



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 11th March 2016

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

Volume 5, No. 11

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, R. A. Jones

St Peter Port North

Deputies J. A. B. Gollop, P. A. Sherbourne,
R. Conder, C. N. K. Parkinson, E. G. Bebb, 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, J. P. Le Tocq, 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 A. H. Langlois, (*relevé à 10h 50*); Deputy M. K. Le Clerc, (*relevée à 10h 29*)

Business transacted

Billet d'État VII	853
I. The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education – Debate continued.....	853
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.34 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	891
The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education – Debate continued	891
Procedural – Sitting to resume next Tuesday, 15th March	939
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 6.30 p.m.</i>	939

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État VII

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

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

The Deputy Greffier: Billet VII – Article I – Education Department – The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education – amendments B1 and B2 laid by Deputy St Pier and Le Lièvre.

5 **The Bailiff:** I will call first the Education Minister, Deputy Sillars.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you, sir.

Members, yesterday afternoon at 4.45 p.m. we heard a persuasive speech from Deputy St Pier. It is a compelling narrative, excellently delivered, and I *would* like to support it.

10 I *would* like to – but I cannot, because closing La Mare is wrong. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

15 It is fictional narrative built on sand, and La Mare is not the right school to close. This is rushed, and not a carefully considered proposal. I ask myself again, why did they not engage? It may surprise you to hear that the Education Department was as much in the dark about the Treasury Minister's proposals as most of the rest of you. We have had just as much time as you to consider Deputy St Pier's proposal. They have not been presented to us, so I must go on just what I managed to scribble down following his speech yesterday.

Sir, and Members, it has been a very long night.

20 Where to begin? We have always been led to believe that Deputy St Pier's three-school option involved building La Mare at 960. He has not, at any stage, led us to believe any different until 24 hours ago, when he confirmed in a media interview, before even advising the Education board or this Assembly, that he now wanted to close La Mare, not rebuild the high school, and leave the rest of that much-needed development – the primary school, pre-school, the communications and autism centre – floundering in uncertainty.

25 Sir, Members we have been misled. This Assembly voted for the full La Mare de Carteret redevelopment back in 2013 as part of the capital prioritisation. We voted *Pour* for that. T&R gave

us money to go through the first gateway reviews, develop our business cases, and were reviewed in terms of value for money. Whether this was the right project; whether we had all the components right; did it support this Assembly's policies; and did we have the right team ready to deliver?

We jumped through all the T&R hoops. We passed with flying colours. Indeed, the independent reviewers described our business case as a compelling business case and recommend that the project proceed to the delivery stage – that means building.

We brought this business case to you as part of our policy letter in November 2014. This Assembly agreed to rebuild all parts of it, but wanted a further review before we could start building it. T&R gave us hundreds of thousands of pounds more to continue with the planning. They were desperate at that time for a 960-pupil school at La Mare. Our design allowed for the future expansion to 960 pupils, as requested by this Assembly. We designed it.

We brought it back to this Assembly. You agreed again to the rebuild. T&R this time gave us a further £1.7 million. We re-designed it as requested. Our proposals were reviewed yet again for value for money, and passed with flying colours, and I quote from that independent review:

'This project represents good value for the States of Guernsey.'

– although it was acknowledged that a 960-school represented better value than a 600-pupil school.

Our current plan allows us to extend La Mare High to 960 at any point in the future and allow future Committees to have the ability to move to a three school option farther down the line, when the time was right. We always had a long-term strategic plan to make the right decisions at the right time.

Now, finally, early in 2016, less than 12 months later, we come to the sting in the tail. Deputy St Pier, and his supporters have decided they do not want a high school at La Mare at all. It really does beggar belief.

Can I just confirm to you we discovered that this was the preferred model in the last 24 hours or so. If this was an option they wanted us to consider, why didn't Deputy St Pier ask us to look this once he had read the consultation paper in September? Then we could have explored it in detail, and Treasury could have costed it alongside all the other options. But, unfortunately he did not.

It gets worse. La Mare de Carteret project started in March 2013, three years ago. Back then, we explored a number of options and La Mare rebuild was the preferred option. T&R agreed with this through every stage of the project. So, why now? Treasury had the Billet in January, and the closure of La Mare amendment could have been published when the Billet was published – but it was not. Then they could have laid an amendment to close La Mare any time prior to this week. But they did not.

Instead, for reasons best known to himself and his colleagues, he lays it overnight just before the debate. Students, staff, parents –

Deputy St Pier: Sir, point of correction.

I have not laid an amendment to close La Mare. I have laid an amendment which deals with the principle that there should be three secondary schools.

Deputy Sillars: I accept, sir, that. But in his opening speech it was all about shutting La Mare.

So, how do we measure against the Six Principles of Good Governance? Good governance means focusing on the organisation's purpose, and on outcomes for citizens and service users. So, how do we fare against this?

Good governance means performing effectively in clearly defined functions and roles. Well, this appears to be overriding Treasury's own SCIP procedures, which we are entitled to do, but are the function and the roles blurred?

Good governance means promoting good values for the whole organisation and demonstrating the values of good governance through behaviour. Good governance means taking informed transparent decisions and managing risk. How can we make a decision on four or three schools without any financial information and awareness of those risks?

80 We fail this basic principle of good corporate governance, and we should not be having this debate without the knowledge of the facts. Good governance means developing the capacity and capability of governing bodies to be effective.

85 Finally, good governance means engaging stakeholders and making accountability real. Until 24 hours ago, the public were oblivious as to which school this Assembly is about to close. There has been no engagement, no consultation.

So, let's now turn to look at why we should continue with our plans to rebuild La Mare de Carteret Schools. Why we should keep our promises to those children, and young people, their parents, and the hard-working staff. Why we should now throw millions of pounds down the pan – millions that have already been spent on getting our plans ready to build – in favour of our
90 Treasury Minister's last minute devastating amendment.

I will try to split my speech into numbers of sections, addressing Deputy St Pier's points.

