Pelley. It was the hypocrisy that got me. Deputy Green criticises the amendment for lacking clear details on how continuous assessment would be achieved. He wanted answers to many questions, but I think that is a bit rich, especially when the Education Department's policy letter provides absolutely no detail about how the one school/four site comprehensive system will work. (**A Member:** Yes.) We are being asked to abandon selection completely with absolutely no detail
1355 about how our most academically gifted children will be stretched in the new comprehensive system. This could be the biggest mistake you have ever made for the most capable children in this Island.

1360 Members, this amendment offers the large majority of people who responded to the consultation exercise, in favour of some form of selection other than the current system, a fair and reasonable compromise. To suggest that any form of assessment is now too stressful is just quite ridiculous.

1365 It also suggests that teachers do not want the responsibility of assessment and that it will all be too much for them. Well, I think that is a massive exaggeration or, if it is not, it is totally unacceptable. They are supposed to be professional. They earn a good salary because they are professional, so they must accept the responsibility for doing something professional. Everybody else does!

1370 Members, it is essential that we provide a means by which everyone achieves their maximum potential. I remain firm in my view that we are being asked to put at risk the education of our most academically-gifted 25%, without any detailed information on how a new comprehensive system will work for those students.

As I say, if the Education Department had produced a report which was full of information and full of detail, rather than just a statistical analysis on their consultation exercise – which they ignored – I would have far more confidence in their plans for the future.

1375 So I ask you, please support this amendment, because it really does offer a less stressful means of assessment.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Wilkie.

1380 **Deputy Wilkie:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, I have not spoken in this debate, so I will try and bring a fresh perspective if that is possible.

1385 Sir, I can fully understand why Deputy Trott brought this amendment. He brought it because he has never been through the experience of failing the 11-plus. He has not lived with the consequences of that test for the rest of his life, unlike the majority of pupils in Guernsey.

1390 Sir, I am going to tell you about how I first heard that I had failed the 11-plus. I was at a scout camp in Rue Maingy, and I remember it clearly. My mother had phoned; it was a time before mobile phones. I had to go to the phone box and take the phone call, and she was rather upset when she told me – actually more upset than I was, because I did not realise the full consequences at the time, and I was rather preoccupied because two of my troop had been kidnapped by the third and were hanging upside down by a tree nearby. I was organising a rescue attempt, and I was going to surround them and give them a good 'dwittering'. Unfortunately, later, my parents moved and I had to join the third, and that was a difficult induction, sir. (*Laughter*)

1395 But that evening we settled down in our tents and swapped stories and, well, rumours about what happened to first years in the certain schools that we were going to. The majority of us were then condemned, by a test at age 10, to a life of low income or manual labour or both. This was a

time before the finance industry. The day before, we were all equal, but at age 10 with those results revealed, that day changed everything. I still live every day with the ramifications of that result and the path it set my life on.

1400 Selection is a Victorian system of education. It is not fit for purpose in 2016, sir. Our economy has moved on and the needs of employers have changed. In the mid-to-late 1980s, the finance industry was overheating. Its demand for labour was unquenchable. Pupils at St Peter Port School were being offered jobs in the finance industry based on their predicted GCSE results, such was the demand of that sector. At that point, sir, our economy changed and its labour requirements
1405 changed. A single grammar school and the colleges cannot supply our economy with enough employees with the academic skills required.

1410 Sir, we do not have selection between 5 and 11 nor for 16 plus, but only between 11 and 16, and it is simply not logical. If we did not have a history of selection and we had a clean sheet of paper in front of us, would Members – bearing in mind the evidence before us and what I have just given you – really propose a system of selection? I think not because you would be foolish to.

Members, selection at 10, as I said, is a Victorian education system and there is no place in our modern economy. It is stifling the personal growth of our children and stifling the growth of our economy. I do not wish to see one more child go through such an unfair, regressive system.

1415 Unlike Deputy Perrot, it is not my belief, sir, it is my experience. Reject this amendment. It is the only logical choice.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ogier.

1420 **Deputy Ogier:** Thank you, sir.

I will brief. In my view, incidents of stress in our children are rising – not in my view, but incidents in our children are rising. That is empirical evidence. Mental health issues are becoming more widespread; self-harming is occurring in secondary schools – and it is. What our children need is less stress, not more.

1425 A two-year method of selection can only, in my view, further harm the health of our nine- and ten-year-olds in an environment where mental health issues are already rising. Children need less work, not more. They need less pressure, not more. They need more playtime, not less.

1430 We need to raise healthy well-balanced, well-educated children and, to me, that is best done by removing selection and ensuring that that we raise the standards of the secondary schools, which will be a topic of general debate, I am sure.

I am unable to support this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley.

1435 **Deputy Le Pelley:** Thank you, sir.

I think I should start, really, by declaring my interests before I get involved in what I have to say. First of all, I am a member of the Hautes Capelles Primary School committee. I am a life member of the Grammar School and Intermediate Association. In fact, I am a life member of that and for 10 years I was its secretary. (**A Member:** Not any more!) I have a son who is in Year 13 at the Grammar School, so that is where I have come from on that side of things.

1440 On the other side of things, I have been 33 years in the secondary system: secondary education. I started at St Sampson's secondary in 1973 and I continued there up until 2004. So 33 years – I say man and boy, really, but I started off at the age of 21/22, and I actually did all of my teaching in the one school.

1445 I might also want to explain why I abstained in the voting yesterday. (*Interjection*) Sorry, somebody was shouting across the way. I am going to explain it because I think it makes sense. If someone had told me to go to the shop and get a box of oranges or something and I arrived at the shop and there are only apples and pears available, why should I take one of those? Yesterday,

1450 I was given a choice of two things, because there are only two options on the table. I did not want either, so I abstained. And today I am offering you, together with Deputy Trott, the option that I wanted –

A Member: Fruitcake.

1455 **A Member:** Do not let him throw you!

1460 **Deputy Le Pelley:** Now, 15 years ago, I would have probably been arguing something totally different to what I am arguing today. Fifteen years ago, we were in a different place. The experience of children within the secondary sector was different. We have heard from various other Deputies who were involved in education that the raising of the school leaving age has happened; that selection has been slightly changed. We have actually got a different system now than we had then. When I was teaching in a secondary school, 15, 20, 30, 40 years ago, there were big, big differences to what there are today.

1465 If you were selected to go to the Grammar School, you had a particular academic route to follow. If you were not selected to go to the Grammar School, you went on to one of the secondary modern schools; you followed a different course. I readily accept that different course, certainly at St Sampson's, was extremely different. We had an excellence of cookery that went on there – that was actually forcibly taken away from the school and given to the College of FE by Education; they actually closed that department down. We had a typist centre, where people who
1470 were going to be typists went there. That was closed down, people were forcefully made to go the College of FE in Granville House. It was a different system.

I was very pleased to be teaching in a secondary modern school. And, although I accept that those that were selected to go into the more academic system had something of an advantage, I used that to my own advantage. I actually challenged my students to see if they could match the success rate – GCSE, CSE or whatever it was in those days – of the actual students who were at the
1475 Grammar School, and I had five years in which to do it.

When you set a class or a group of students a task over a number of years, you have to put something through the middle, a sort of a core of what you are teaching. You will have students who will be able to meet that core, that middle band. But you will have in any group of students
1480 some that will struggle with that level and so practically every lesson I ever prepared had something which was a minimum achievement or something, from time to time, may even have been more simplistically expressed so that those who were less able could actually cope with what the task was, given the actual main core task. I also had more able students who needed to have some kind of extension, and so there was something a little bit over and above that central core
1485 that demanded more of them, but by the end of 16 or so, they were in a position, had they followed the core, to be actually able to join into the sixth form at the Grammar School and continue along that path. It worked, and many, many students transferred across to the Grammar School.

But we are in a different time. Today, those children will be able to transfer across at the
1490 Grammar School much more easily than they could in those days. Fifteen to twenty years ago, it was very difficult. I think Deputy Sherbourne mentioned that there was a time, many years ago, where lots of children actually left school at 15. They did not actually sit the exams. So they were in no way ready or prepared to transfer across, and even those that did stay after 16 may very well have had other more vocational careers that they wished to follow.

1495 I want to come to the reason why I have actually seconded this amendment. I mentioned talking about what would happen if someone was sent to the greengrocers and actually was asked to bring something back that did not exist. I am looking at this 'Your Skills, Your Choices' and I think there are a couple of words that are missed out of the title: 'Your Skills, Your Opinions, Our Choice'. Because I think what has happened here is that the Education Department has
1500 actually asked people to give their views; those views have come back and they have not

answered or given the due attention to it all to give people the chance to actually look at the whole range of responses that came back.

1505 Now, we had 61% of all respondents who were against an all-ability system with no grammar school, whilst 28% of respondents were in favour of an all-ability system. That is an awful lot of people who wanted some kind of change to the selection process: a change to the selection process, not that they just wanted to have no 11-plus system whatsoever.

1510 I want to talk, as I go through my notes, about some of the things that people have actually said. I think Deputy Langlois summed up very, very well a lot of the things that, as an academic, one would expect him to say, and I sympathise with an awful lot of what he said. We are always being assessed. You are going to be assessed throughout the whole of your life. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) You are going to be assessed in two or three weeks' time. (*Interjections*) Some of you may not ... (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) (*Laughter*)

1515 The reason why, yesterday, I voted to actually go down the line of the sursis was because I think that this is going to come back. I do not think this is going to be resolved today or tomorrow, this Friday or even next Friday. I think this is going to be an election issue. I think we are going to be having parents or grandparents and other people interested in the education system raising it as an electoral matter. I think that whatever decision we come to this week, it could very well be tested and tried in the next term. We could very well be going down the line of actually setting things in motion and then actually having to undo them at some time of cost/
1520 some cost of time, and also in money. It is going to actually end up with delay and financial cost. And those of us that get re-elected and the new people that come in are going to be talking about this again. There will be 47 people here today making a decision. (*Interjections*) Today there will be 47 and in two months' time there will be 38. (**Several Members:** 40.) Plus two from Alderney: (*Laughter*) the only two who are guaranteed to be here! (**A Member:** And the Bailiff) To get rid of you, sir!

1525 I think it is very, very important that we actually discuss this fully today; that we actually have the chance of thrashing it around, because I am sure it is going to come back. I am sure that people who are considering standing in the election are taking great notice of what is going on, and depending on how the electoral districts return their Members, it could very well come up again.
1530

Now, we are talking about continuous assessment, and it is going to be hard work for teachers and it is going to be very difficult for primary school teachers to make assessments. But primary school teachers, as I think Deputy De Lisle mentioned, are actually making these assessments and recording them all the time. When I was head of English, 20 years ago now, one of the first jobs
1535 that I had to do once the 11-plus results were out was to actually go and meet with the junior schools. With the junior school teachers, I actually went through all of the records of assessment over the last two or three years of those children's academic lives and we actually looked to see where we were going to put them in which set. That was no easy job.

1540 And I tell you another thing, when it comes to assessment and you are choosing which set you are going to put the child in, come the first, second or third year of parents' evenings and you are suggesting that someone is going to drop or change a set, my goodness, you are under pressure! It is not just about whether you are going to this school or the other school, but if you are going to be dropping from a triple science down to a double science or you are going to be dropping down from a double English down to a single English subject, the parents are there on your case.
1545 No doubt about that at all. So do not think that there is going to be no pressure. Assessment exists in the secondary schools all the way through.

1550 I taught English Literature and English Language, and one year it was total teacher assessment, but it was partial teacher assessment all the way through my teaching career. What you did is you did an assessment as a teacher and then you actually graded the work and then you actually submitted that to the rest of the teaching in the English department who also had their own candidates, and you actually assessed everything that was in front of you. It was work over two years, continuous assessment. Then you made your recommendation of your grades and then you

1555 went to a full Island consortium. It still happens. You then had the grades assessed, checked, challenged. The rubric was laid out. You put the actually marks and the scores and all the objectives that had to be reached against the rubric and you then had to agree where your grey boundaries were going to be and you actually made your decision where the cut off points were going to be.

1560 Then you had to send all that off to England and it was done county by county. After that, the examination boards would actually pull in various samples from the different counties, and also from the different examining boards to make sure that the standards were the same across all of the boards. That is how it works; that is assessment and that is pressure on teachers.

1565 What is different about pressure on junior teachers? Why should secondary school teachers have that kind of pressure and be able to cope? Suddenly people are telling me, 'Sorry, primary school teachers will be under too much pressure.' I do not think so. 'Primary school teachers in Year 6 are going to be up and away!' I don't think so. These are professional people. These are people that are making decisions about children day in and day out. A lot of head teachers are not going to want to have the administration that some of this is going to require. I always want to know what the teachers think, not what the head teachers think. When there is a question about exactly what does this or that mean, you have got to be very, very careful that what the actually question was interpreted as is actually what you meant it to be.

1570 I think it is very, very important that we are actually having this extended discussion today. I am very, very grateful that Deputy Trott and others have persuaded me to talk to you and actually have this amendment aired and discussed, because without it we are actually missing a huge chunk of the options that should be on the table. **(Two Members: Hear. hear.)**

1575 Now, I have also heard from three Deputies who have actually said – I do not want to pick anybody out – 'I failed the 11-plus' or 'I did not succeed at the 11-plus and it has been a rock around my neck for the rest of my life'. Well, some of you are here and that must be the highest accolade you could possibly have done for your education. *(Interjection and laughter)* Well some of you might want to go up a few steps and sit up here. *(Laughter)* But I do not think that anybody fails at 11-plus. I think the only people who are failing to actually control themselves properly are the parents who are putting all sorts of false ideas into the children.

1580 You are being selected for a type of education, at a pace that you will be able to handle. I would much rather have had, when I was teaching, a group of youngsters – and I think this may have been touched on by Deputy De Lisle, again – when you have actually got in a secondary school the A set or the top set in front of you, they are big fish in a small tank, and they will prosper, they will do well. If you were to have those same students in a very, very big comprehensive – and this is the trouble for me: the size of comprehensives – if you have got those children in a very big school, they might very well only be – those that would have been set A in the secondary school – in C or D in the comprehensive school. So their feeling of self-importance, their feeling of achievement, is actually improved by being in a secondary school.

1590 Deputy Bebb actually said to me, 'I have not heard anybody singing out the praises for the high schools.' Well, I will sing out the praises for the high schools. I think we have got some jolly good ones. I think that the people there are doing extremely well and the system that we have actually got in place now, as opposed to 15 or 20 years ago, is giving them every possibility to get into the sixth form, to get onto either the International Baccalaureate or the A-level and into university. The Minister, I am sure, will tell us exactly how many people are going away and following those kind of courses. It is getting better and better every year.

1600 Mind you, we do have to be careful about educational creep. That is where the grades go up and up and up, year on year on year. I think there have been various benchmarks that had to be changed and actually dropped down a bit to make sure that we do not actually have 102% of people who have passed the exam.

I said that all of the high schools and the Grammar School and the colleges are doing very, very well. I think all could do better and I encourage people to do better. Somebody mentioned that, if we actually go down this path of voting in favour of this particular amendment, there is

1605 going to be an industry of tutoring going on. Well, there may be more tutoring. For me that is
good news. It means that youngsters are going to be actually given more help. I was tutored
when I was 10 or 11, not for the 11-plus, but I was one of those who actually was not that bright
1610 on maths. Without getting the foundations right, I was going to be lost, so I had tuition to get me
on the right path – not for long, because my parents could not afford that much, but I had it and I
appreciated it. I think that the right intervention, at the right time, is good for everybody. If you
have got a youngster that is struggling to read or struggling with its mathematical understanding,
why not get a bit of tuition, one to one teaching? Brilliant, if that is available within the school. I
am sure that there are probably systems around where older, more able students might be
1615 actually helping the less-able. It might be parents go in to give a bit of help. What is wrong with
that? (**A Member:** Nothing!)

What I want to see in Guernsey is a raising of the education standards everywhere, whether it
is at Ladies' College, Elizabeth College, any of the high schools or the Grammar School, or even
the primary schools, wherever; we should all be aiming to do our level best. We should not be
talking about failures; we should be talking about people achieving the best that they possibly can
1620 do.

For me, the present system is not broken. What we have is a risk here. I mentioned that I have
a background – having come from the Grammar School – where I have encouraged my students
at the secondary school to try and match or to overtake the people that are alongside them in
different schools. My top set English, when I was teaching at St Sampson's, we were always trying
1625 to outdo the second set or the first set somewhere else. That was part of the game; it was part of
the challenge; part of the 'keep them going'. Raise our standards by making sure that we were as
good, if not better than some other class. It is competitiveness. It is there. I think Deputy James
mentioned something along the lines of 'non-competitive sport', well Education, in several places,
have tried that. It did not work, because everybody wants to beat the other person. It is always
1630 there; it is part of our nature, so I make no apologies for actually having my kids all fired up and
ready to go.

Some of these proposals in theory are fine. In practice, I am worried, because we have
something which works at the moment. It may be able to be improved upon, but what we are
actually thinking of doing by yesterday's vote is going into the unknown. We are going
1635 somewhere we do not know exactly what the risks totally are. If we get it wrong, there is going to
be a generation of youngsters that are going to suffer. We are also going to have a period of
transition, if we go down the decision that we made yesterday, where a whole five-year or so band
of youngsters in the selective Grammar School are going to be put at risk. There will be teacher
movement; there will stress and strain amongst the youngsters that are there. I think you need to
1640 be very, very careful that in deciding to make this change ... I do not know what the transition
arrangements are going to be; I do not think it has been worked out properly yet, but whatever
they are, you are putting a huge group of youngsters at risk. You have a successful school. You
have a successful culture. You have a very good reputation in this Island of what you actually
produce in the schools. All that is put at risk if you change the system.

I think we also need to talk about special needs. I do not know what is coming. I have not read
the other amendment so if I stray, please tell me. Special needs exist at both ends of spectrum.
You have got to be able to cope with the ultra-bright as well as those that have learning
difficulties. They are both as important ... (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) If you have a gifted child, you
must get that child to use all of its gifts. to express them, to expand them and to nurture them
1650 and to make them the best they possibly can be. This may very well happen best in a selected
school. You have also got to be able to help those that need extra help, learning difficulty-wise.
That may also happen in a selective system.

I have not taught in lots of schools, but I have had experience of them. I taught, on a teaching
practice, in inner London and Southampton and I have seen some tough schools. I have seen
1655 some tough kids: hoodlums that would give the roughest and toughest in this society – and twice
their age – a good run for their money, because I was teaching in primary schools.

1660 I think Guernsey has got an education system at the present time to be proud of. I did my teacher training in Chichester, West Sussex. West Sussex ran a three-tier system of education: 3-4 and up to 8; 9 to 13; 14 to 18. I must say that, when I did my teaching practice or teaching observations – and it was not a properly assessed teaching practice, but it was where you used to go once a week and you did an afternoon or you went for a Friday, and I went to Herbert Shiner Middle School. It was actually the showcase school of West Sussex, a brilliant school. I suggest, in fact, that perhaps your best age for selecting would be 14 rather than 11, but that may be something else that Education needs to look at.

1665 Somewhere along the line we are going to have to decide exactly what is best for our kids and, for me, the best for these youngsters is to have some form of selection which is less stressful. I really do believe that continuous assessment is less stressful, because if you go on and say, 'Well we are not to have any course work assessment or any sort of continuous assessment' then you can forget doing GCSEs because five GSCSEs at Grade A-C, English, maths and a science is what gets you into the Sixth Form Centre. If you do not get that, you do not get in there. Then you go on to do your A-levels. If you do not get two As and a B, you can forget the best universities. If you do not get your 38 points, you are not going to go to one of the better international universities or the university of your choice. And when you get there: your modules, guess what? Continuous assessment.

1675 I think I have answered most of the questions, most of the points I wanted to make. I would just like to finish by thanking you for listening and hope you will support this amendment.
Thank you. *(Applause)*

1680 **A Member:** Hear, hear.

A Member: Good speech.

The Bailiff: Does anyone have a short speech?

1685 **Deputy Perrot:** I have a long short speech. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: A non-short speech. Well, that will give us something to look forward to over our lunch, Deputy Perrot. *(Laughter and applause)*

We will rise and return at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.28 p.m.
and resumed it sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education – Debate continued

1690 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Perrot.

Deputy Perrot: Actually, sir, before we recessed for lunch it was just my little joke, really. I have not got a long speech at all I just wanted to upset people a bit. *(Laughter)*

1695 I confirm though, all that I said two days ago, of course I am not going to repeat it. I do not deflect in my own mind from what I say about being in favour of selection. But there a couple of things which arose through the course of this morning's debate that I thought it right to comment on.

First, I thought that it was unfair on the mover of this amendment to try to rubbish him by there being a sort of mob rule against him when he said that it was not his amendment but that

1700 he was speaking on behalf of the majority of the Guernsey people. The fact is that the majority of
people who cared enough about the system to comment on it commented as we have read in the
Billet. I think that Deputy Trott and Deputy Le Pelley, both of them, are doing a service to the
community, at least in airing this amendment. This is a debating, democratic Chamber, why
shouldn't they do that? I think it was unpleasant and certainly unhelpful for Deputy Brehaut to
1705 make that snide remark by implying that Deputy Trott was somehow electioneering by putting
forward this amendment.

What this amendment is doing is broadening the opportunity for accepting the possibility of
selection. Deputy Fallaize said that those who will support this amendment support the 11-plus.
Actually it is much more nuanced than that, because a number of people said yesterday and the
1710 day before that, they were in favour of selection, but they felt that perhaps the 11-plus was a
rather too brutal form of selection. It seemed to those who are putting this proposition – it
certainly seemed to me – that it was right that there should be an alternative amendment put
forward. But the way in which this debate has been structured – and I do not cavil at it – was that
those amendments 1A and 1B were going to be debated together. That was set in stone for the
1715 purposes of this debate, absolutely fine. But it would have been helpful, I think, if we had had the
possibility of debating an alternative amendment such as this during that earlier part of the
debate.

It will come as no surprise to anybody that I am of the same view as I was two days ago. It
comes as absolutely no surprise to me at all that other people are of a completely contrary view
1720 so far as Education is concerned. This amendment is not designed for those who are implacably
opposed to selection, such as for example, Deputy Sherbourne, who said yesterday he had waited
47 years for this result. There is no way in which he is going to be swayed, and that is not the idea
of the amendment. Although I think, in saying that, we can draw the teeniest-weeniest inference
that he did not approach the results of the consultation with an entirely open mind. (*Laughter*)

1725 What Deputy Trott is doing – I do not wish unnecessarily to repeat myself but it is important to
understand, though, what he is trying to do – is to offer a genuine alternative way. As I said two
days ago, everything such as this will have its own difficulties. If we are negative about it we can
always find so many negative things about continuous assessment and about testing that we
never do it. But if we were to approach it in a positive way and say, 'Yes, that is what we are for,'
1730 we could work together with the Education Department to find something. I say, I think that the
objections to this alternative way are really much exaggerated. I do not understand the objection
to testing.

Now, of course, it is many years since I was at primary school – we wore short trousers then
and I really cannot now remember ... but what I *do* remember is that we were tested all the time.
1735 And philosophically if one is teaching, how does one find out whether children are learning
without testing? It seems to me that testing is an inherent part of the educational system.
Doubtless people will stand up and say, 'No, no, no that is far too old-fashioned, never do that, it
absolutely upsets the school pet rabbit.' (*Laughter*)

I cannot believe that we can have a system of teaching without testing. All the things that I
1740 have ever done – whether it was at primary school, whether it was doing ground lessons to learn
to fly or ground lessons to learn to navigate at sea or reading for the bar – we were tested *all*
the time. What is difficult about that? And what is difficult about reporting on how well children do at
school?

Somebody mentioned earlier on that we have annual reporting, school reports, so what is the
1745 big deal therefore about continuing with that? As far as I remember, we were the subject of
quarterly reports when I was at school and that was certainly of considerable interest to parents
and I suppose –

I give way to the Chief Minister.

1750 **The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq):** I thank Deputy Perrot for giving way.

I hope that ... I certainly do not have anything against testing and I think it is very useful. It is what you are tested for and what you do with those tests. I am sure Deputy Perrot when he –

1755 **Deputy Perrot:** Sir, I wonder if I could finish my speech. I had not realised that Deputy Le Tocq wanted to make a separate speech.

The Chief Minister: Well, could just finish my interruption first? (*Laughter*)

1760 **Deputy Perrot:** I think he has spoken already hasn't he sir, in this debate?

The Bailiff: Yes, but you gave way to him so I think you have got to allow him to finish –

Deputy Perrot: Well, can I stop giving way to him? (*Laughter*)

1765 **The Bailiff:** Unless he wants to give way to you.

1770 **The Chief Minister:** I will be brief, but I was going to suggest that what you are tested for really does matter and what you do with those tests and the results of those tests. I am sure Deputy Perrot, he was talking to me in the lunch break about it, when he took his exams at Caen University so that he could practise at the bar here in Guernsey I am sure that they did not say, 'Now you can fly a plane.' It is not appropriate, I think, as a result of those exams ... That is the reason you had to take *other* exams to fly a plane.

The point of testing, it is not appropriate to then segregate to different schools. That is –

1775 **Deputy Perrot:** I wonder if the Chief Minister will give way to me now? (*Laughter*)

1780 Well there we are. He started speaking about my time at the University of Caen. I suppose I ought to finish the story which I told him at lunchtime, which is that we had seven vivers – you will remember this, sir, I am sure – at the University of Caen in French. In my contract law, I do remember Professor Bustard, inappropriately named, he could have actually had a more felicitous name with just the change of a vowel (*Laughter*) – Professor Bustard said to me, 'Monsieur Perrot, have you actually opened a book on contracts since you have been at this University?' I have to say that I was devastated then, but anyway that was at the University of Caen and not at primary school.

1785 Deputy Fallaize came up with his usual little parsing of amendments and actually, unfortunately, I do find myself in agreement with him, because when I looked at the first iteration of this amendment, it did not have a second limb to it. I do regard that second limb as sitting really rather unhappily with the first limb, and I do not know how to navigate my way through that. I would hope that Deputy Trott, when he sums up, will find some way perhaps of asking if we can vote disjunctively in relation to the two limbs of this Proposition, rather than conjunctively because I do not think that they read happily together.

1790 Deputy Green said that this, the amendment, makes the 11-plus look good. Well, that was a terrific soundbite, and I am sure it was impromptu, but even if he worked all last night to think about it, it sounded really terrific this morning, (*Laughter*) however wrong it was. It does not make the 11-plus look good. What it was was an offer to have a genuine response to the debate, and I keep coming back to this: we are a debating chamber. It is not good enough for Deputy Green to say, 'We have debated this to death.' He is saying that because he got a result yesterday, but if he had not got a result he would be as keen as I am to keep debating the subject. If you do not like that, tough – through you, sir – that is democracy. Live with it.

1800 I was impressed by the speech from Deputy Louis Jean. And I thank him for speaking up for the relatively few, but nevertheless just as important ordinary school children, despite pressure from the Education Department.

I also congratulate Deputy Langlois for what I thought was a very balanced approach.

1805 Deputy Gillson sought to downgrade this amendment by saying that it was a classic Guernsey compromise. No it is not! It is a grown-up response to a debate. It is a genuine attempt to open up the width of the debate and to give people the opportunity of voting on something different. If, as Deputy Gillson says, that it results in the schools and teachers being subject to enquiries, in pressures from parents – good. There needs to be proper engagement between parents and the schools.

1810 Deputy Sherbourne finds it amazing that we are going through the debate all over again. Well, again, I think we have to get used to it, that is what a democratic system is all about. But he finished with a theatrical flourish (*Laughter*) by quoting from a monograph of a lady who, wow, she has got a PhD. Well, look, I do not care whether she has got a PhD, or like my father was a labourer. The fact is that all she is doing in that monograph is giving an opinion; we all follow our opinions and beliefs when we are debating here. It is not as if she was writing or engraving in a tablet of stone which was found at the bottom of Mount Hebron in the wilderness of Sinai. (*Laughter*)

1820 Deputy Bebb used this as an opportunity for using what he said, he loved the expression, ‘a fatuous exercise’ and he did that of course in his high Welsh English and said it was, ‘separating sheep from sheep’ Again, terrific soundbite, but absolute nonsense (*Laughter*) and we all know that it was nonsense. Actually that does injustice to what is a perfectly acceptable system which is continuing assessment. As I say, there are problems with every system and what you have got to try to do is to iron the bugs out of that system. (*Interjection*) I will ignore that. (*Laughter*)

1825 He also spoke about snobbery. Quite why he had to introduce that at this stage of the debate, refer to the Ladies’ College ... he referred to one of his acquaintances who said, ‘I want my children to be in a nice school with my nice money.’ Well again, if he thinks that he is going to tar all of us who believe in private education or selective education with that sort of comment he has got another thing coming. So far as I am concerned, in all of the 59 years since I passed the 11-plus and went from a dirt poor family to the hallowed precincts of Elizabeth College, I never once came across anybody who treated my other than as an equal. Not necessarily as a friend, because 1830 all boys are not necessarily friends. But no one *ever* treated me as if I was somebody who was below the salt because my parents did not have the money that they had, nor did their parents ever behave that ... I do not believe that people at the Ladies’ College or at Blanchelande do that sort of thing. So bringing that sort of thing into the equation – shame on him, or at least he ought to choose his acquaintances more carefully.

1835 As far as Deputy Wilkie is concerned he says that, ‘Our selection of people will be condemned to low income or manual labour or both,’ Well actually that is not a world that I recognise at all in relation to the way in which our educational system operates and –

1840 **Deputy Wilkie:** Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Wilkie.

1845 **Deputy Wilkie:** I was actually saying that that was back in the early 80’s when I was going through the selection system, not now, sir.

1850 **Deputy Perrot:** That is not a world that I recognise, either now, nor do I recognise that from the past. But he finished off by saying, ‘Unlike Deputy Perrot it is my belief,’ Well actually when I was talking about my belief I was talking about my belief that the Education Department approached the consultation process with a less than open balanced mind. What Deputy Wilkie was talking about at that time was the concept – so he said – of failure.

I commend –

Deputy Wilkie: Point of correction, sir. I was talking about *my* experience.

1855 **Deputy Perrot:** He was talking about the concept of failure. If we need to actually find out whether that is true or not we can look up *Hansard*, but I think that the intervention is not at all relevant.