95 Firstly, cost savings. Capital – Deputy St Pier seemed to be claiming that we would save £64 million by not building La Mare. We will not save £64 million. The case for all the other facilities is not in question. For now let's assume he thinks that they should be built, as otherwise we have nowhere to educate a large number of children at La Mare Primary School, or provide the necessary support to our children and communication with autism difficulties.

100 So what are we talking about the cost of the High School? That is about £19 million. What is the Minister's solution to that? Well, we will build up three extensions on our other schools. What are the cost of these extensions? We do not know. Well, we know how much it would cost for just one extension, St Sampson's High, because we included that cost in our policy letter. It is approximately £12 million to increase it by 240 pupils.

105 One of our local architects, independent of the Department, has commented that if La Mare de Carteret is built in its 960-pupil configuration then yes, you could probably get them on three sites; but the option being considered, and as preferred by Deputy St Pier, is not to rebuild La Mare de Carteret and extend the existing three sites. Beaucamps and Grammar were designed as a courtyard layout basis and not designed to be extended. He does not say that they cannot be, but you would end up with an inefficient and costly design.

110 That is why they have had to design La Mare de Carteret, the high school element, to accommodate 960 pupils, rather than just simply an original 600-pupil school. They tried to extend the original scheme but the circulation areas became too large, and the adjacencies of the various rooms and departments could not be made to work. St Sampson's is a linear design, and may be easier to extend, although this could compromise the external areas which are quite tight already. So we could end up with extended schools, which are inefficient and costly to build and run.

115 The architect goes on to say:

'I don't think Gavin has analysed this even on the proverbial back of a fag packet. It would be embarrassing if the three schools strategy was passed and then found out it was not actually achievable.'

Deputy St Pier talked about needing three schools of 700. Well that might be okay for the number of children we have now, but it certainly will not be in two years' time as our numbers start to increase.

So –

120

Deputy St Pier: Sir, point of correction.
Sir, I said 700 to 800.

Deputy Sillars: So you were talking about 700.

125 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I said 700 to 800, which will take us up to 2022.

Deputy Sillars: I was going on to say, so it is three schools of 800, or bigger. What are we going to do with the sixth form? If it stays at Les Varendes, then we can only hold up to 600 11-13
130 to-16-year-olds on that site – a site that is nearly 40 years old, and will very soon need millions spending on it. Indeed, we need to spend about £6 million on it now, just for the roof.

What about the revenue savings that he claims that will come from not rebuilding La Mare. Of course, we will still have the same number of children to educate. I think he talked about £2 million per year by moving to a 15:1 PTR. Deputy St Pier does not show how he calculated this £2 million. This is, I think, based on the report from Chris Nicholls, which had a cavalier approach to costings, and no engagement with the Education Department to discuss the figures.
135

I can tell you that it is nowhere near as much. To move to a ratio of 15:1 we would need to lose around 28 members of staff. So, even if we assume that we lose teachers on the highest pay points, and include their on-costs, the most we could save right now would be £1.4 million.

But as I stated we are already doing this! Our current pupil-teacher ratio in our high schools is 12.2 to 1. The Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre staffing ration will always be different, because of the Sixth Form Centre and the fact that some of the staff teach across the full 11-18 age range. It currently stands at 11.3 to 1. I would like to know, and perhaps Deputy St Pier will tell us in his closing speech, how much it will cost us to provide the staffing we require at our 11-18 schools, which ensures that we are providing a breadth of curriculum for our students. Pathways, and options, seem to be forgotten, and appear not to be available for those of our children educated in Guernsey.
140
145

Through natural wastage, and not replacing staff who retire or leave, we will be reducing our secondary staff numbers by around four or five this September. This will save us in the region of £200,000 to £250,000. This means that the cost saving identified by Deputy St Pier is in reality just over £1 million by this September.
150

But what happens to those savings as pupil numbers rise and pupils' needs change? We will need more staff to maintain the 15:1 ratio. So the costs increase again. Remember, we are going to have 300 more children in our States' secondary schools by 2026-27. Although we have been told by Treasury that our staff costs are not formula led, as the student numbers increase we can expect no increase in funding. We know that our numbers are rising. These children are in our primary schools now. Staff numbers will always need to flex to take changing pupil numbers into account. He is planning to close a school at the trough of our student numbers. This is madness. Where is the long-term strategic planning?
155

Let's not forget, we want to stretch and challenge all our children. We want to set our children in smaller groups if they need additional help, and this all requires more teachers, not less.
160

What we do know is that if Deputy St Pier gets his way and closes one of our secondary schools, it will be extremely disruptive – extremely unpopular with students, teachers, parents, and the wider community. It will provide very little flexibility for the future, and the option they are proposing will not deliver equality of educational opportunity. Our proposals B1 are recognised as the least disruptive, and in the interest of children in our system now.
165

In contrast to the primary school closures, which we brought to this Assembly, we are talking about staff redundancies if we close one of our secondary schools. This is not the same as at St Andrew's and St Sampson's Infants – there were no redundancies. Our staff have careers and responsibilities to their families. There are shortages of teachers in England, but there is job security. To keep our staff here during the planning and the transition period will need golden handcuffs to keep our staff. If it is La Mare staff, as per Deputy St Pier's proposal, then we need to incentivise them financially, and that is a significant cost.
170

Do not underestimate the disruption that moving to three schools would bring. There would need to be a phased transition to avoid moving students mid key stage. We would have to go to great lengths to hold on to staff. A closure would have to be done over two or three years, once the extensions are in place. How are we going to hold on to staff during this process, when we
175

180 have just got to the place where our secondary education outcomes are good, and La Mare de Carteret's inspection was very good? Are we going to throw this away by closing the school? Redistributing students from the school they are passionate about, moving them into three cobbled-together extended schools, risking poor retention of staff, making recruitment more difficult? Surely, our students, staff and families at La Mare deserve more than that. Surely, our community deserves more than that.