I commend the proposer and seconder of this amendment. I also believe that it will be lost because one detects what the atmosphere is in this House, I have done it on many occasions, and my antennae tell me that it is not going to win. But I think that it is right that it ought to be able to be debated and it ought to be debated without being shouted down and laughed with scorn, as it was in the opening few minutes of Deputy Trott's speech.

I will be voting for the amendment, even if no one else does.

1865 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley.

Deputy Hadley: Mr Bailiff, I think the debate yesterday and this morning has shown that people have forgotten the central issue that we are really debating, and that is whether it is appropriate to separate children at the age of 11 and bring them back together at the age of 16, whether or not it is appropriate to divide people into different groups when they are entering state education.

There are all sorts of arguments about the suitability of one form of selection or other that is totally irrelevant to the thrust of the debate. And why, I think, some of my colleagues on the Education Board have got a little frustrated, because this amendment really is so close to the amendment which was debated yesterday as to be only marginally different.

The central issue is do you want selection for state schools and that is why this amendment should be rejected.

The Bailiff: Deputy Adam.

1880 **Deputy Adam:** Thank you, sir.

I wish to start by saying that in the debate yesterday I stated, 'Assessment of ability at 11 is not a reliable predictor of achievement in later life. It is not even a reliable predictor of academic performance at school.' I did not specify whether that was the 11-plus or assessments before that. Some people have been talking about assessments and looking at exams. One thing I remember distinctly is Deputy Brouard and he said his daughter is now at university – very good, excellent – and she has routine assessments, excellent, and modules to do over a two-to-three-year period, but his daughter is not 11 years old. It does make a difference.

Deputy Gillson, he was very accurate about assessments in primary school. Primary school assessment is of a child's progress in learning *not* a measure of any potential for future progress or expected attainment. Old ideas of intelligence ability as predetermined are long discredited, that means the IQ tests that the old 11-plus was based on is no longer accepted. Neuroscience is discovering more and more how the brain can change and adapt, and this knowledge is increasingly being integrated into teaching. Now they know that the brain has what is called neuroplasticity, and also it can develop new neurons and this is part of the development of the brain. We are all talking about the 11-plus as if the brain is fully developed, as if all your learning is done – no it is not, it is just starting. The point is learning is a complex matter. When you are young you use sensory and motor stage, that means you are using your senses and your muscles exploring things, touching things, smelling and seeing. Then you go on to language differentiation; then you go on to representational thinking.

Now, most of primary school children are what is called concrete thinkers as opposed to logical thinkers. Aged 7 to 12 concrete thinking is the main skill, not principle or formal logic and abstract thinking. It is not until later that that develops. So basically, believe it or not, children aged 9-10 you might call them different animals from children 14-16. Learning depends on experience and plays a huge part in development. So that, I think, is why we can say that the 11-

plus is not a good method of assessing at that age. There is no point saying, 'Teachers are doing it already' – yes they are, but it is for a different purpose, as Deputy Gillson says.

1910 I suggest that it is reasonable enough to have an amendment concerning this so it can be discussed in full. But remember the Education Department did look at other methods and it is stating that they felt they were not suitable, it would be difficult to assess. We have heard ... and in fact after yesterday's debate I received two or three emails late last night and early this morning from primary school teachers saying that it would be difficult to get teachers having to assess children over a two-year period for the purposes of separating them into different schools. And as Deputy Hadley has just said, what are we talking about? Should you separate them at 11 and join them up at 16 or are all-ability schools purely acceptable?

1915 Sir, in view of what I have said I am sure Deputy Perrot will realise I am not supporting this amendment.

Thank you.

1920 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Lièvre.

Deputy Le Lièvre: Thank you, sir.

1925 I am approaching this issue from a completely different angle. A child spends six hours a day, five days a week in school and a young child will spend around 10 hours a day in bed or seven nights a week in bed and about eight hours a day with his family and friends. That is 30 hours a week in school and 156 hours a week out of school. One-sixth of a child's life is in school. Rather like an iceberg, five-sixths of a child's life is out of school.

1930 I would like you to consider – especially as we are talking about assessment over a two-year period of that child's performance, bearing in mind that five-sixths of his life is spend outside of school – some of the impacts of things that might happen to him out of school that will actually affect his performance in school.

1935 The biggest one, of course, of these is marital breakdown. I looked up at lunchtime – because I did not have much time – various research and in New Zealand it reveals that one in eight children will have experienced the impact of marital breakdown by the age of five – one in eight. Now I am not a statistician so I do not know what the figures would be for one in 10, but it would be significantly higher than that. And what about the toxic years before a marriage breaks down irretrievably? How does that affect a child? Marriage and re-marriage, family re-formation, overcrowding, the health of the parent or the parents or a brother or sister, the child's health, the death of a close family member, bullying, these are all relevant issues that will happen outside of school and sometimes in school that will affect a child's performance, and specifically over a two-year period the chances of one of these things happening is greatly increased. It is not like the 11-plus which happens over a week or two or whatever. This is over two years we are talking about.

1940 I want you to consider what happens when a parent is told that their child has been selected out, so to speak, and one of these things has happened in this child's life. Well, I will tell you what has happened because I have sat on the various appeal panels within Education and other appeal panels from time to time. The parent will choose the best defence they possibly can. They will find every reason under the sun why the performance of their child has been lower than would have otherwise been expected. They will do that, and they will do it for the child, and one cannot blame them for doing that. They will hire the best help possible to achieve the outcome they so desire, that is a fact. And good luck to them, I expect them to do that. But we cannot divorce five-sixths of a child's life and their performance in school, or rather out of school, with what happens in school, the two are inseparable. Therefore what would happen, if the States agrees this and it went ahead, Education would be inundated with appeals at the time of selection, there is no doubt about that whatsoever, it would be inundated and it would be faced with making these extremely difficult decisions which really there is no real answer to.

1945

1950

1955

So my advice is steer well clear. It has a certain allure to it this amendment, there is part of it which says yes, I could go with that but I would avoid doing so because two years in a child's life is a lifetime.

Thank you.

1960

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I rise merely to say that my view has not changed. I stick by what I said on the Deputy St Pier A1 amendment yesterday, every single word of which applies to this amendment.

1965

I have heard some excellent speeches from both sides in this debate. The stand-out speech for me was made by Deputy Le Pelley this morning, who I thought made the best speech he has ever made in this Chamber. However, on balance I am not going to change my mind, I am standing shoulder to shoulder with the board on this whole issue. I always base my decision and my vote on what I consider to be sound, logical and evidence-based views and ultimately, of course, what I consider to be best for the Island.

1970

For me, sir, it is all about quality and equality, it is not about quantity. And no amount of cajoling or comments in the corridor or threats or bullying from inside or outside of this Chamber will change my mind about that, because I only need to hear a good argument once. A weak argument will always remain a weak argument, no matter how many times it is made. And sir, to echo the words of Deputy Perrot and Alderney Representative Jean, that is *my* belief.

1975

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

1980

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I think today's debate has been a little more ill-tempered than yesterday's, which is perhaps inevitable because so much of what has been said has been repetitious of that debate.

1985

Deputy Gollop said that this amendment had obviously been rushed, 'hastily prepared' I think was the phrase he used, which of course it had been because he picked up that those bringing it had incorporated the same typo as I had in my amendment. (*Laughter*)

But I think Deputy Langlois has made the point that he felt that it would have been deficient not to have looked at this issue and I do understand that, but I have to say, sir, I think it would have been far better for those who have adopted this position had they – in the knowledge of the amendments which have been laid on behalf of Treasury at the end of last week – to have brought this amendment in order that it could have been debated at the same time. I do think that it is unfortunate that we have been put in the position that we have, sir.

1990

I thank Deputy Conder for indicating his Department's support for the amendment which will be shortly laid if this amendment is defeated, because I do feel that academic setting by ability is the appreciate way to address the issues of so much concern to so many people.

1995

I think it is worth just noting some of the comments from the profession on this. From a Year 6 primary teacher and deputy head, 'For a variety of reasons it is unworkable that Year 5 and Year 6 teachers have any choice or influence on which schools pupils move to for their secondary high school education. I am surprised that this is even being suggested as a viable solution.'

2000

Also from a primary teacher and a parent of three children, 'I am at a loss and only hope that common sense will prevail on the basis that it is both ridiculous and educationally unsound.'

In relation to the Rule 15.2 point, I think Deputy Gillson drew attention to the fact that is quite possible that implementation of this amendment would incur costs to the States in producing this new system and certainly in the moderation of it, which he spoke to. Again, I reiterate the same points I made in closing yesterday's speech, sir, that the consequences for the educational viability of a three-school model would be impacted as well if this amendment were to succeed.

2005

This Assembly has not actually ducked making some very difficult decisions, but I think to change our minds in less than 24 hours is precisely the sort of decision which would bring this Assembly into disrepute, sir. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2010 If anyone changes their vote I think it should be to add to the majority rejecting it, just as Deputy Luxon did yesterday on voting on A2, and I do consider that to be the responsible thing to do. Because I think, as Deputy Jones pointed out, the amendments yesterday were very clear, they were between the retention of the 11-plus or a non-selective system and this Assembly adopted admission by non-selective process, so nothing at all, sir, has changed overnight in relation to that prior decision.

2015 Deputy Fallaize spoke of his son being in Year 5 and about the requirement for them, at that age, to be free of the potential pressures of a combination of progress tests and continuous assessment. I would agree, sir, that I think at that age the key aim of education should be to enable children to acquire an enjoyment of learning. Because if they acquire it at that age that will stand them in good stead through the rest of their educational career and beyond.

2020 Deputy Green really I think, raised many of the questions I was going to about the contents of what this amendment means. What combination was one of his questions, but what I would also like to ask those moving this, to what subjects are we going to apply this combination of progress tests and continuous assessment? Could we perhaps have some detail around that – will it include verbal reasoning and non-verbal reasoning, for example?

2025 Deputies Fallaize, Bebb and Hadley I think in varying degrees all made the same point. Why are we selecting two schools providing *broadly* the same curriculum and the same education? That is the point. What is this selection process for? And that has not been answered by this amendment. What will it achieve that academic setting by ability cannot?

2030 Deputy Luxon, sir, I think to some extent hit the nail on the head with ... he did not use this word, but this amendment to all intents and purposes is a surrogate sursis. If it succeeds I think it does bring the whole thing to a shuddering halt.

2035 Deputy ... Sillars yesterday – forgive me, I have got so many names in my head sir! – gave a story about the fox and the scorpion. Well, we all know that Deputy Trott is a wily old fox and he may at times be a scorpion too. (*Laughter*) He can perhaps combine both roles of that particular story, and he is smart enough to know the implications or the potential implications of this surrogate sursis

2040 Deputy Brouard spoke of his own daughter's experience. Sir, with respect, the big difference between his own daughter and this amendment is about 10 years. And the fact that he suggested that the children probably will not even know that they are being assessed, I suspect his daughter does know she is being assessed, and I can certainly advise, based from the experience of my children who have assessments; they certainly know when they are being assessed. I think that chimes with Deputy James's comments and others in relation to the stress around this.

2045 Finally, sir, Deputy Le Pelley said, 'The present system is not broken', but yet he would not support the present system yesterday.

The Bailiff: I see no one else wanting to speak so the Education Minister will speak immediately before Deputy Trott replies. Deputy Sillars.

2050 **Deputy Sillars:** Thank you, sir.

For brevity I would like to thank all Deputies who are supporting to vote against this amendment, some excellent speeches so thank you.

2055 Not quite reverse order, but regarding Deputy Perrot I just really wanted to say that I guess you chose to take your flying test, I am not sure many – although a couple here who have passed their test – want to go flying, but actually the result is totally different. You do not go down a totally different pathway if you do not pass that test. Testing causes 'teaching to the test', in this case it would be over two years, but I would like to thank you for your speech.

2060 Deputy Jones said we did not listen; well we do: 70% said we wanted another means of selection but were divided over what this should be. At what point did the public say they wanted testing over two years? This amendment, if passed, will damage the parent, student, teacher relationship immeasurably.

Deputy Domaille, yes, we did consider other options for retaining selection and we did consider what this amendment is suggesting, but we discarded it very quickly.

2065 Alderney Representative Jean, this amendment is an experiment. By voting for this you will be voting for an experiment in Alderney, which you say you do not want to do. Regarding the Public Meeting that was held in Alderney, whilst I accept that not many attended, but the overwhelming view of the parents there were of the view that they did not want their children to leave the Island at 11. The new head teacher at St Anne's is absolutely behind the Education Department's proposals.

2070 Deputy Luxon, thank you for asking your two very good questions and I look forward –

The Bailiff: Can you do it through the Chair – you are directing Members directly. You do not need to look at me. It is just the way you were –

2075 **Deputy Sillars:** It is a pleasure to do so, sir. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: It is the language you were you using, rather than the way you directed, sir.

Deputy Sillars: I look forward to Deputy Trott's reply.
2080 Deputy Langlois, I am glad you confirmed that you taught – *(Laughter and interjections)*

A Member: That *he* confirmed.

2085 **Deputy Sillars:** Sorry. I am glad *he* confirmed that he taught 14 years and older, but we are talking about 9-to-11-year-old children.

Deputy Conder, as an expert on higher education, has said many times that he did not know about primary and secondary education. I am personally really glad how much he has learnt in this area, as I, over the last four years whilst on our board. We are talking about 9-to-11-year-olds and wanting them to embrace learning and a wider world in all its beauty and all that entails.

2090 Deputy Brouard, I have always appreciated your full support of our education policies. You referred to your daughter. *(Interjection)* *He*, sorry; can I have a five-minute recess whilst I change 'I' to 'he'? *(Laughter)* I think I am allowed to say this – You referred to your daughter who –

A Member: To *his* daughter.

2095 **Deputy Sillars:** Who I guess is aged between 19 and 20. I think you have missed a decade. *(Interjection)* He missed a decade *(Laughter)* – anyway, we will carry on, see how we can get on with this – surely you cannot compare, one cannot compare *(Laughter and applause)* a 19-year-old with a nine-year-old. I do not whether to say I, you or we ... is somebody saying we need to get our primary schools up to university level? Well we are doing jolly well but that does seem a tad ambitious. We have already voted for the best yesterday, it is certainly not the least worse.

2100 Deputy Lowe, all head teachers have strongly come out against this fag packet amendment. It would have been far better to have laid this some weeks ago and not moving it this morning, surely.

2105 Deputy Le Lisle talked about borderline students, but that is selection to go to a school. It should of course be about widening the experiences and the opportunities for these children, providing them a thirst for learning, not narrowing the curriculum down to a series of tests and assessments for a school place. He seems to be implying that the Grammar School teachers are

2110 better than high school teachers, well if that was the intention that is appalling. I simply hope that
2111 this was not his intention when he was referring to house moving and things like that.

Deputy Le Lisle: Sir, it certainly was not.

2115 **Deputy Sillars:** Good, thank you.
Deputy James –

A Member: Which one – the sensible Jones or ...?

2120 **Deputy Sillars:** James. I have dealt with one of the Joneses, if I am allowed to say it like that,
and the other one I dealt with because he had a very sensible speech.

2125 Deputy James asked two questions for me. In Finland, one of the highest performing
jurisdictions in terms of academic achievement and wellbeing, the first high-stakes exams are at
18. Ours would be 16, but we have to consider we are part of the British Isles. Of course currently
our first high-stakes exams are at 10 years old, which is the 11-plus, but of course that would
become 9 or 10 if this amendment was successful. Your second question I can answer for myself
and my board and know it is not for financial reasons that we supported removing selection at 11.
It is for *very* strong educational reasons.

2130 Deputy Gollop, if he does not like selection vote against this two-year selection process. He is
talking about flip-flopping; well, please flip-flop over to our side of this debate.

2135 Deputy Spruce, nothing new to respond to, disappointing that there have been so many
derogatory remarks about the profession who work successfully in our schools day in, day out for
the benefit of all our children and young people. They are doing an amazing job. How can a two-
year process of assessment and testing to decide which school a child is going to not add
additional pressure and stress? Teachers are happy to assess and do so when the clear purpose is
to improve the learning of the children, not to determine a school place. That is what they do
lesson in and lesson out.

2140 Deputy Le Pelley, thank you for your different offering and your secondary teaching
experience. I hope that this Assembly rejects it. Do we really want our children old before their
time? Do we really want them to enjoy their childhood, to foster an enjoyment of school, to be
excited about learning, to be creative, to have fun? What he is proposing will take all that away
from them, affecting their ongoing development and their willingness to learn. The public have
not endorsed his amendment, let's be clear about that.

2145 In the space of just a few hours I had so many emails asking us to kick out your amendment; I
cannot even count them. The vast majority begging us to stick with the decision we made
yesterday. Listening to his speech before lunch, it came across to me that this is a very clever
amendment as it would effectively be a sursis as we could not then go on to debate any of the
other issues before us today. In addition, he spoke about the trauma of putting children into sets
in Year 7, and at a later date moving them from set to set in the secondary phase. Imagine the
pressure on primary teachers in the last two years of the primary school, who would have to
2150 assess children for the purpose of selecting their school and the undoubted pressure from parents
and grandparents.

2155 Your amendment states that there are no financial implications. That has been covered but I
would like to confirm you know that is not true, as you explained the internal external moderation
across school would be of critical importance in your process. We would therefore have to
increase substantially the resourcing of in-school moderation, external moderation in our primary
schools at significant cost.

2160 He went on to talk about the benefits of competition in sport, inferring that the next step of
these developments would be to reduce that in Guernsey. I think he was probably talking about
the UK predominantly, but you are well aware that our schools in the wider community fully
embrace competitive sporting activity and will continue to do so.

2165 How much longer are we going to dither? How much procrastination would the whole Island have to endure? We should be ashamed of ourselves to having this debate again. I am not surprised that Deputy Trott wanted to delay this debate with a sursis so here we go again. In terms of the proposal we are ridiculously being asked to consider to come up with an alternative form of selection to replace 11-plus. We have already addressed that in our policy letter: There is not an alternative. No one else has come up with one, Deputy Trott.

Let me just deal with some of the problems he is proposing. His proposal would lead to the worst of both worlds. It increases the amount of testing on our children and puts pressure on teachers.

2170 By the way, I would like to draw Members' attention to the resentment and anger amongst some of the profession caused by some Members' speeches yesterday suggesting that teachers are opposed to selection so that they hide behind their performance. I would encourage Members to engage their brains before opening their mouths in this area. It really is not fair and they have no way of answering.

2175 Deputy Trott's proposals will lead to teaching to the test and narrowing the curriculum. Whilst I might not expect him to know what the purpose of primary education is, I am surprised that Deputy Le Pelley is supporting this amendment as a former teacher.

2180 The purpose of primary education is to establish the foundations and enjoyment for learning, provide the wide range of skills in literacy, numeracy, social skills, communication skills, creative development skills, problem-solving skills, collaboration and physical development. We want our children to enjoy learning and be excited to learn, develop a growth mind-set and a can-do attitude. What Deputy Trott is proposing is completely the opposite with Years 5 and 6 becoming a treadmill of testing, harking back to the dark Neanderthal days of Michael Gove. **(Two Members: Hear, hear.)**

2185 Let's also look at this from a practical perspective. One; I believe based on the feedback overnight that we will struggle to recruit and find teachers to teach Years 5 and 6. Why would they want to be associated with such a turgid curriculum? And what if the increased moderation required for this will put even more pressure on our teachers? Deputy Le Pelley knows this, so it is inexcusable that he is seconding this amendment. Deputy Trott's lack of understanding is more understandable.

2190 And what of appeals? The States of Guernsey will be deluged with appeals from parents who will be challenging the judgements of the continual assessment – a completely nonsensical proposal. But of course, most fundamentally, Deputy Trott's proposals ignore the point that age 11, 9, 10, is too young to assess potential and separate students. Selection at 11 is wrong. Current assessment is to inform future learning and not about selecting a future pathway or school. If teacher assessment is used to select a school it will heavily distort the curriculum. As an aside this amendment is in effect suggesting starting a selection process at nine. This will spread the anxiety over two years. Children have got to be allowed to be children and allowed to enjoy their education. A teacher wrote to me this morning dismayed at the States' indecision and revisit of yesterday's debate. Towards the end she said and I quote, 'I cannot pass this on to other Deputies at this present time as I have a class of 27 children waiting for me to ignite their love of learning.' That is what I want primary schools to be all about – a love of learning, not a fear of testing. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

2200 Yesterday we listened to our primary head teachers. So what do they say of this amendment? This is the view of one of our head teachers, 'This would place a terrible pressure on teachers, teacher assessment would be hijacked into formal testing to objectify their views. Progress is often a measure of the success of a teacher and not a pupil's ability. Teacher-parent relationships would be at risk and the school comparisons rife. It would still divide pupils into successes and failures.'

2210 I would like to ask Deputy Trott in his closing speech to share with us how many of the Bailiwick's existing head teachers he has spoken to, to develop his amendment and whether they support it.

2215 Deputy Duquemin in his excellent speech quoted from one of our head teachers. I can tell you that this statement is supported by all – that is *all* – our head teachers. All heads met this morning at their regular half-termly meeting – it was already organised before anyone accuses us of orchestrating it. (*Laughter*)

Now, on behalf of all our head teachers I repeat:

'As we heads meet today to discuss our curriculum with the four pillars of successful learners, responsible citizens, effective contributors and confident individuals, with mindset and wellbeing at its core, a proposal is placed to narrow the curriculum, extend the stress to pupils, parents and teachers.

No one will want to work in Years 5 and 6 and many teachers already refuse to work in Year 6 because of the pressure. It is based on the most fixed of mind-sets. With the majority of our children being above level 4, where will the cut-off be?

If this passes through, rip up the Vision, as it is meaningless. I do not know if I want to lead a school with principles of fixed mindset, narrow curriculum and narrow measures dictating the last two years of our children's primary experience.'

2220 I would urge Members to reject this amendment. It is claspng at straws and it is the worst possible fudge. We made a historic decision yesterday, so let's put this amendment to bed and behind us.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Domaille

2225

Deputy Domaille: Sorry, sir, just through you, I did ask my wife's very good friend, Deputy Sillars, if he would outline the current assessment procedures for those in the last two years of primary school. (*Interjections*)

2230 **The Bailiff:** If he is not able to do that, Deputy Dorey do you have a ... ?

Deputy Dorey: A point of correction, sir.

2235 I think the last speaker and others have referred to this as a sursis, but there is nothing stopping the debate continuing even if this was successful, because all it is saying is that we have a selective system of education and there is a report back on the method of selection. It does not affect, for example, the next amendments which might be whether we have three or four schools. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Is that interpretation correct, sir?

2240 **The Bailiff:** It was referred to as a 'surrogate sursis', and of course there is no such thing under the Rules. (*Laughter*) You could call it ... (*Interjection*)

Deputy Trott.

2245 **Deputy Trott:** You are right, there is not, sir. There were a number of tricks deployed during both the Treasury Minister's speech and the Education Minister's speech, and a number of fundamental errors made.

2250 I will start with the first fundamental error. Deputy Sillars was asked by Deputy Domaille – he was right to press him on it – to outline the assessment that is already undertaken within the States' primary sector; he did not get that answer. But no matter, sir, because I will be able to give that answer with the help of those who work within this environment today.

I am grateful to the dozens of teachers who have contacted me with detailed explanations of what actually happens in primary schools at present and also for their support of this amendment, so here we go.

2255 Every child is assessed from Reception to Year 6 in reading, writing and numeracy by teachers continually, and all that information is sent to the office. Furthermore, any parent at any time can go and see the head teacher and ask to see those results, such is the accuracy of that material.

2260 'Education already make an assessment of students suitable for selection.' Assessment is already a routine process in primary school. And we have heard from Deputy Sherbourne as well about something I did not know about, this so-called tracking which apparently follows a young person's progress as well.

So with that cleared up, sir, let's now look at just how extensively the Education Department looked for a system that might work elsewhere along the lines that is being proposed. I did not have to look very far to find a system in the Netherlands. Now in the Netherlands, sir, students do stay at elementary school until aged 12, rather than age 11, after which students are placed in different schools according to a combination of tests and teacher recommendation. Let me just have a little browse at the amendment, yes, it is precisely what we are proposing. And that is what makes it relevant, because the Netherlands is regularly in the top three ranked European States for education, including OECD and PISA rankings. Sir, this system is not divisive or elitist and is much loved in Holland, resulting in some of the highest participation rates in higher education than most other developed countries. That system is outstanding in its education delivery.

2275 Sir, Deputy Sherbourne's speech was, if I am allowed to say so, unusually fair today. He said, and I quote him directly, 'We, at Education, would manage if this amendment went through.' So despite the attempts by the Education Minister to rubbish it, the man who sits on his board with the most education experience tells this Assembly, 'We, at Education, would manage if this amendment went through.' So far from being unworkable or unmanageable, as some would have you believe, Education *would* manage, says former head, Deputy Peter Sherbourne.

2280 Deputy Jones' speech was, I think, typical of the view of many in our community. He started by telling us that the belief is that this States does not listen. That is the belief and a number of you will find that out in the next few weeks. He said how can the pupils experience trauma when they will be oblivious to the continual assessment that is already undertaken. I mean, the Education Minister is oblivious to these tests, so why does he think that the students will be bothered by them? They happen, this assessment happens without the students even being aware of it – that is the truth.

2285 **Deputy Sillars:** Can I do a point of correction please, sir?

Deputy Trott: I give way, sir.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you very much.

2290 Regarding Deputy Domaille, I did actually answer it. I was rather thrown by the start of his wife's comments on me, I was flattered so thank you. Teachers are happy to assess and do so when the clear purpose is to improve the learning of the children, not to determine a school place. So we are already assessing and we continue to assess.

2295 As far as the Netherlands is concerned, as I say, it is 12 and beyond and we are talking about 9 and 10 here.

Deputy Trott: I am told, sir, that the assessment in the Netherlands actually takes place over three years, 9, 10 and 11, with the provision being made at or around age 12.

2300 Sir, Deputy Fallaize tells us that this amendment will turn Years 5 and 6 into one giant test. No, it will not, because as I have already explained it is precisely what happens already. The 11-plus exams are the concern and those are gone and probably forever.

2305 He asks me, sir, about the previous consultation back in 2001. Well, I remember it well because I was a new, raw, Deputy who was asked, alongside Deputy Gollop, to front at St James in front of a packed audience, certainly the largest audience I have ever seen at St James, the retaining selection argument and I did it in the interests of democracy, expecting to be very much in the minority – nothing could have been further from the truth. That evening was memorable because of the overwhelming support from that audience for selection at 11. It was absolutely bewildering.

So I was not in the least bit surprised when 14 years later, that the consultation responses that the Education Department *hoped* to get were not what they got.

2310 Deputy Green – nice chap – he asked me, sir, what is a progress test? Now, Deputy Perrot said to me before I rose to my feet, he said try not to be a cheeky chappy; try and stick to the facts. So I am going to take his advice and in answer to the question, Deputy Green, what is a progress test? It is a test that evaluates progress. (*Laughter*) Let me give you an example of what I mean by that, which is incidentally precisely what you do in the schools already. If an eight-year-old can
2315 read a book suitable for a nine-year-old, they are a better reader than an eight-year-old who cannot read a book suitable for a seven-year-old. That is how you do it. That is how it works; I hope that helps! (*Laughter*)

2320 Sir, Deputy Luxon asked me the question why does the consultative process give a mandate when the sample is so small. It is, I think, an appropriate question because one can never be sure with any consultation process how many responses you are going to get. However, what is unequivocally clear, is that those who felt strongly enough to respond – and I know there are some who will say well, all those that did not respond were in favour of the status quo – I do not accept that for one moment, although I would think a significant percentage, probably greater than half, would have had that view. The reality is that those who were bothered enough about
2325 this process were very significantly in favour of maintaining some form of selection at 11. That is a fact.

2330 Sir, Deputy Alistair Langlois is an experienced teacher, and a nine year veteran of the Education Council and subsequently the Education Department. He supports this amendment. He said continual assessment is hard work for teachers. I am sure it is, but they do it already, they seem to manage, and Deputy Sherbourne has said they will manage if it needs to continue. But the point is that teachers do conduct continual assessment already and assessment is a part of life. I think that we do our children a huge disservice by somehow or other trying to protect them from this. Playing football in the playground and you are the last person to be selected – it used to happen to me, Deputy Fallaize – it does not feel very good; it is part of growing up. It is the reality of life
2335 and sometimes we try and protect our community from the realities of life and I think we do them a disservice in so doing.

2340 Deputy Brouard made an outstanding speech. He said what many said yesterday, and what very significant numbers in our community are saying. The Education Department have not made the case to do away with the Grammar School, they have not, and that is a significant problem for them and it will be a significant problem for the next Assembly and the next Education Board.

I very rarely disagree with my friend Deputy Perrot, who I think speaks a huge amount of sense, but on the way he addressed Deputy Gillson's comments when my very good friend, Deputy Gillson, described the amendment as 'a classic Guernsey compromise', Deputy Perrot took exception to that. I do not, because he is spot-on, it is a classic Guernsey compromise. It is what the majority in our community want and that is why it is needed, the airing that it has had today.
2345 (*Interjection*)

I give way, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

2350 **Deputy Burford:** Thank you, sir, to Deputy Trott for giving way.

Before Deputy Trott started summing up I had not – I have to confess – looked much into the Dutch education system, but I just wanted to ask Deputy Trott if the system he is referring to is the one where children at 12 take a test and then as a result of that test, that test informs the pupil and the parents who then make the decision on which school the child goes to. That
2355 position is actually not made by the testers; it is made by the pupil and parents and at any stage in the secondary education, the children can move sideways between different types and grades of schools.

Thank you.

2360 **Deputy Trott:** I am sure that is true, sir and, of course it is precisely –

Deputy Sillars: Sir, could I also ... *(Laughter)*

Deputy Trott: I give way, sir.

2365

Deputy Trott: Although wouldn't it be better if I answered that question first?

Deputy Sillars: Well it is linked.

2370

Deputy Trott: My understanding, sir, is that in our system or under the system that used to exist, the 11-plus, parents were given the choice of which school their children went to. Some would choose the Grammar School; others would choose a Catholic education, others the other colleges. Surely it is exactly the same under the Dutch system.