185 We all too easily remember the cost of the closure of St Peter Port School, impacting negatively on outcomes at two of our schools. We are still dealing with this now. Why should we close a successful school? And yes, La Mare, it is La Mare I am talking about – [*A mobile phone rings.*] Sorry. (*Interjections*) I will give £10 to the Bailiff's charity. Luckily I brought some money.

190 I am talking about La Mare and not the Grammar, a school where the inspectors found the following key strengths: the leadership of the head teacher, senior leadership team and majority of middle leaders; the quality of teaching and learning in most subjects; staff's use of progress attainment data to focus on and improve the performance in each subject; the school's inclusive ethos and support provided by staff and partners to help students with special educational needs; the steps taken by the school to improve the engagement of parents and their children's education; the high levels of participation of the motivated students in the school's extensive programme of enrichment activities.

195 This is a school that is an example to all others and in support for the care of all students. We need to build on this for all who live in the community, and spread this good practice into all our schools, and not destroy it. We have a community here that needs a strong school like La Mare. Do not redistribute these children around other schools. Keep a strong four-school model working collaboratively, sharing good practice, and keenly focused on the individual students.

200 Do we want to throw away the opportunity for all-age provision from 3-16 on one site, with all the benefits that that will bring this community? Do we want to delay the community facilities and opportunities for the inter agency working? Do we want to throw away the opportunity to give some of our most vulnerable children and families the best chance in life? We are talking about the potential flight of quality staff from our schools.

205 In the costings of the possible three-school options we considered in our policy letter, we included figures for golden handcuffs, to seek to persuade staff to stay in Guernsey before their school closes, as once they leave we will not be able to recruit quality staff for the period leading up to the school closure, so we will have to have supply teachers instead. None of these costs are included in the B2 amendment or reflected in the explanatory notes. They have either been conveniently ignored or forgotten. Maybe Deputy St Pier can wave his magic wand and circumvent all the States' policies and just grant us the money we need from the Transition or the Transformation Fund.

215 I would like Deputy St Pier to inform the Assembly, in his closing speech, how he intends to protect our children's education. Is he guaranteeing the provision of golden handcuffs to keep all our staff? That it will apply to all staff, not just those on Licences? And what are the details of those provisions, so that our staff have certainty to make decisions about their careers and job security, so that we do not see staff resigning *en masse* and fleeing Guernsey?

220 I find it bizarre that this debate is being considered with so little information on costs. In fact it seems slightly surreal that should the three-school amendment be approved by this Assembly, we will have to adjourn so that Deputy St Pier can draft new amendments and work out what capital costs are required, or perhaps it is none. We appear to be consigning the whole SCIP process to the dustbin, and making multi-million-pound decisions on the hoof.

225 This is not the behaviour of a responsible and mature Government. The three-school option is not something that the Education board members feel is deliverable, or desirable, at this point in time. In fact I will go further: based on what I have just said, walking into this decision would be catastrophic.

So, let's put aside the fact that Deputy St Pier has told us he does not want to build La Mare, because that actually is not included in his amendment. That is actually much more vague about this, is what you are being asked to vote on.

230 Deputy St Pier wants three 11-16 schools on a broadly comparable size, with at least one making provision for ages 16-19. At least one making provision for ages 16-19, so is that one, two or three schools offering a sixth form? We do not know. Please can Deputy St Pier advise us?

If it is more than one school, how are we going to ensure closer collaboration working with the College of Further Education? If it is more than one, then what size do we need these three
235 schools to actually be? We do not know. Can he elaborate in his closing speech, what the three schools of comparable size means, and what is he planning on the ground – what precisely does a three school model look at? What are the practical implications and what do we need to extend or build?

On top of this, it seems that Deputy St Pier is proposing to duplicate management and staffing
240 structures in three distinct schools. But, again, there are no costings – although he claims it will save money because we will not need to appoint an executive head. He seems to be suggesting that we duplicate sixth form provision across more than one site. At what cost? We do not know.

The beauty of our single school across four sites option is that it truly allows us to realise the economies of scale by sharing staff, organising our resources under one leadership, and the
245 governance structure, but still retaining the small school benefits of close relationships between the staff and students, excellent pastoral support, and the feeling of a strong community. So, is Deputy St Pier actually suggesting now that that we throw all this into doubt? It seems he is, and so, sir, Members, I need to take some time to advise you of the serious consequences for the education of our children and young people, should we choose to go down this route today.

250 So, if we do not build La Mare, we need to find spaces for up to 600 11-16-year-olds in our other schools. Remember, our current school population is the lowest it is likely to be for many years. So this is not about providing spaces for our current numbers at La Mare.

Bearing in mind Deputy St Pier's amendment talks about three schools of equal size, with at least one having a sixth form, where will they go? We need to provide a minimum total of 2,350
255 places to cope with the number of 11-16 year olds coming through our current system. We would also need to provide around 500 places in one, two or three sixth forms. I am not sure where 2,100 comes from, as this ignores the 10% excess capacity that all schools are advised to operate with. That is without any flexibility, our schools would be 100% full. There would be no allowance for future population growth, no space for pupils moving out of the colleges, and not even any of
260 our special place holders. They will be bulging at the seams.

So that means we need three schools of 1,000, if all of them offer sixth form; or two schools of 840, and one of around 1,200, excluding space for the 500 sixth-form students at one school, or two schools, or 1,100 and one of 840. What class sizes are you talking about? What do we have
265 now if we do not replace La Mare? A school at Beaucamps, built for 660 students, a school at St Sampson's built for 720 students, and a school at Grammar, in a building now nearly 40 years old, built for up to 600 11-16 year olds, plus 400 sixth formers. So, there are only two options to allow this to happen: extending two of these sites; or significantly increasing class sizes in all the schools. Thankfully, he does not seem to be advocating increasing our class sizes to up to almost 30, as its extensions will lead to the capital savings for the high school at La Mare.