I give way to Deputy Sillars.

2375

Deputy Sillars: Thank you, sir. If I may read this out: 'The secondary school system in the Netherlands is organised very differently than the primary sector. Whereas primary school students can go to any school they like, students can only go to a secondary school that will accept them and the secondary schools can establish their own entrance exams. In general the decision as to where students will apply is made on the recommendation of the primary school teachers. The exams are not mandated by the States but they are produced under the auspices of the State and are taken by the vast majority of the students, 92%, because the secondary schools require them.'

2380

Deputy Trott: Okay, so under the Dutch system recommendations are made by teachers as to which school the pupil should go to, precisely part of the process contained within the amendment.

2385

Sir, Deputy Le Pelley, with 33 years as a secondary teacher, and another able teacher, like all the teachers in this Assembly were able teachers, but like Deputy Alistair Langlois does not toe the educationalist party line, because he tells us that after all that experience he is certain that the amendment is the appropriate way. He also addressed the issue of primary teachers under too much stress and I am not sure if he used the word 'nonsense' but that was certainly the view or the thrust of what he was saying. He said assessments are a fundamental part of a teacher's job and of course he is absolutely right. A teacher that is unable to assess the performance of a child would – and I do hope they won't be offended by this – not be a very good teacher, would be my view. So based on all his experiences he says that the risks associated with the complete abolition of selection is too great.

2390

2395

Finally, sir, Deputy Spruce; who in a very good speech summed it up, as many did yesterday. He talked about the levels of exaggeration that some within the Education Department have espoused, and he said, 'We are being asked to abandon selection completely without the evidence to support it.' That, Members, is the problem. It will not go away. It will be mitigated if you support this amendment, but any idea of this being a sursis is nonsense. The electors will see to that.

2400

Thank you very much.

2405

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

2410

Deputy Sherbourne: Yes, sir, actually I was going to ask for a point of correction at the end. Am I allowed to continue?

The Bailiff: Well, it is a point of correction.

Deputy Sherbourne: He is sat down. It is a point of correction.

2415

Deputy Trott: I can stand up because I wanted to ask for a recorded vote anyway, sir, so I can now do that and I give way to Deputy Sherbourne.

The Bailiff: It is a point of correction, not a give way.

2420

Deputy Sherbourne: I think I will actually withdraw that, sir. We have got to a stage which I think is a natural end. It was to do with Deputy Spruce's claim, but I will withdraw that if that is okay and sit down.

2425

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Members, it is a recorded vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Trott, seconded by Deputy Le Pellet.

Deputy Soulsby.

2430

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, yes, I have an amendment and wonder whether it could be circulated now?

The Bailiff: That could be circulated now. It is just that we debate that after we have taken the Deputy St Pier, Deputy Stewart amendment, but it is all on a slightly similar theme.

There was a recorded vote.

2435

Not carried – Pour 20, Contre 27, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 0

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Kuttelwascher	Deputy Harwood	None	None
Deputy Domaille	Deputy Brehaut		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Robert Jones		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Le Clerc		
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy Sherbourne		
Deputy Trott	Deputy Conder		
Deputy David Jones	Deputy Parkinson		
Deputy Lowe	Deputy Bebb		
Deputy Spruce	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Dorey	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Paint	Deputy Stewart		
Deputy James	Deputy Gillson		
Deputy Perrot	Deputy Ogier		
Deputy Brouard	Deputy Fallaize		
Deputy De Lisle	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Inglis	Deputy Le Lièvre		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Collins		
Deputy Quin	Deputy Duquemin		
Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy Green		
Alderney Rep. McKinley	Deputy Le Tocq		
	Deputy Adam		
	Deputy Wilkie		
	Deputy Burford		
	Deputy Sillars		
	Deputy Luxon		
	Deputy O'Hara		
	Deputy Hadley		

The Bailiff: The result of the vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Trott, seconded by Deputy Le Pellet was 20 in favour; 27 against. I declare it lost.

We will just pause while the other amendment is circulated.

2440 Members, those amendments have been circulated. We will move on to the amendment which was circulated first thing this morning to be proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Steward.

Amendment:

To insert at the end of Proposition 1, 'and that the States' secondary schools shall set students by ability as appropriate.'

The Bailiff: Do you wish it to be read, Deputy St Pier?

2445 **Deputy St Pier:** I am happy to read it, sir.

The Bailiff: You will read it, thank you.

Deputy St Pier read out the amendment

2450 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I understand that Education do regard this as an operational matter, but I do think it is important in view of the debate that we have had for the last however many days, that for the avoidance of doubt, we do have it on record that we do regard this as part of our secondary education policy.

I am glad that the Department have indicated that they will not be opposing this and do accept it as perhaps being the price worth paying in order to give comfort to Members of this Assembly, and indeed outside, that actually there will be a recognition through the setting process based on academic ability of people operating at a different academic level.

2460 I think it would perhaps be useful though, sir, if the Minister or whoever responds to this amendment could just confirm the understanding of 'setting', because for me, sir, it is the process of taking your year group by subject and dividing them up into bands of ability. So if you had five sets for a particular subject, say maths, your top 20% would be in set 1 and your bottom 20% would be in set 5. That is my understanding of setting by ability and it would be helpful, I think, if that were confirmed on the record to ensure that everybody's understanding is the same, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stewart, do you formally second the amendment?

2465

Deputy Stewart: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sillars, do you wish to speak at this point? Does anybody else wish to speak?

2470

Deputy Conder.

Deputy Conder: Thank you, sir.

2475 I will be very brief. As I said earlier, the Department will support this amendment. Not reluctantly, but I think with all such amendments as this, I think I need to make the point that really this role properly belongs to the head teachers and the senior leadership team. It is hardly necessary for a government or parliament to instruct its educational leaders how to set their schools, but if it is the wish of this Assembly I do not believe the Department would oppose it.

2480 At the risk of being corrected by much more eminent and knowledgeable colleagues, I would just define the difference between setting and streaming, as I understand it. Streaming, which this amendment does not propose, is where a whole group, a whole year group, is streamed for all subjects, so they stay together for all subjects. Setting is quite different; setting is by subject and is

perfectly capable of individuals moving from one set say for upper maths to middle maths or whatever, and there would be movement depending on performance in any one year group between those subjects. Setting is subject based, streaming is year group based. And this amendment, which we are supporting, is for setting.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: Sir, just a brief addition to the debate.

This is a rather confusing amendment for schools because there are subjects that lend themselves to setting and there are others where it is inappropriate. And of course, they are not actually specifically mentioned in this amendment. So I hope the spirit of the amendment is one which will enable the managers of our schools to organise their curriculum, to plan their curriculum and help their staff in managing the needs of all children in the school in an appropriate way. I think it will be a sad directive from this Assembly to ensure that that happens. I hope that the Treasury Minister perhaps can give me some comfort that will be the case.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

Just following on from what Deputy Sherbourne said. I can support this amendment because of two words in it, the ones at the end saying 'as appropriate', because I think that is really important, and as a result I will be supporting it.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I support the amendment. But I am surprised that Deputy St Pier of all people does not necessarily appreciate that there could well be, and probably will be, some financial implications in this.

Speaking on the earlier amendment, perhaps slightly off the point, but I was talking about how children from more deprived backgrounds, those with special needs, those with dysfunctional families, all kinds of people, will probably need special attention so that we get away from the lack of social mobility. We heard from Deputy Perrot earlier about how there was social mobility before the 1970s, there is not so much now, we know that, Deputy Le Lièvre has explained this. Therefore setting and the coaching required for that, and the special support that needs to be put into it.

I would also say that one reason perhaps why Education's vision has been delayed from 2013 to now has been the amount of time that particular department had to spend on the FTP and how they delivered. Nevertheless, that was a burden against the more visionary side of their enterprise. My point here is to say that if setting, in the brave new vision, is to work as effectively as it could, you will need to consider pupil-teacher ratios, not only for the most able but for the less able.

I think we can all support this broadly today, setting is a better philosophy than streaming, generally speaking, but we do need to be clear on if there is a cost, and be prepared to deliver the new system with sufficient financial and human resources.

I would also say that I always found myself in the bottom set for woodwork.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

Deputy De Lisle: I think there is also a question, sir, whether in fact mixed ability teaching will continue in the schools. Very often one finds that the groups in a particular subject are somewhat

2535 limited to a smaller number of students that would not warrant actually setting, in that particular case. So I think we need to know what is meant by setting students by ability and whether that continues right through for all subjects.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

2540 **Deputy Green:** Sir, yes, like others I can support this amendment.

I think the point that Deputy Burford made is the right one, it is the words 'as appropriate' at the end which really mean that I think the whole Assembly should be able to support this. For me, sir, certainly the decision to get rid of the 11-plus was a very difficult one, but the *quid pro quo* has got to be that there is widespread class setting as appropriate in the new regime, together with selection for pathways at 14.

2545 I think this amendment is a very important political signal. Strictly speaking, it may not be necessary because of the operational emphasis of something like this, but I think it is important politically to be saying that in the brave new world as is, there will be rigorous class setting to make sure that there is a proper differentiation between children of different abilities.

2550 So I think this amendment will give comfort to some extent to those who fear the new system. And just to touch on what Deputy De Lisle said a moment ago, there is a misperception out there that a modern academy or a modern comprehensive school in the UK is based on complete mixed ability teaching and mixed ability classes; that is not the case. I do not support mixed ability teaching across the board – absolutely you have got to have proper, effective class setting, certainly in the core subjects, English, maths, science, languages. It might be different in the likes of design and technology, woodwork or art, but certainly in those fundamental core subjects like English and maths and science and languages there has absolutely got to be robust class setting in the brave new world.

2560 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

2565 Just a quick question, I just wondered if this could be answered: when there are borderline cases how does setting come into play then? How is it decided, if there is a borderline case, which set the pupil will be in? I just wonder if anybody could answer that question for me, the teachers amongst us.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: No one else rising. Deputy Sillars.

2570 **Deputy Sillars:** Thank you, sir.

We already do setting, and we will continue to set, so the Education Department will support this amendment. It is the last two words, as I say, 'as appropriate', which is the get out of jail card. **(Two Members: Ooh!)**

2575 But actually, just to explain setting, in some key subjects is where there is setting, and that is what we do already. The head teachers, the teachers will decide upon the pupil percentage ratio. So, for example, it cannot be stuck at 20%, it could be 25% in one set; it could be 15% in another. The head teachers must be allowed ...

2580 **The Bailiff:** Are you giving way?

Deputy Sillars: Why? He had not said anything. I did not know there was a point of correction. *(Laughter)*

2585 **Deputy Stewart:** Well, I did not say 'point of correction', so I was standing politely.

Deputy Sillars: I was in shock, thank you.

The Bailiff: Sir, it is a matter for you whether you wish to give way. You can give way to Deputy Stewart.

2590

Deputy Stewart: Sir, I would just like the Minister, and I think the Members of the Assembly, would probably like a little bit more clarity around that last remark, which is a 'get out of jail card.'

2595

Deputy Sillars: It was probably ... it has been a long couple or three days, and I did not really quite mean it like that. If he took in the sense I meant, it was that we already do the setting and so it is a continuation to do the setting. As I say, as long as we are not tied down to whether it is 20% ... so the teachers must be allowed to set accordingly. That is what we will accept, why we accept this particular amendment.

2600

We are nervous about this Assembly dictating how things are done within the curriculum, dictating how to go forward. The head teachers must be allowed to teach for the benefit ... they are the professionals, we have listened to them over the last few days, but we will agree to this amendment.

2605

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, the key words clearly are 'as appropriate.' That is what deals with both Deputy Sherbourne and Deputy De Lisle's points, the flip side to the same concern, as it were; Deputies Green and Burford have already addressed the point that that is absolutely critical.

2610

And I absolutely agree with Deputy Green's analysis, this is a political signal from this Assembly that they regard this as being a critical part of the architecture going forward.

In terms of the financial implications I do not accept Deputy Gollop's suggestion that there will be any, on the basis of the reassurances from the Department that this will not require any additional resources to do what they are already doing in relation to setting in those subjects, where it is appropriate, some of which Deputy Green has quite correctly identified in his speech.

2615

The Bailiff: We vote then on the amendment proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Stewart. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

2620

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

Next we move on to the amendment that has just been circulated, the one that has been proposed by Deputy Soulsby, seconded by Deputy St Pier.

Deputy Sillars.

2625

Deputy Sillars: Sir, I am not quite sure I should say this, but I would like to ask for a five-minute recess as my entire board have not had time to consider this.

2630

The Bailiff: I think that is only fair the Department has five minutes to consider its response to this.

We will rise for five minutes or so.

*The Assembly adjourned at 4.01 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 4.14 p.m.*

**The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education –
Debate continued**

2635 **The Bailiff:** Members, we are ready now to move on with the amendment to be proposed by Deputy Soulsby, seconded by Deputy St Pier.

Amendment:

To add an additional Proposition 1B as follows:

'1B To direct the Committee for Education, Sport and Culture to publish by December 2017 a policy for the identification and support of the most able, gifted and talented children in Guernsey and Alderney; and the desired outcomes from such a policy, the measurement of those outcomes and any resources required.'

2640 **The Bailiff:** Would you like it to be read, Deputy Soulsby?

Deputy Soulsby: Yes please, sir.

The Greffier read out the amendment.

2645 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

2650 I think I did hear a collective groan that another amendment would be landing on people's desks, but hopefully this will not be a mammoth debate. I believe the Education Department will not be opposing it.

Sir, as I mentioned in the earlier debate, this amendment is relevant whether we had voted on selection or not. However, I do believe it will fit in very well under the non-selective system that has been approved.

2655 At present the use of gifted and talented programmes is variable across schools and there is no central policy. The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that there is a co-ordinated policy across schools. Something I think makes complete sense and works very well under a comprehensive system.

So what are gifted and talented students and why does there need to be a policy for them? Dr François Gagné, who was a leader of the field in this area, made the following definition:

Gifted students are those whose potential is distinctly above average in one or more of the following domains of human ability: intellectual, creative, social and physical. Talented students are those whose skills are distinctly above average in one or more areas of human performance.

2660 The key word here is 'potential' and this is not just about the most academically gifted, far from it. The aim is here, as I have said, to deal with the potential. That a child needs support and guidance to achieve his or her gifted potential. It is estimated that approximately 5% of students in a mixed ability school will be gifted and talented, but that is not set in stone and will vary and should vary.

2665 So, why do gifted and talented students need to be considered separately? Well, for gifted and talented students they often find the normal curriculum may not be sufficiently interesting, motivating or stretching. They often need more challenging tasks if they are to maintain their enthusiasm, develop independence and reach their potential. Some exceptionally able students may have weaknesses which need specific attention if they are not to undermine outstanding abilities in other areas. Extremely able students can become bored, unhappy or disaffected if their potential is unrecognised or neglected. Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) is a broad term for special practices, procedures and theories using the education of students who have been identified as gifted and talented.

2670

2675 At present in Guernsey schools approach gifted and talented students in different ways and to a greater or lesser extent. There is no overriding policy approach to gifted and talented students. St Sampson's have details of how they deal with gifted and talented students for Years 7, 8 and 9 on their website. However, there is no policy in terms of the identification of gifted and talented students, aims and objectives and measurement of outcomes. The purpose of this amendment is to fill that gap.