270 Given that one of our schools, Les Beaucamps, cannot easily be extended, and the Grammar School has similar issues with limited pace to expand, this poses problems, plus the need for compulsory purchase of land. But can we accommodate all these extensions? Why not? When buildings are built for 600, 660 and 720, pupils have a certain number of toilets, a certain number of science labs, a certain size of school hall, or number of changing rooms, a certain number of
275 locker space for a certain amount of staff, a certain number of power and data points, a certain amount of space for dining, for break-out, for meeting rooms. Planning give permission based on the number of people accessing the site, either by bus, by car, by walking. They consider the site

management arrangements, the fire officers and Building Control sign off the fire strategy including how many people can be in the building, the muster points required. I could go on.

280 These are the inconvenient truths that destroy the compelling argument for Deputy St Pier's preferred three-school model. You cannot simply decide on one day we are going to add several hundred more children on to one site the next day, and expect it to happen. Extensions will be required, they will need to be planned, they will need to be designed, they will need to be paid for, and they will need to be built, which requires a few years.

285 We are performing well in our high schools, and now we are going to throw all that out. If we are looking at value for money three extensions will equal approximately three times £12 million. How is that value for money, when we are talking about approximately £19 million for La Mare? If you include the enhanced sports centre it would be £27 million. So the extensions alone at the three sites total around £36 million, less the £27.7 million by not building La Mare or the sports
290 facilities, at a cost of £27.7 million, so we already have an additional cost of £8.3 million.

However, that is not all. We must add to this the further cost of delaying the other element of La Mare projects, redesign fees, contractor overheads, profit, additional costs associated with economies of scale. These add perhaps another £3.8 million. So, Members the total associated increased costs under this proposal is around £12 million.

295 I will give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: I thank the Minister for giving way, sir.

300 Could I just say, sir, if we are quoting numbers, that La Mare rebuild will need to have ground works, professional fees, and other things, and if these are prorated, actually the kind of figure we are looking at for the high school is probably more likely to be £33 million, sir.

Deputy Sillars: They are not building the high school.

305 Anyway, if Deputy St Pier and his supporters are proposing to close La Mare de Carteret School, we would lose a balanced catchment for the feeder primaries of La Houquette and La Mare and a proportion of St Mary's and St Michael's. If we are moving the redevelopment then we need a primary, we have a number of vulnerable families living in this area who need a school close to give their children the best chance of success.

310 Leaving aside whether this includes sixth-form numbers or not, Les Beaucamps was built for 660 pupils. St Sampson's High is built for 720 pupils, and the Grammar School can currently cater for 600 pupils. So Beaucamps is not big enough, St Sampson's High is not big enough, and it depends on what you do with the sixth form centre as to whether the Grammar School is big enough.

315 Do we know how much this is going to cost? Deputy St Pier is again silent, although he does point out that it will be general revenue savings from operating a smaller Education estate, and yes, there may well be. But this Island will need to spend many more millions of pounds of taxpayers' money extending and expanding our existing schools, before we are in a position to close one of our schools.

320 Sir, Members, I would refer you to section 9 of our policy letter, where we carefully set out the three-school options we considered as part of our deliberations, and the pros and cons of each option. We looked at the three-school options, which at least could be delivered, and would make farther use of any school buildings that were to be closed. In section 10 we go on to estimate the cost of the three-school options we considered.

325 Building a 960 at La Mare will add around £8 million to the £64 million price tag. Extending St Sampson's High will cost the taxpayers of this Island £12 million more. We do not have the approval of this Assembly to spend this amount of money. We have not been through Treasury's SCIP process or the capital prioritisation process.

330 Deputy St Pier, how do you propose to fund the additional capital expenditure? Where is the
business case? What other projects would you move further down the priority list to ensure we
can close a school?

335 Closing a school brings its own costs. We know from closing St Peter Port secondary school a
few years ago. Through any period of closure you must maintain continuity for the education of
our children. You cannot move them midway through their GCSE courses, for example. So you
have to maintain staffing levels for a school of years across four schools while transitioning to
your three-school model.

340 Will staff want to stay and work in such a system, especially when the majority of secondary
teachers are here on a Licence, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to attract them to Guernsey
now because of the high living costs? Add to that the national shortage of teachers, especially in
certain subjects, such as maths, English, and science, and the so-called brain drain with teachers
joining international schools all around the world, because of the better pay and conditions. How
can Guernsey compete? We need to consider tying staff in to contract, through a golden handcuff
type payment, but at what costs? Deputy St Pier does not mention that, but we would anticipate it
running into several million pounds over at least two or three years.

345 So, where does Deputy St Pier's three school option come from? I think we can trace it back to
the first independent review of our La Mare de Carteret rebuild proposals, commissioned by
Treasury & Resources early in 2015, led by Dr Chris Nicholls. Dr Nicholls suggested in his report
that Guernsey secondary schools were small, with only St Sampson's High regarded medium in
size. He went on to say the size of our schools meant there are no benefits of economies of scale,
and that it was difficult to deliver best education opportunities as a rich and varied curriculum
becomes expensive to provide in small schools.

350 Dr Nicholls' solution was to move to three schools, although he noted that such a move would
require very careful consideration by the States and that there are many factors which would
influence when, and in particular how, such a move may be best implemented – not least the need
for any move to be managed sensitively, and in a way which does not impact the educational
outcomes during transition. I would suggest that receiving this amendment two days before this
debate, and then finding out only yesterday, the Minister did not want to build La Mare, does not
represent very careful consideration.

360 I would be horrified if this Assembly, on the basis of this debate, and without any detailed
evidence, decides to close a school. However, we believe that the economies of scale and the
wider breadth of curriculum that drives Dr Nicholls' three-school option can equally be achieved
through our one-school, four-site proposal. We will be able to retain the advantages of small
schools.

365 I will give way to Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: I am grateful to Deputy Sillars for giving way.

370 Would he agree with me that there is no proposal before the States to close a school? He did
say he would be horrified if the States decided to close a school. But there is no Proposition at the
moment. Unless someone is going to bring an amendment, there is no Proposition before the
States to close a school.

Deputy Sillars: As I understand we have got two amendments, one to go to three, and one to
go to four. In my language, three does require a school being closed.

375 But, actually the point I am making is that in the opening speech from the Minister of T&R
brought in La Mare. Now if he had not done that, yes, most of the speech would be irrelevant. I
accept that, but he brought it in and I cannot let it go. Sorry.

We will be able to retain the advantages of – oh, hello.

The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq): I thank the Minister for giving way.

380 Just to confirm though, and notwithstanding the comments that Deputy St Pier made when he opened the debate on this amendment, and which has no doubt resulted in the Education Minister's detailed response on that, if we vote for the amendment that is before us today, we are *not* voting to close a school. That is not what is intended. I certainly shall not be doing it on that basis. *(Interjections and laughter)*

385 What we will be doing is deciding the model for secondary education. *(Laughter and interjections)* That may result – that is absolutely true – that may result, and we certainly will not be voting to close La Mare automatically either. In my mind that is certainly not the case. There are many other scenarios that could take place. I think we need to bear that in mind.

390 I encourage Members of this Assembly to see very clearly what is best in terms of educational outcomes for our children. That is what we should focus on.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

395 **Deputy Lowe:** Sir, it is really a point of clarification from Deputy Le Tocq but he has sat back down. But is he asking –

The Bailiff: Well, he was not making a speech; it was only an interjection. No doubt he will be making a speech in due course.

400 **Deputy Lowe:** Okay, I will interject.

Deputy Sillars: Let me just read what the B2 amendment says:

'That 11 to 16 education in the States' sector shall be provided in three schools of a broadly comparable size.'

Well, three is not four.

405 We will be able to retain the advantage of small schools in terms of ethos, identity, close relationships with staff and pupils, monitoring attendance and behaviour, links with the surrounding local community and so on, plus deliver some of the advantages of a larger school such as offering a broader curriculum for all students, teachers, specialisation, mentoring and collaboration.

410 We believe that not only will the students benefit from our new structure, as they will have access to a far broader curriculum offer, and also keep the level of close pastoral support that is so welcome in our current system, and our staff will benefit too. They will have far greater opportunities to work together in partnership, to share good practice, to team teach, or share planning and preparation. We will also be able to provide a greater opportunity for teachers to teach across the full 11-18 range, not just for those working in our current Grammar School. We
415 will be able to address the duplication of functions within our single school structure. We will be able to deploy our staff more efficiently and effectively. We will look to move towards a flatter management structure under the executive head teacher, a new board of governors working within a devolved financial management structure, or Guernsey LMS. All this will have significant benefits on the teaching and learning in the classroom.

420 Under Deputy St Pier's three-school option, he will have three completely separate schools with three head teachers, three separate management structures, three governing bodies, duplication of functions, duplication of facilities, little staff collaboration, no opportunity for schools to specialise. Under this amendment we lose one of the key parts of our proposals: the selection for pathways and options at Key Stage 4, based on the individual students' aptitude
425 ability, past performance, potential and preference. We lose that opportunity for students to follow an individual pathway that is best suited to them, regardless of which school site offers it. Under the three-school option, schools will be in competition with each other, not in collaboration. We reduce our ability to cope with future fluctuations in population, and, of course, we do shut a school.

430 I have spoken at length about the costs and complete lack of any details from this amendment. But what is striking is the educational outcome appears to have been ignored in these proposals. I fully understand the need for value for money, which means balancing various objectives. It does not mean simply the cheapest.

435 To keep it simple, let's just take one example. Under the three-school model, will each school offer French, German and Spanish at Key Stage 4, or will those pathways and options be limited? If they are limited, then we constrain choices for our students. If they are all to be available with staff reductions as he proposes, then they will be taught by teachers outside of their subject specialisms. Well, guess who suffers!

440 We want our teachers to share best practice and collaborate together. All the research shows that it has huge benefits and impact on teachers and learning. We want our schools to collaborate. With post-16 we do have one international baccalaureate on offer – what, on all the sites, or just one, and at what cost? I look forward to hearing his answers to these questions in the closing speech.

445 Sir, Members, how do you think closing a school will be viewed by our parents, our students and our dedicated staff? Well, I can tell you, because I still bear the scars. Now is *not* the time to do this. It is too risky, presents an unacceptable level of disruption. It is not what the public wants, and it provides too little flexibility for the future. It is an ill-thought folly with no costings. What is in the explanatory notes is not even half the picture.

450 I do expect Deputy St Pier to clarify what cost assumptions he has assumed for the golden handcuffs to keep staff –

I will give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb.

455 **Deputy Bebb:** I thank Deputy Sillars for giving way.

Deputy Sillars is making reference to subjects taught in schools, but is it not true that it is common practice in the UK, where there are far greater distances, for teachers from one school to teach the same subject in another school, and that is with having driven much further than would be necessary between any campus in Guernsey?

460

Deputy Sillars: Sir, I thank Deputy Bebb for his interjection, but actually it is exactly what we are trying to achieve. If you have got separate schools, separate heads and everything else, you do not have to have separate timetabling and everything else. That is exactly what we are wanting to achieve.

465 I also expect Deputy St Pier to clarify the cost assumptions he has assumed for the golden hand ... sorry, I have done that. I do sincerely hope he has made some provision for this, despite not providing any details, as the alternative is again compromising the educational outcome for all our children.

470 The Education Department has been criticised for not listening to public consultation on the subject of four schools, four sites. As an aside, the Education board are happy with one school over four sites, or a federation of four schools, so let's not get into the semantics of four schools or four sites as long as there is co-ordinated approach to the four working together based on collaboration and not competition.

475 Now back to the public consultation: 70% favoured four schools, with 66% of teachers supporting this option. Apart from those who identified themselves to be States' Members in the public consultation, all groups were in favour of retaining four schools including the majority of our teachers. I will repeat, two thirds of our teachers want four sites. Value for money was the least important factor for respondents to the public consultation.

480 For those of you who castigated us over the last couple of days for not listening to the public consultation – and there have been a lot of you – please take heed. The public does not want to close a school. They want to keep four schools; 70% of them who responded to our consultation

were in favour of smaller schools. They wanted to keep all our existing schools, all four of them, including La Mare, and we listened to that proposal.