2680 Such policies on gifted and talented are common around the world and in particular the USA and Australia. In a recent review of gifted and talented provision in Scotland, the author suggested that the focus on equality of opportunities and reluctance to consider selection in the Scottish education system meant that the needs of gifted and talented pupils had largely been ignored. I do not think we can afford to ignore our gifted and talented pupils. Failure to identify
2685 gifted and talented students risks damage to individuals who are so tuned off by rigid education that they opt out, sitting well below the attainment radar on the way to dropping out. In turn, that damages our society and not letting them reach their potential also means we are just not maximising the potential value to our economy.

2690 Sir, this is a common sense amendment and, as I say, I understand the Education Department will not oppose it. I urge Member to give their support.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier, you formally second it?

2695 **Deputy St Pier:** I do so. May I speak now?

The Bailiff: Well, unless the Minister wishes to speak now ... He does not, so you may.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

2700 Very briefly, for me this is a barbell. Clearly the Education Department will already have policies for those who struggle and need extra help and no doubt also for those who fall into this category of being the most able, gifted and talented.

2705 But this amendment, sir, fits for me very well with the last one in terms of setting. In the language that Deputy Green used this is a political signal that we are not dumbing down in a non-selective system, which *is* the fear of many and I think we have to recognise and acknowledge that, and address that fear. I think this amendment helps.

On the contrary, the objectives are, of course, the continuous improvement of outcomes and I think this is a very important way of signalling that intent.

2710 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

Deputy Bebb: Thank you, Monsieur le Bailli.

2715 I cannot possibly support this. The idea that we actually have a gifted and talented policy as though schools do not deal with such matters, in the same way that there would be a policy for children who have certain learning difficulties, there are policies that will be there for this and that and the other, it is nonsense to imagine that there would not be. Deputy Soulsby herself said in her opening speech that St Sampson's apparently already have such a policy.

2720 But the main reason that I think that this should be rejected is because it centralises, which is nonsense. The whole thrust of the argument from Education is that we should be handing more control to schools. But here we have a direction that the Committee for Education, Sport and Culture has to publish its policy, making it one policy fits all for whatever the school, regardless of the circumstances, what facilities they have available and what they might actually want to have as a centre, a focal point for them. It seeks to actually have a one size fits all. It is not helpful. It might sound attractive, but realistically what I see is a move for a greater involvement from the Civil Service in terms of the Education Department, rather than entrusting the decisions to the head
2725 teachers and then to be judging overall on the head teachers.

2730 Finally, I find that it has to be published and all the rest of it ... I do question now are we actually having amendments for the sake of amendments? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Because realistically this does not come back to the States, it will not come to be debated because there is no direction for it to come back, and I sincerely hope that it never comes back for debate, because it is not something that this Assembly should be dealing with. It is something that should be dealt with by the head teachers and let's stop micromanaging.

The last amendment was bad enough, but this one really does go too far for me. This is nonsense. Head teachers do this type of work. For us to be saying that we need to send some dog whistle from this Assembly for them to do their work is nonsense!

2735 Let's stop with superfluous amendments. We have a debate to get on with. We have got other business; we are already talking about back next week. We do not need this type of amendment asking head teachers to do their work. Please reject it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Conder.

2740

Deputy Conder: Thank you, sir.

I do not actually disagree with a lot of what Deputy Bebb just said. However, I think in these particularly slightly febrile times in terms of education, it does not hurt, as Deputy St Pier said, to send a signal in terms of maintaining standards, if that is what people want to hear.

2745 There are of course published policies in a whole range of matters. It is interesting that perhaps there isn't a codicil to this, that we should have to publish a policy on those who are not quite so gifted or have special needs, but be that as it may, my colleagues and I will support this.

2750 But I would say in, perhaps not quite not the same language as my fellow Deputy Bebb would, we have a policy which we will be outlining to you later on in this debate to devolve as much power and authority and responsibility from the centre, that is the Education centre, to our Executive Head, to the Executive Head Senior Leadership Team. That is where the decisions about issues like this should be.

2755 I am happy to support this, but I hope it does not signal that future States are going to require our head teachers and our senior education leaders to produce various reports, not even for bringing back here, just to produce them. But I understand under these particular circumstances why Deputy Soulsby and Deputy St Pier have laid this amendment. I will support it, not with great enthusiasm, but I think it might be on just this one occasion, a useful signal to those who continue to have concerns. So I will support it and I would urge colleagues to support it.

2760 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I will read three quotes from the UCL report which I think backs up the need for this amendment. On page 1688 it says:

'the finding that the pupils who attend grammar schools do better than equally able pupils in comprehensives, with this finding confirmed by later reviews,'

2765 So pupils who attend grammar schools do better than equally able pupils in comprehensives. The second quote is:

'Students in secondary modern schools achieved worse GCSE results on average than equivalent students in comprehensive schools while grammar school pupils obtained [much] better GCSE results.'

Those are both from page 1688, the top and the middle of 1688. And on 1690 it refers to Northern Ireland and a study that was done on that:

'on the academic nature of the grammar school curriculum in Northern Ireland and suggest that a combination of the academic culture of the schools, high expectations and the learning environment created by the pupil peer group have an impact on performance.'

2770 And that is my experience from talking to students, that they do benefit from being together in a group of equally gifted pupils and they benefit from that contact with others of a similar ability.

What we are doing with the comprehensive system is splitting up those groups who were all at one school under the selective system. So I think it is absolutely essential that we have policies to make sure that we do not have the results as I have listed where equally able pupils in comprehensives do less well than if they had been at a grammar school. And these are very big studies; this is academic research on other studies that have been done.

So please support this amendment, it is needed and it is very important.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

2780 **Deputy Gollop:** I agree with a lot of what Deputy Conder has said, but it is the nature of it that we have to be seen to be moving forward in such a way that we can enable people of all abilities to succeed.

2785 I think the clue here is the Committee for Education, Sport and Culture. Deputy Soulsby mentioned people with physical gifts, social gifts; it might include sport, it might include creativity in music, it might include certain kinds of academic and of course the new department will hopefully have the opportunity to integrate what Culture & Leisure do and what Education currently does to ensure that there is a central direction to the use of these facilities.

2790 I agree with Deputy Bebb inasmuch that we do not necessarily want to see centralisation but, of course, I think we are talking about not four self-managed schools but one school with an executive, plus, of course, the special needs schools, St Anne's School and the colleges which will still be around, and this surely would be like a hub. It might be for those who are really gifted at coding or digital work, and those children reputedly in some instances often are on the autism spectrum. I think you cannot totally divorce special needs from high academic needs as well. I think this is worth pursuing. Some people call them indigo children, some hothouse children, whatever.

2795 The one criticism I might have with it, I do not think it is meant in this way, but it would be if it was seen to be elitist. Because, for example, we already have some centres of excellence on the Island, I would name the Guernsey Music Service, who we all enjoy their concerts. But we need to ensure that such services are available either free or at limited charge to children from all social backgrounds and all kinds of interest. That is just one example, we could say the same about sports, youth organisations, maybe IT clubs. We really do want this to work so it is not just the most vociferous people who get the attention.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stewart.

2805 **Deputy Stewart:** Mr Bailiff, I will be supporting this.

I think for many people that have perhaps taken – as Deputy Trott said earlier in the debate a day ago – a leap of faith, this is really a good political steer and I do thank Deputy Conder for giving the reassurance that he did in his speech, which I felt was a lot more measured than that of Deputy Bebb, who I think to quote the vernacular 'went off on one'. *(Laughter)*

2810 This is not about micro-managing, sir. This is policy. And we have policies for those with learning difficulties, we have policies for those with special needs, we have policies for those with disabilities but what we must not forget are the other end of the scale, some very talented individuals also have special needs. All we are saying – and this is not micromanaging, sir – is that we would like to see what the Department's policy is for dealing with those most gifted. Often with very gifted children come very different problems, but problems nonetheless, as often they

can feel frustrated in the learning environment and it can lead to behavioural problems and all sorts of things.

2820 But I think it is only right – given the leap of faith that some Members of this Assembly have made, and also for the public that are listening to this debate, and the reaction and the interest in this debate is enormous – that I think we do need to have a policy in place to deal with those most gifted in our society.

So I would urge Members to support this amendment.

2825 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: Thank you, sir.

2830 This might surprise you but there is a side of me that actually finds this quite attractive, but in another way I would say to Deputy Soulsby be careful what you wish for, because at the moment there certainly is an identification of fairly talented children and gifted children in the Island. But it is not always to do with their actual talent; it is to do with the ability of their parents to pay for the opportunities to develop skills.

2835 My colleague, Deputy Gollop, mentioned the Guernsey Music Service, a superb service but you might be interested to know that there are very few high school youngsters, for example, attending the Guernsey Music Service and receiving benefit from those opportunities. Yet we know extremely well that there are youngsters who show incredible talent in music outside of the conventional classical music, for example, that slip under the radar of the service. I think that a policy that actually asks for the identification of a wide range of talent and skills would be quite helpful.

2840 My friend and ex-colleague, Denis Mulkerrin, set up, with help from the Sports Commission, the High Performance Centre in sport. Again, it might not come as a surprise to you that there is not one ex-high school young person accessing the High Performance Centre, and yet there is incredible talent in our high school sportsmen and women.

2845 I think that the policy that could emerge from Education after deep consideration about that might not be quite the sort of policy that I suspect that Deputy Soulsby is looking for, but I will give her the benefit of the doubt and I know she is an honourable person.

I will support this amendment but I hope that she takes note of the observations that I have actually made.

Thank you, sir.

2850

The Bailiff: Deputy Domaille.

Deputy Domaille: Thank you, sir.

2855 I will be very brief. I rise as a Deputy for St Peter Port South, although albeit not for much longer. I think actually Deputy Soulsby has already had this drawn to her attention, but I merely mention the fact that it would be helpful if in her speech or in her comments she could mention the island of Herm, and be very clear that Herm is included in this policy.

Thank you.

2860 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I am very much in favour of this amendment. I applaud Deputy Soulsby and Deputy St Pier for laying it.

2865 I think it is absolutely vital that a child's strengths are recognised and supported in the school environment. And my concern is that far too much time could be spent working on a child's weaknesses and not enough focus given to their strengths within the school environment. To have a policy in place can only be a major step in the right direction.

2870 Sir, I know things have moved on considerably since I was at school 50 years ago, but the
system failed to recognise my strengths until they were recognised by three teachers when I was
12-years-old. The strengths that had gone unnoticed until that point were my love for art, my love
for music and my love for creative writing, and once my strengths had been recognised by those
2875 teachers I became a different child altogether. Up until that point only two adults in the whole
world had recognised my creative talents, and they were my dearly departed mum and dad.
Although we had a music class and an art class at school we only attended those classes for three
quarters of an hour a week, and those three teachers actually stayed behind with my after school
to work on my strengths. I cannot thank them enough for that because when they started doing
that I became a confident and extrovert child.

2880 Prior to that happening I was an introverted and shy child, who painted pictures and wrote
poems and short stories, and hid them in the cupboard for fear of being ridiculed. In fact, I
became so confident I was encouraged to enter an Island-wide schools short story competition by
one of my teachers and I actually won that competition out of 88 entries, and that boosted my
confidence even further and that certificate was presented to me in front of the whole school by
the headmaster.

2885 I was telling this story to Deputy Soulsby and my brother, Deputy Laurie Queripel, over lunch,
that I was actually in class when the head boy was sent to the class to ask me to go to see the
headmaster and that particular teacher said to me – who was one of the teachers who did not
recognise my talents and my love for creativity – ‘Queripel, get to the headmaster’s office, I
suppose you are in trouble again’, which was odd, because I very rarely had been in trouble, being
2890 a shy, introverted kind of child. The headmaster asked me if I would be in agreement to him
presenting the certificate the next morning in front of the whole school at assembly and I said I
certainly would be in agreement with that because I felt so proud. I went back to the class and I
was going to tell the teacher and she said to me, ‘I do not want to hear it Queripel, sit down.’ And
I was crushed by that sort of approach. The next day, when I was called out in front of the whole
2895 school to be presented with the certificate, I am convinced she thought I was going to get the
canes for something, her face was picture and I will never forget it when I was presented with the
certificate. The school master was immensely proud that one of his pupils had won an Island-wide
competition.

2900 Now, I know, sir, things have moved on a lot since those days, but support for a child means so
much when their strengths are recognised. So, sir, I think it is essential to recognise a child’s
strengths and they are not put to one side whilst their perceived weaknesses are worked on. I am
not saying for a single second that teachers in our schools today have that kind of approach.

2905 But picking up on what Deputy Bebb said, he said that this is something that head teachers
should deal with, but of course without a policy in place there is no guarantee that they will do
that, especially when the pressure is on to improve academic results. And that the budgets for
Culture & Leisure activities are in danger of being reduced when the two departments are merged
into one committee. That is my great fear, sir, that is why I support this amendment
wholeheartedly.

2910 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: No one else? Deputy Sillars.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you, sir.

2915 I will support this amendment, although it may not sound it to start with.

2920 The States Review Committee is all about strategy and not operation, but I guess we do not
have that yet. Sir, we are getting very close to the Assembly directing the operations of our
schools; this is not what the Assembly should be doing, it is what our head teachers should be
doing and *are* doing. Our schools are already doing this. Each school is doing it already. The high
schools already get students attaining A’s and A* at GCSE, teachers can teach to this level as
proved by the grades. How do we want to get higher grades?

As I said, I will support this, but what I would like to just quickly say while I have got the opportunity, is I would like to publicly thank all our head teachers and staff for continuing achievements in the successes of our schools and the phenomenal work you do for our children and young people on a daily basis.

2925 And yes, sir, I do support this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, thank you, I will try and be brief.

2930 I would like to thank my seconder Deputy St Pier.

Deputy Bebb is not here, but he has completely missed the point, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) as Deputy Stewart has made very clear. This is about policy; it is not about running the operations of the Department. And I think the policies of our Education Department should be published, isn't that all about transparency?

2935 I thank Deputy Conder; it is a signal, but I believe it is more than that. This is not about, as I said, operations but setting an overall approach.

I thank Deputy Dorey and I am glad he referenced that part of the report, because it is that which actually triggered me to place this amendment.

2940 Deputy Gollop, yes, this is about the variety of gifts and talents. Central direction is a phrase not central control; it is for schools to operate that policy in the best ways that they see fit. It is not about being elitist either, but about teaching to pupil's strengths which I think is something that Deputy Lester Queripel was alluding to. I do not want it to be elitist, and from everything we have heard from the Education Department over the last three days about equality of opportunity I would not expect that to be the case.

2945 Deputy Sherbourne, I thank you for your comments. The last thing I want is for this to be elitist, as I say. I have concerns about elements like the School Music Service, which can be seen as elitist, and I share much of what you say there. I nearly thought about laying an amendment on that, but I thought better of it. That is why I think a policy may well deal with that exact issue.

Deputy Domaille, yes, I do intend Herm to be included in this.

2950 Deputy Sillars, thank you for supporting the amendment, as I say this is about us having a central policy and not to set the operations, that is for the schools.

So I just urge all Members to support this amendment.

2955 **The Bailiff:** We vote then on the amendment proposed by Deputy Soulsby, seconded by Deputy St Pier. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

Next we will take the two amendments marked B1 and B2 to be proposed by Deputy St Pier and seconded by Deputy Le Lievre.

Amendment B1:

To delete Proposition 1c and insert the following additional proposition:

'1A. That 11 to 16 education in the States' sector shall be provided in one school operating on four sites (with at least one making provision for ages 16 to 19 (sixth form)) and with selection to individual pathways at Key Stage 4 based on guided discussion between school staff, students, parents/carers, overseen by the school senior management team, and informed by individual aptitude, ability, past performance, potential and student preference.'

Amendment B2:

To delete Proposition 1c and insert the following additional proposition:

'1A. That 11 to 16 education in the States' sector shall be provided in three schools of a broadly comparable size (with at least one making provision for ages 16 to 19 (sixth form.))'

2960 **The Bailiff:** Do you wish them to be read or will you read them or will just say what the effect of them is?

Deputy St Pier: I think for the benefit of those outside the Assembly, sir, it might be preferable if the Greffier could read them, sir.

2965 *The Greffier read out the two amendments.*

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier

2970 **Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

One school of 2,100, or three schools of 700, that is the next question. Listen to the profession we were told on the matter of the 11-plus, and this is what the profession has to say about one school:

'It seems to me that the board have sought to promote a course of action that achieves two of their long-standing and well publicised objectives regardless of the outcomes of any consultation and in the complete absence of any consideration as to how they may be implemented. These appear to be the removal of selection at age 11, the rebuild of the La Mare de Carteret schools.'

That is the view of one experienced, senior school leader and that I think was sent to all Deputies, I believe, except those on the Education Board.

2975 That individual goes on:

'Having worked on the federation curriculum offer from the day that the secondary schools were told that they must operate such an offer, I have had serious reservations about the practicalities, effectiveness in terms of educational outcomes and value for money of this way of working. To commit the education service to the expansion of such a way of working and to actually rely on this as a prerequisite for the new structure before there has been any evaluation of the effectiveness of the current federation provision is, in my opinion, very high risk, inefficient and educationally flawed.'

This experience with federation is backed up by one parent who wrote to me:

'My son is Year 10 at La Mare and is doing one of the federation classes. He has chosen to do computer science at St Sampson's, and I have to say the idea of it is great, but in reality not so much. He received two lessons on the Tuesday, as does everyone. The only problem is that the children that attend that school receive a further lesson on a Friday which all the other children do not. Our children are given a free lesson instead on the Friday in which they are supposed to do something towards the computer science lesson which they cannot do as they need to be in the classroom at St Sampson's with their computers, so he is taught a third less over the course of a year. When we attended parents evening his teacher explained that, yes, it is a major flaw and that all of these children have to play catch-up every week which puts them at an unfair disadvantage.'

Our experienced senior school leader continues:

'However I do believe that the removal of selection is simply incompatible with any four school model, with or without a federated approach. In order to provide the best possible curriculum provision differentiated learning and additional support for the comprehensive intake, I believe we would need an absolute minimum school size of 600 and an ideal size of 720 or 840. In order to provide the projected 2,400 secondary school places we could quite easily expand on the existing three sites and remove any need for the re-build of a secondary school at La Mare. Furthermore, it is likely to be achievable within the same time-frame as the proposed secondary re-build and will provide the La Mare catchment area pupils with the facilities and resources to which they are entitled and overdue.'

The four site model he says, 'is almost certain to be both ineffective, from an educational perspective, and unfeasibly inefficient in economic terms.'

2980 So very high risk, inefficient and educationally flawed, ineffective from an educational perspective – this is strong stuff. Not from me, not from Treasury but from one of our senior school leaders and he is not alone.

Here is another from a school leader:

'The Education Board's preferred solution would in practice be educationally ineffective requiring a federated approach in order to provide a broad and balanced curriculum which meets the needs of all learners, simply because the four schools would be too small to provide this individually, as their proposed solution demonstrates a compromise is far from ideal and it would result in both an ineffectiveness and an inefficiency.'

2985 And it was an irony, sir, that Deputy Sillars referred to a compromise and a fudge in his opening speech because that is what his Department's proposals are. 'Educationally ineffective' these are not my words, these are not Treasury's words, these are the words of a senior teaching professional. That is what they think of a one school model, that does not bode well, I would suggest.

2990 Deputy Laurie Queripel said that some teachers are supportive of the proposals, but it is very telling that none of the public messages from the head teachers or the unions, for example, are supporting the one-school, four-site model. They have confined themselves to commenting largely on the issue of selection.

Even the policy letter and consultation feedback says:

'Senior educational service leaders pointed out broader opportunities that could more easily and cost effectively be achieved through moving from four to three schools.'

So we are to listen to them on the 11-plus, but not on this issue.

2995 Here is another long-standing teacher, 'I am fully behind you in questioning the need for four schools. If La Mare is re-built, one school needs to close.'

3000 One school leader told me that the heads had all agreed that only three schools were needed but that that advice had not been accepted by the Grange. So the pupil numbers simply do not support the need for four sites. Chris Nicholls and his team identified that over a year ago in their report. The only way Education can ensure a broad, rich curriculum for all students is to create this nonsense concept of a hard federation. That never existed before this policy letter was published. We had already been told that the schools were in federation, it was even on their letterhead, I think, but only now are we told that it is soft.

3005 Multiple sources of evidence, including the Institute of Education quoted in the policy letter, tell us that the ideal size for a secondary school is between 600 and 1,000, but with a four site model we will have a single school with 2,100 and whilst each site will have a capacity of 600 only St Sampson's will actually have students exceeding that number. It is madness! So let's get this right. We are going to create a single school larger than that recommended by any of the evidence and then split it up into units smaller than that recommended by any of the evidence.
3010 And you call that evidence-based decision making? No wonder the profession describe it as 'educationally ineffective'. No wonder they describe it as 'incoherent'.

3015 Sir, can I just remind Members of some of the key numbers, and I have rounded to the nearest 100, and this is important: There are 2,100 students in the secondary system today. Education are proposing that we build to a capacity of 2,600. We expect numbers to peak at 2,300 in 2026. What is going on now? Grammar is built for 600 and is operating this year with 433. Beaucamps was built for 660, it has never operated close to that, and is operating with 497 this year. This September, when Year 11 leaves and the new Year 7 arrives, numbers at La Mare are likely to fall below 400, possibly to around 375. The arithmetic is so stark we should not even need to have this debate.

3020 Let's face the harsh reality, if La Mare was burnt down tomorrow or it was flooded in the absence of its flood bund, we could accommodate all of its current students in the other three schools the day after tomorrow. We have 2,000 places available, but actually we probably have nearer 2,300 desks and chairs given classrooms are built for 30, even though the policy of course

3025 is a smaller number per classroom. And let's make it clear, I am not suggesting that is a solution, I am merely giving you the facts.

An additional 200 places across all three other schools will be sufficient until 2022. In short, we have plenty of time to build the extra capacity to meet the peak in 2026 and can more flexibly respond if population numbers alter from projections.

3030 Beaucamps cannot be extended we were told, but paragraph 9.1 of the policy letter concedes that it can be. In fact, if you look back Education proposed a school for 850 on that site in 2001 as part of – wait for it – a three school estate. In 2002 they proposed a school of 720 as part of a four school estate, and then only reduced this in 2009 to 660 because pupil projections had dropped. Topographically it is obviously a difficult site, but that does not make it impossible.

3035 The Director of States Property Services has advised me in the following terms, 'I would not go as far as to say that it is simply not possible, but it would not be possible to do it simply.' That seems to me to be a very fair summary.

Would three schools of around 700-800 each be too large? No, of course they would not. We have already got St Sampson's at 720 and it has operated at 774 in 2009-10. The Grammar School site is designed for 1,100 and is currently operating at 880.

3040 Sir, before I go further I should say that the whole La Mare community must be congratulated on the fantastic evaluation that they received in their recent independent inspection. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) It is a real tribute to them all, especially the leadership. And it is also a testament to what we all know, that teachers have far more to do with educational outcomes than buildings. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) But I am afraid that the La Mare rebuild is the story of the *Emperor's New Clothes*, like the little boy in the crowd someone has to say so and today it falls to me to do just that. I know that will be deeply unpopular with many people, but it makes no sense to rebuild La Mare and then close another school. I understand the emotions that there are around that and there will be anger and the Education Board of all people know the emotion around closing schools and the Chief Minister referred to that when he has spoken as well.

3050 Weren't La Mare promised a rebuild 15 years ago? Yes, of course they were, but that was before all the underpinning assumptions on pupil numbers turned out to be wrong. Don't they deserve the same facilities as their peers in other schools, particularly after such a glowing report?

3055 The management committee of La Mare wrote, 'What is quite clear is that pupils and staff of La Mare deserve the same standard of premises afforded to other schools on the Island, regardless of the outcome of the debate in the forthcoming States Meeting.'

3060 Yes, they absolutely do but that does not require us to spend £64 million for a dwindling number on the pupil role to provide them with the facilities on that site. The most effective and quickest way we can improve their conditions is to close their school and move them to other schools. Given that they are the smallest secondary school this will be the least disruptive solution for the system as a whole.

3065 But the public do not want three schools, do they? They told us so in the consultation. Well, they certainly do not want one school of 2,100, and they were not even asked about that! Neither in question 14 of the consultation were they asked their views on schools of 720-840, that bracket was missed out, so we do not know what they think of that. Perhaps we could ask that question and add it on to voting slips on 27th April. (*Laughter*)

3070 Neither were we told when they were asked that question that the schools would be underutilised. If they knew that would they still want to spend £64 million? I very much doubt it. But surely not building La Mare would waste the £2.3 million or so spent so far on the project, yes it would, but not nearly as much as wasting a whole lot more on a school we do not need and then having to run it for the next 50 years. How on earth have we got to this place? On the verge of spending millions of pounds on a project that is not required. Well that may well be a question for the Public Accounts Committee to look at. Part of it, of course, is the delivery of the Education Development Plan, committed to by this States all those years ago, even though the environment has changed. Part of it, I suspect, is because we have an Education Development Office whose

3075 *raison d'être* is development. Their role is in the name. We have created a monster and it needs feeding.

But what about all the other facilities planned for that site – the primary school, the pre-school and particularly the autism unit and so on? If the amendment for three schools succeeds I would move a consequential amendment to direct that these areas are considered and also, importantly, providing the funding from the capital reserve under delegated authority to allow these to progress as appropriate. And I thank Deputy Stewart for agreeing to second that, if we get that far.

3085 But won't we lose teachers? Why? The decision is made there will not be any uncertainty. We did not lose any when the St Peter Port School closed; they were redeployed in the normal way. But what about all the chaos created in the system when St Peter Port was closed? Again, if we actually listen to the profession, they tell us that that was because it was badly planned and it was dragged out for too long.

3090 The Department tells us in paragraph 2.13 that they are worried about their capacity to manage change. We can fix that. Again, if the amendment for three schools succeeds I would move a consequential amendment to direct funding from the transformation and transition fund to ensure that there are sufficient resources made available under delegated authority to successfully manage this transformation in our education service.

3095 But surely we will need to spend millions on extending the other three schools. Yes, of course, some extensions will be necessary. Education have estimated £12 million for an extra 240 spaces, so a working estimate for adding the 360 spaces between Grammar, St Sampson's and Beaucamps, needed before our peak in 2026, would be around £18 million, so we would still have a lot of change out of £64 million. And these three smaller projects, together with any of the other facilities that are required –

I will give way.

3100

The Bailiff: Deputy Conder.

Deputy Conder: Thank you, Deputy St Pier.

3105 Deputy St Pier just said that the cost of putting in the extra 360 spaces would be £18 million, but there would still be a lot of change out of £64 million. But the £64 million is for a secondary school, a primary school, an autism unit, a sports hall, all the extra additional site works and a community centre. So forgive me, I do not think his maths adds up.

3110 **Deputy St Pier:** Deputy Conder actually interrupted me as I was just about to ... and in rising he may not have heard what I was saying. I said these three smaller projects, the extensions of the schools, together with any of the other facilities that are required and that is exactly those which he described, such as the autism centre, could be funded out of the difference between the two. And they could also be better spaced out.

3115 This will be better for our local construction industry than one huge project, which is going to suck in so much off-Island labour, contractors, sub-contractors and so on to support to it. Especially at a time when some of these big projects – the Guernsey Brewery, Leale's Yard and so on – are getting going again.

3120 This decision could also settle the future of the College for Further Education so enabling that project team to crack on with the design of the college consolidated on the Ozouets site, for example.

Once again, if the amendment for three schools succeeds I would move as part of that same requisite consequential amendment, delegated authority to provide funding from the capital reserve to allow all these projects to progress immediately.

3125 Sir, I am sorry to say, but the only logical solution, the only obvious solution and the only sensible solution is to close La Mare. I have said very little, actually, about the financial case for three schools and not building La Mare; and this is mainly because the case has already been

made on the educational arguments alone. But the financial savings are obvious: The avoidance of the £0.5 million each year for an executive head and transport for the four sites, the avoidance of the capital costs for transport in 2022, the ability to speed the transition from education zone pupil teacher ration 1:15 from its current 1:12.6, at an estimated £2 million a year. These numbers cannot be ignored, particularly in the context of the statement I gave on Tuesday about our fiscal position overall.

Then, of course, there are the massive capital savings that can be made, releasing capital for the other parts of the educational estate, including the College of FE and maybe the refurb of Grammar School, which no doubt will be needed at some time and for the other projects that we just talked about.

We spent several hours debating the unavailability of the few tens of thousands for the Biodiversity Strategy and yet we can contemplate spending millions on an avoidable redevelopment and locking us into an inefficient, educationally flawed model for a generational more? Sir, I would ask those such as the Alderney Representatives and Deputies Paint and Quinn, who would normally be the very first to remind us of the need to be fiscally prudent, to really contemplate their positions on this matter as support for the La Mare project is totally inconsistent with fiscal prudence.

But I know, we know, that value for money is not about the cheapest solution. It is about getting the best educational outcomes for the money spent. That is where these proposals fall down too. Educational outcomes are being compromised and constrained by obtaining such poor value for money, and what I mean by that is we could be ploughing more into frontline teaching where it would be most effective if we were not wasting it on an inefficient one-school, four-site model.

Sir, loyalty is a great virtue and the Education board have shown great strength in their loyalty in sticking together with these proposals. In that context, I am particularly grateful to Deputy Le Lièvre for seconding this amendment. As the Deputy Minister for Education, he was very closely associated with this project and spent many hours arguing its case in front of me and my Treasury colleagues. I know he has found it immensely painful to change his position with the accompanying feeling of disloyalty to his former colleagues on the Education board. We all know that he is a man of principle, we all know that he is not a man who would be won round by the fiscal arguments alone. He has only done so because he has concluded that it is the right thing to do educationally.

My final plea, even if it falls on deaf ears, is to members of the Education board to climb out of their bunker and change their mind. There will be no loss of face, there will be respect. In particular, sir, I want to address through you Deputy Sherbourne. Forget the financials. He knows in his heart of hearts that the four site model is educationally suboptimal. He knows that it is an unsatisfactory compromise; he knows that his colleagues still in the profession who described these proposals as educationally flawed and educationally ineffective are right. He knows that three broadly comparably sized secondary schools will offer a better educational service. I ask him to back the educationally more robust three-school model. Not for me, not for the financial savings but for the constituency, the children he has devoted his entire career to and for the future generations of children who will pass through the education system long after his Education board have left office in six weeks' time.