485 Deputy St Pier said that we are talking about one school of 2,100, or three schools of 700 or 800. We are not. By the time we get round to closing the school, we will be talking about over 200, and this also ignores the fact that the Audit Commission recommends schools operate with a percentage of unfilled places. I wonder if Deputy St Pier is aware of this fact. Whilst the Audit Commission does not recommend a single level of spare places that would be appropriate, it has stated that 10% spare capacity is generally agreed appropriate. This means we need to plan for
490 2,400 just in the next few years. This takes no account of our predicted peak population in 2026, no account of the States' Resolutions on population, no account of any movement out of the colleges – far from it, our projections actually assume that numbers at the colleges will rise as the secondary school population rises – and most importantly, no account of additional wriggle room required in order to manage a smooth and successful transformation from four to three.

495 It also leaves no flexibility should numbers go up or down. We will not be able to extend the other schools in time, even if it were feasible to do so. With the exception of St Sampson's, it is not. Yet Les Beaucamps was originally conceived as a far larger school, 720 or 840. But it has since only been designed for 660, so we are where we are. It cannot be changed back to 720 or 840. It is too late. It has not been designed with flexibility to do so, because the past States' decisions had
500 been for four schools.

I am completely unclear where T&R are expecting these children at secondary level to go. St Sampson's High School is virtually full to capacity. Based on its existing catchment area, and capacity, we have been oversubscribed at St Sampson's High School for the past two years, and have struggled to balance the numbers. This is at a point when our secondary population is at an
505 all-time low, and is expected to rise substantially over the next 10 years. There are more than 60 additional children in our current reception year compared to seven years ago. That is just one year group.

We do have about 150 places at Beaucamps and 100 at the Grammar School, but we have over 400 children at La Mare de Carteret, and we are expecting our secondary population to rise by
510 almost 300 pupils. That is 700 additional pupils to fit into 200 or so places. We cannot extend at Les Beaucamps, and we cannot extend at the Grammar School and keep these schools operational. Neither of these schools have been designed to be built upwards, even supposing Planning allowed us to do so. They do not have sufficient external space to both extend and keep the necessary outdoor facilities. We do not even own the playing fields and the land at the
515 Grammar School – we lease them. The Education board does not support a move from four to three secondary schools under a selective or non-selective secondary education system. However, in its report the board has outlined two possible three-school options. The closure of La Mare de Carteret High School was not one of them.

Seventy percent of people who replied to questionnaires said they preferred smaller schools and wanted to keep our four main secondary school sites open. They like the smaller pastoral care that is provided. T&R say in their letter of comment that given the States finite resources, the education system must provide good value for the taxpayer in delivering its outcomes. They say it is not within their mandate to comment on the educational merit of our proposals, and yet the T&R Minister is proposing a three-school option that is based entirely on cost and not value, in
520 my view.
525

T&R say in their letter of comment that they remain concerned about the quantum of capital investment sought by education departments. Members, if you support this amendment today you are committing the next Assembly to far greater capital investment than this Education board is asking for today. The truth is T&R do not even know what sort of capital commitment their
530 three-school option might require. We will adjourn shortly, maybe, if the three-school model is approved so that they can get another fag packet out to make some guesses. This is no way to run a government! (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Our proposals have been accused of being a leap of faith, of being radical, revolutionary, unfeasible and impractical. Well if that is what you believe about our carefully considered evidence-based and widely welcomed proposals, then how shall we describe Deputy St Pier's amendment? I will leave you to answer that.

He has not even stuck to the suggestion in T&R's letter of comment that three-school option C, which sees the Grammar School site being used as a tertiary college – the cheapest three-school option – is the one that the States should go for. Instead he is proposing a completely different three-school solution, with no costings, no consideration on the impact of our children, on their education, on their life chances, on our staff and our community.

Sir, Deputy Stewart made a number of comments and asked a lot of questions about the process, and how we got here. I agree, and I would welcome the Scrutiny Management Committee's involvement in this area. Deputy Stewart may not be aware that the States' Internal Audit Team are looking at Treasury SCIP process with La Mare as a case study, and we look forward to reading that in detail.

If you remember, this project has been through the States approved process in 2013, T&R recommended a 600 high school in their portfolio. In 2014, oh, they wanted a 480 high school! By 2015 they wanted a 960 high school, and now in March 2016 they do not want one at all. I wonder what will happen next week.

Also remember the outline business case, which was reviewed by T&R's own external consultants, was deemed to be excellent value for money. Education has at every turn done what this Assembly has asked of it (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and completed States' Resolutions. We very much hope that the Scrutiny Management Committee look at this project, as we find Treasury's behaviour slightly erratic and not at all consistent.

Sir, Members, I urge you to throw out this three-school option today, safe in the knowledge that if at any point in the future we need to increase our pupil places, or indeed reduce them, we will still have the flexibility to do so, and to do so in a carefully planned researched and considered way. Support our one school across four site proposal, amendment B1. Listen to our teaching unions: the NASUWT, the biggest teaching union in Guernsey, said they would be very concerned if there was a move towards the three school model. 'This would be a significant reorganisation and cause uncertainty and anxiety for pupils, parents and staff.'

The NASUWT went on to say:

'... believes the States should stick to the recommendations to retain all four schools so that focus is on standards and not structures.'

Listen to our head teachers. They stated they were encouraged that our recommended proposals meant that no school site will face closure. Our proposal keeps the best of what we have now, but also provides equality of opportunity and fairness. It will allow us to work more efficiently, and effectively, without affecting the ongoing education of our children and young people. It allows for a smooth, seamless transition from primary to secondary schools, where children stay together with their friends. It opens doors, provides choice, allows for collaborative working, sharing good practice, working together as one organisation, with one vision and one aim. Our focus has always been to put the needs of the child at the centre of our thinking, with the aim of providing a learning experience that will stretch and challenge, where appropriate, and offer extra help and support when needed. We wholeheartedly believe –

I was in full flow.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you for giving way, Deputy Sillars.