Sir, it dawned on me the other day that this is probably my most important speech in four years. There is so much at stake, not only financially but also educationally. We are on the verge of committing – wilfully squandering, actually – millions of pounds of taxpayers money to create a one-school, four-site behemoth to a one-school, four-site model the public does not understand, to a one-school, four-site model the profession tells us they do not want, and worst of all to a one-school, four-site model which is educationally suboptimal according to the profession themselves.

If the Assembly approves these proposals at the end of this term it will undoubtedly be my lowest point. I will be ashamed to have been associated with such poor quality decision making.

3180 We should do what is educationally right, which is to have three broadly comparably sized secondary schools and give them and St Anne's in Alderney local management. Just as they were promised, just as we were promised in the vision for education which this Assembly adopted in 2013. To accept Education's proposals would be, sir, a financially irresponsible decision by this Sates on a monumental scale, and according to many educationalists they are educationally illiterate. They need to be amended by the adoption of the three school solution. The very same solution the Education Department recommended themselves in 2001.

3185 Please support B2. *(Applause)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Hadley.

3190 **Deputy Hadley:** A point of correction, Mr Bailiff.
When St Peter Port School was closed we did lose teachers. We now have the prospect of –

The Bailiff: You can make a speech ... **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) Are you making a speech or just a –

3195 **Deputy Hadley:** No. I was also going to make the point that this will inevitably follow with the closure of La Mare de Carteret.

The Bailiff: You can make that point in a speech in due course.
3200 Deputy Le Lièvre, are you formally seconding the amendment?

Deputy Le Lièvre: Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sillars, do you wish to speak at this point? No.
3205 Deputy Stewart.

Deputy Stewart: Mr Bailiff, at the beginning of this debate Deputy Trott said it would take a leap of faith, on his behalf anyway, to support this. For me, this is more of a journey, sir.

3210 I thanked Deputy St Pier yesterday for bringing the whole 11-plus debate into focus. I think it was the right time for that amendment. Now having passed that amendment to move away from the 11-plus I was then pleased that we brought the amendment around setting, and then Deputy Soulsby bringing her amendment. This now gives me comfort. I feel I am on a journey through this debate and at the end of this debate I will then have to vote on all the proposals as amended.

3215 I wholeheartedly agree with what Deputy St Pier has just said in a truly excellent speech. For me, if we vote to retain four schools, after getting rid of the 11-plus, that is a deal-breaker. That is a deal-breaker for me because there is no way, whether you look at the educational outcomes or the maths ... and more importantly we had a statement from the Treasury Minister at the beginning of this session of the States around our fiscal position, and we cannot afford four schools. We do not need four schools, particularly if we do not have an 11-plus. I think there will
3220 be members of the public incredulous if we voted through a capital spend of somewhere in the region of £64.5 million, the on-cost, and having run businesses over multiple sites, and I have had this conversation with Deputy Luxon, it is not easy running businesses on multiple sites. The less sites you have the easier it is to run an organisation. So, for me, if we vote for four schools as opposed to three, it is a real deal-breaker.

3225 I would rather see extra money invested in teaching, invested in those facilities. And when it comes to sport and the sports facilities we know we have excellent sports facilities. The Island Games inspection team or whatever they were called recently commented on that and Culture & Leisure are to be applauded at the hard work they have put in to maintain so many excellent sports facilities and opportunities across the Island. We are going to end up with more swimming
3230 pools than Beverly Hills if we are not careful! *(Laughter)*

Sir, for me, we cannot spend –

Deputy Sillars: Point of correction.

3235 **Deputy Lowe:** Point of correction, sir.
There are no swimming pools in this site at all.

Deputy Sillars: We are not building a swimming pool. I wish he would understand what we are trying to achieve, sir.

3240 **A Member:** Hee-hee! (*Laughter*)

Deputy Stewart: We will end up with surplus facilities. Surplus spaces and it will be not good value for the taxpayer. I would also be interested to know, and I hope that whoever sits on the next Public Accounts Committee can pick up this and understand how we have spent some –

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, point of correction.
There will not be a Public Accounts Committee; it will be a Scrutiny Management Committee.

3250 **Deputy Stewart:** Sorry, the manual for the next Sates, sir, is in my briefcase, but whoever is in charge of that I think needs to look –

A Member: Keep digging!

3255 **Deputy Stewart:** – at how we can get to a point where we have spent so many millions of pounds without fundamental basic decisions being made and that is why I thank Deputy St Pier for bring the whole 11-plus debate to the fore.

Also, just to touch on building projects, it will be welcomed by local contractors – and I am sure that Deputies Lester and Laurie Queripel will bail me out on this – the local contractors will prefer more smaller projects where less off-Island expertise or larger contractors are brought in. There will be more opportunity if there is extra work done at the existing schools to make them fit for purpose rather than building a fourth school, so I will be supporting the three school proposal, sir.

3265 **The Bailiff:** Does anybody else wish to speak? Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

I just want to go on a completely different tack. On page 1764 the second highlighted paragraph is of great interest and I will read it:

In addition to the revenue costs associated with the Executive Head and the increased transport costs of the new system set out in paragraph 8.8, totalling £460,000 per annum, the financial models include further additional revenue costs which rise to almost £3million per annum in the preferred model, giving a total ongoing cost of some £3.5million above the current baseline.

3270 These are ongoing annual costs – I am not giving way just yet, I will towards the end.

The Treasury and Resources Department considers that this is completely unaffordable given the very real fiscal constraints that can be expected to persist.

The reason I bring this is up is I believe that this Assembly was very much in support of the Service Guernsey initiative and the purpose of that is to try and produce what is called a 'reformed dividend' which is a combination of two things: more effective service delivery and a dividend, a financial one. What this does is produce not a dividend but a deficit. It is certainly a big

3275 transformation and it certainly runs a coach and horses through the whole Service Guernsey idea. And it is a very large deficit.

Now, I know people may challenge this £3.5 million, I suspect that is what Deputy Brouard may want to do, but that is the point. If this was to go through the Assembly or if the four-school model was to be accepted, it is going to run a coach and horses through our Service Guernsey initiative because somewhere else you would have to make that up just to be back where you started. Therefore for that reason I think this needs some *very* serious consideration. For that reason I support the whole idea of the three-school model and not the four-school federation. And that is not just from the fiscal point of view, because I think there would be, as was stated by Deputy St Pier, an educational outcomes benefit or improvement because the federation, whichever way you look at it, will result in I do not know how many students for how many hours over every year spending their time on transport going between colleges.

I will only accept any points of correction. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you, sir.

3290 **The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

Deputy De Lisle: I just would like to have some clarification, sir, on the three school model that Deputy St Pier has proposed.

He made the point that the extension of the schools, the existing schools, would be for 360 spaces and would cover about £18 million; I think he was saying in terms of cost. Now, he also said though that the other facilities at La Mare, he was not rejecting those facilities, in other words the primary school, the pre-school, the sportsplex and the autism centre and the community facilities, all those would go ahead, which I tally up as about £40 million. I do not know whether he is talking of continuing with all those facilities but if that is the case we are up to about £16 million and I am not sure what exact saving that he is coming out with at the end of the day, if he could clarify that.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

3305 **Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

I was not going to do it this way around. I was trying to save my right to speak for another time but I think it would be very helpful for the House overnight for the Treasury – and that is why I was trying to interject when Deputy Kuttelwascher was speaking, not to try and catch him out as we usually try and do – but it was just to ask the Treasury, who had obviously spent a lot of time looking at this particular proposal. There has been so much work in the background going on and the thoughts about this particular amendment which none of us here have.

One of the criticisms we have been giving to Education was that there is not the meat in their proposal. We now find there is not the meat either in a three-line amendment. I am not trying to score points or anything else or make some proposal, I was just going to try and ask could Treasury let us have that A4 or several A4 sheets of paper showing how the savings come on capital. What would still happen to La Mare site, what spending will still have to be done on the bunds etc. and where they see that the extra expenses will go elsewhere on the portfolio to accommodate the children from La Mare and what the net position is from there. The same for the revenue costs, which obviously you have done all that already, and I was just trying to put a plea in for the rest of us.

Trying to do maths and adding them all up in your head as the Minister was speaking is great for some of us. I like to see it in black and white on a piece of paper and I was just going to ask a plea to Treasury and to Deputy Kuttelwascher if they could overnight just give us a basic background of how their model works on the three schools, if that what be helpful for the rest of our Members.

Thank you very much, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

3330

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

'Why now?' is the question that I have got. Why now? Why have we got this amendment before us now?

3335

Two years ago when it came to the States for the La Mare de Carteret rebuild there was the amendment to say it had to be value for money and they had to go away and they formulated a panel of a one architect, one accountant and one retired educationalist who came back, as we know, with a much broader response than looking to see if the building was value for money. At no time did we have anything from T&R to say three schools, it was not on the radar, so why now? Now all of a sudden as well, the last three days we have been planning the education system as educationalists, we are now planning this as architects because we are looking from moving from one site to the other. All these different permutations are being put before us; it is all new to us because we have not been part of that.

3340

And we are talking about – I say 'we' through you, sir – Deputy St Pier actually just said looking at the numbers and at La Mare. Well of course you have only got to look at the newspaper about three weeks ago and on the front of the paper was about the Castel Hospital site and how that was being looked at for housing development. How does that fit in? That is a huge site, how does that fit in with the numbers that would be in La Mare de Carteret catchment area in future? All of that as well needs to be part of the decision making.

3345

Not only that, La Mare de Carteret has eight parishes that attend that school – eight parishes from around the Island attend that school legally. Hence there are eight parish representatives on the school management committee. It is only St Martin's and St Andrew's that does not actually go the La Mare de Carteret High School. So those youngsters are going to be spread further around the Island, listening here, down to St Sampson's as well.

3350

Again, I just find this absolutely astonishing that we have here at the eleventh hour an amendment which I think is absolutely disgraceful, I really do. This has been in the pipeline for *two* years, and we have suddenly got this in the last week of the States. It is disruptive, it is unfair. Certainly with my hat on as president of La Mare de Carteret School Management Committee, we have not actually been asked the opinion from either the primary school or the high school of the views of how we feel this would work on this site. We work very closely with the schools. I know definitely that La Mare de Carteret High School, as we all know, have done extremely well, they have been a credit for the last three years at the change there. They have had glowing reports, they are on a high and now after today with this bombshell coming out – because nobody has actually brought it to their attention – is the biggest kick I think they can possibly have.

3355

But yet again, those youngsters and the teachers will actually be trying to lift them up and saying, 'It's okay, that is how the States are behaving. We are going to carry on teaching you to the best of our ability and make sure that you are a success.' I just stagger that we can actually treat people like this and treat not only the pupils, the teaching staff and indeed the parents and our community with this approach.

3365

So there is no way I will support a three-school ... Speaking as well with the staff as we do frequently and Deputy Wilkie is also on the School Management Committee, so he will be able to say his point of view on this, but he will know that this is fact. The amount of work and resources that have been put in with the amount of pupils that we have got at that school that are seeing a 3% attendance increase cannot be underestimated. That is a huge input by the staff to get the numbers up. A lot of that is because the parents and the families around the school have been able to be supported to get those numbers up. It is a credit to the school, an absolute credit.

3370

There is no doubt, as well, talking with the teaching staff who a lot come from the UK, have said to us if in the UK you are talking about a school of 960 that is definitely a way forward, that is the norm for in the UK. However, they are of the view when we have discussed it with them the

3375

3380 smaller school numbers have enabled them to get the numbers up and to be able to get the success that they have got by having a school of around 400 and 450 pupils and sometimes it has actually gone up to 500, which is too many.

3385 So all the good work that we have had, all the great plaudits that we have actually given La Mare, we could see unravel because of this amendment here, which I see as irresponsible, unfair to our community – with very little thought to the education of those youngsters that are attending that school.

I ask Members to think *very* carefully what they are doing here by saying about going to three schools because, yes, that might be great that we might save some money, but how much will we save in educational costs for these youngsters? Are we going to go backwards again that we will be having youngsters that will not actually be attending school, that will not have the attention that they are getting currently from all the resources – these cost a huge amount of money – both in time, financially, teacher’s time and everything else to get the school where we are. I just see this as a retrograde step. So I ask Members, as I say, to think very carefully about that.

3390 Also, bear in mind about the Castel Hospital site that is being looked at for development for housing and all the other unknown questions that we have all been excluded about, but apparently Treasury & Resources have got the answers, which we have not got. But they would have to give me an awful lot of detail to persuade me that we will go down the route of having three schools. Because I am not prepared to vote to make it more difficult for the schools or the pupils that attend La Mare to be now scattered to other schools and not have the personal attention that they have got there. That is not a criticism on the other schools, the other schools do extremely well as well, there is no doubt about that.

3400 But when you have got here, and I was absolutely shocked to hear a member of Policy Council stand up and say about ‘more swimming pools than Beverley Hills’, that he does not even know about what he is actually discussing and debating here because he has not even been down and had a look at the plans at La Mare de Carteret School. He has not read the Billet that is here before you because there is no swimming pool in the plans that you have got before you and you have got detrimental remarks like that which are below the belt, which reflect on me, that very few in here really appreciate what La Mare de Carteret School is all about. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.)

3405 I ask Members to please reject the amendment for three schools.

3410 **Deputy Dorey:** Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

3415 **Deputy Dorey:** Sir, the Castel Hospital site is in the Beaucamps catchment area.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

3420 **Deputy Fallaize:** May I ask, are you permitting debate on Proposition 3 alongside the debate on these amendments because –

3425 **The Bailiff:** Well, the way that the Treasury Minister opened the debate on this, he did go into the question of the future of La Mare, so I think people are perfectly entitled to respond to that. If that is his rationale for bringing this amendment, and it seems to be a part of it, then I think people must be entitled to ...

Deputy Fallaize: But the Proposition, the voting, is on the principle of three or four sites, is it not?

3430 **The Bailiff:** Absolutely, but say we did not have that further amendment, there would be absolutely nothing to stop the Treasury Minister, as he has done, saying we can save a lot of money by not building La Mare. Just because there happens to be another Proposition coming later does not prevent this debate, in my mind, going the way that it has done, given the way that he opened it.

3435 **Deputy Fallaize:** It would be open to Members to propose other permutations.

The Bailiff: Absolutely. If you want to close St Sampson's School or something, then you can propose that.

3440 **Deputy Lowe:** Sir, could I just come back on Deputy Dorey's clarification about the Castel Hospital site would be in the catchment area for Beaucamps. When I raised that with the Education Department they would be moving the catchment area because there would not be enough room at Beaucamps to take all those pupils.

3445 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Just through you, sir, would it be possible that if Treasury & Resources have got any paperwork on this new proposal that they could let Members have that overnight, sir?

3450 **The Bailiff:** You have already asked for that.

Deputy Brouard: I have already asked, but just through you yourself, could you perhaps ask for me? *(Laughter)*

3455 **The Bailiff:** I cannot ask for it, you have asked for it.
We will rise and resume tomorrow at 9.30 a.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.32 p.m.