I was trying to find an opportune time to be able to stand up and ask this question, because I have already spoken on the amendment, so I thank you for that.

I would like to know how Education are going to deal with this bombshell that has been dropped, and the ramifications of that, bearing in mind, just in the last hour we have had over 100 emails alone. And how are Education Minister and the Education board going to address this damage limitation for over 1,000 people that are involved in La Mare de Carteret Primary and High Schools, because they are all extremely concerned?

Could you give some assurance of how you are going to deal with that as Education Department, even if we are talking about three schools or four schools, and it is now being said we are not talking about La Mare, when actually La Mare has been put into the equation. There are serious problems here.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you for that interjection.

As I say we have been up half the night and most of this morning. We have already had our Director of Education go down to La Mare to speak to the teachers, because it has come as a huge shock to everyone down there. I have gone on at great lengths to explain why this is so wrong to have done this.

We really have to wait, I guess, until the end of today, I hope, as to quite what the outcome will be. But, of course, we have not had time to think this through as carefully as we might. As I say we have already instantly reacted to, to try and give comfort.

The point is actually that the students are in the middle of their GCSE's some of them. And this is what is so awful, it is the timing of this. (*Interjection*) Where are they going to be with their heads? We know the fear – we had long discussions on 11-plus yesterday, and the day before, where the kids are going to be as far as their heads are concerned and keeping focussed. Can you imagine what is happening at La Mare at the moment? Those children are doing really, really well.

So yes, if it goes through to three schools, we will have to manage that. I accept that totally because it would be the will of the States, we live in a democracy, that is what has to happen. Yes, we will manage it as well as we can. But it will be incredibly difficult, and as you say the uncertainty at the moment is phenomenal.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott:

Deputy Trott: I am grateful, sir, for the Minister giving way.

Just one thing has troubled me with his speech, and that is the idea that this is somehow a bombshell. The Minister of the Treasury & Resources made it absolutely clear in his opening remarks on St Pier A1 and A2, the binary choice regarding selection, that if this Assembly chose to do away with selection at 11, we would not need four high schools – either educationally or financially.

It was no bombshell we knew exactly what we were doing when we were considering selection at 11. (*Interjections*)

Deputy Sillars: Well, Deputy Trott does not attend a lot of the meetings, I know, but for me – (*Laughter and interjections*) You started this! For me, we knew the three-school option was coming, of course we did. The bombshell, if he wants it made into quite plain English, was the shutting, or his proposal to shut La Mare. (*Interjections*) That was the bombshell. How you can say it was not a bombshell, I just have no idea, sir, through the Chair.

I was beginning to finish.

We wholeheartedly believe that our proposals provide an appropriate solution for Guernsey, one that will ensure all our children and young people are able to reach their full potential, enable our community to meet the challenges and demands of the 21st century, and provide our greatest asset, our people, with the knowledge, skills, and tools to face a complex and challenging future with enthusiasm and confidence.

To support B2 would be irresponsible, and our community would have many years to regret this decision. If you support this amendment you are making policy on the hoof with no evidence,

no consultation, or engagement with the community, and no proper costings. Can this Assembly sink any lower, I wonder.

635 I urge Members, do not support B1. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Dave Jones. I will call next Deputy Dave Jones, but Deputy Le Clerc do you wish to be *relevée*?

640 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Yes, thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dave Jones.

Deputy David Jones: Thank you, Mr Bailiff, Members of States.

645 The Education Minister used the word in his speech 'semantics'. It is a lot of smoke and mirrors, this morning. The idea that getting rid of selection will not lead to the demise of the Grammar School, which is what we heard yesterday, is complete and utter tosh. We know exactly what is going to happen to the Grammar School with selection gone.

650 Now, of course, we are told that because we have abolished selection we only need three schools, and therefore what makes complete sense is to stop the rebuild of La Mare. We are told no, no, that is not what we are saying at all. That is the reality if what is going on here.

Of course, we have already agreed to close two primary schools a little while ago. To me we are moving to a sort of EU model of education in Guernsey – a one size fits all, regardless of the consequences type of education system for Guernsey.

655 But you know what, I feel like many in this Chamber, I suspect, who feel played, who feel betrayed in many ways (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) by some of the rhetoric over the last two years and the feigned support for La Mare, and the fact that we were going to have a review, but, of course, it will not cause a delay. I was sucked into that. In fact, I voted, at that time, for that delay because I believed the people who told me that it would not cause a delay, and it has done
660 exactly that, and to the point now, where we are actively talking about the possibility of not building La Mare, and in fact closing it down.

665 But do you know, what surprises me more is the seconder to this amendment. Because if you go back two years, to a speech that Deputy Le Lièvre made, and I just want to quote a little bit from it from *Hansard*, he said that ... where are we? I am sort of taking it out of context, I accept that, but the message is clear. (*Interjections*) The message is clear the – I am sorry, I have lost it now – ah sorry, yes – thank you Deputy Ogier, who is my IT consultant and – (*Interjection and laughter*)

670 Right, this is a direct quote from Deputy Le Lièvre two years ago, and the only reason I am saying that is because I know how passionately he feels about La Mare, and about the hundreds of tenants who live in that area, and the school itself. He said:

'We cannot ignore the fact that La Mare is very unfairly becoming a by-word for everything that is wrong in education – poor results, poor attendance, poor conditions, poor outcomes.'

Now we know that since he made that speech that has been turned round, by the results of La Mare the other day:

'This is all changing and improving very rapidly. A brilliant headmistress and equally sharp management team, supported by young vibrant teachers is turning this school round, and rapidly at that. Education wants to continue that trend, not at any price, but at the right price. We want La Mare to become a facility of choice: a community facility that offers centres of excellence in sport, in care, in outcomes, in the education of children on the autistic spectrum and in many cases the children that have had a very unequal start in life.'

He went on to say that:

'Value for money, although always desirable, does not always sit comfortably with such a vision.'

Amen to that.

'Education dreads the idea that its vision for La Mare is devalued by a body with no responsibility and no accountability. I ask you where will this review team'

675 – he is talking obviously about the review team at the time –

'be in 20 years' time, when a new school is found not to perform as originally intended, when it has failed to become the facility of choice, and when the students leaving the school have not achieved their optimum performance?'

Now that shows – it does go on slightly – a very passionate Deputy who cares deeply about La Mare and about what was happening at the time of that review. So I am surprised to see Deputy Le Lièvre seconding this amendment from Treasury –

I give way to the Deputy.

680

Deputy Le Lièvre: I would like to ask...

The Bailiff: Can you put your microphone on.

685 **Deputy Le Lièvre:** I would like to ask Deputy Jones a question. Have I said at any stage that La Mare should be closed or not rebuilt?

Deputy David Jones: No, you have not. But what I am saying is, I find it surprising, given your passion for the social problems that we know we have in that area, and with that specific school, that you would second an amendment that may lead – sorry, through the Chair – that may lead
690 (*Laughter*) to the closure, as a by-product of the consequence of this amendment. So that does surprise me.

I cannot support the three-school option, simply because I think selection will be back after the next election. I do not believe that this decision that was taken two days ago will be allowed to stand by a new Assembly, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) especially if there is a significant change. Because it has to be said, and it may be uncomfortable for some of you who are moving on to greener pastures, but that decision was made by many who will not be here in 2016. In fact none of us may be here, that will be a matter for the electorate.

But I do not believe that that decision will be left as it has been decided this week. I already
700 know that, speaking to some prospective candidates, that they will move very quickly in the new term, should they be lucky enough to be elected, to make sure that that is overturned. So, I cannot support the three-school option, because I think we are all being a bit premature in thinking that the decision taken to abolish selection will stand.

But, going back to my original point, I do feel, like the parents, the teachers and the children of
705 La Mare de Carteret, that I have been thoroughly led up the garden path by T&R who always gave me the impression that, yes they wanted value for money, that was clear round the Policy Council table, but the other thing that struck me at the Policy Council was that no matter what the Education Minister said, never ending barriers were put up, was that there was always another agenda. You got that feeling that there was always another agenda, and I think that agenda has
710 now become crystal clear.

I said a couple of days ago, in Deputy St Pier's speech then, that it had suddenly clicked with me exactly what was going on here. So, I hope you do not support the three-school option, for whatever reasons, and I hope that you take great exception to the way that I believe that many of us have been led a dance here over the last two years over this particular issue.

715 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

720 Sir, if we are going to have a three-school model, and close La Mare, and presumably it will have to be demolished, it is not fit for purpose. Of course, if a developer buys the site they could pay for the demolition, but they would only do that on the understanding that they were going to make a substantial profit if they were to build houses on the site.

725 The States themselves could repair La Mare and use it for some other purpose – but as Deputy Sillars has already told us, a new roof alone would cost millions of pounds.

Alternatively, of course, the States could be stuck with the building, and either has to demolish it and return the site to a green field, which I am sure would please many in the community, but which would cost hundreds of thousands of pounds. We could demolish it and build something else on the site, or leave it empty to become an eyesore, and a target for vandals for years, as Fort Richmond has been left. If it was left to disintegrate, taxpayers' money would presumably have to be spent on some kind of security provision.

730 So, sir, I am wondering if Deputy St Pier and his board have a long-term vision for the site, should the school be closed. Then, of course, there is the issue of all the money that has been spent on the whole La Mare project to get us to where we are today. I suspect that comes to several hundred thousand pounds. Deputy Conder says millions. I do not dispute that.

735 I appreciate T&R are not just looking at this from a financial point of view, but closing La Mare could result in a penny-wise, pound-foolish approach, whereby it could cost almost as much to close it as it would to rebuild it.

740 Now, I know I am exaggerating, sir, but we all do that in this chamber to suit our own ends. Some more than others. But I am expressing a genuine concern, and I would like to hear the Minister's view on that concern when he responds, please, sir. I say all that, knowing full well the next Assembly could overturn any decision made by this States, but I would like to hear the Minister's views just the same.

745 In closing, sir, I would just like to read two paragraphs from an excellent letter published in *The Press* yesterday written by the head boy at La Mare de Carteret. This is what he said:

'With a wider difference in student to teacher ratio in the three schools proposal, teachers will be teaching many more lessons than they currently are and will have a lot less time to plan and prepare lessons. Because of that the quality of lessons will go down, and the quality of learning will also go down. In the end the grades will go down with it. I believe this is the most important debate in Education's history, it might even be the make or break of our economy for the everlasting future ... We might just be left with a decreasing population and students looking for jobs elsewhere'.

So, sir, I would to hear Deputy St Pier's views on that when he responds.
Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel.

750

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

755 Sir, I believe this issue, these amendments, they represent the quandary for many of us, especially now the idea of rebuilding or not rebuilding La Mare de Carteret School has been in to the equation. Even though we are told that these amendments do not directly relate to La Mare de Carteret situation, it is hard to see, hard to see how it could be different, because the other three schools are either new, or comparatively new, and if we were going to close one of those schools, either the Grammar, or Les Beaucamps, or St Sampson's High, unless that school were sold, perhaps, to create a Channel Islands University, for example, then it is hard to see how we could justify closing one of those sites. So, this issue, regardless of what has been said up to now, 760 it must, to some extent, be about La Mare de Carteret School and its future fate, whether it is closed or rebuilt.

So, sir, it is difficult to make a judgement without all the analysis and detail to hand, and I agree with what Deputy Brouard said yesterday.

765 Now, I must admit I do have a preference for smaller schools. There must be a greater sense of community and ownership within them, and the quality of pastoral care must be higher. (A

Member: Hear, hear.) I imagine it is easier to identify and meet the individual needs of pupils within a smaller school. But, sir, if I can be convinced that there will be significant savings, and educational outcomes will not be damaged, then I could consider voting for a three-school model – but that comes with a very significant caveat, sir, which I will touch on in a minute.

770 Because I am attracted to the idea of financial savings, and the more efficient use of facilities. But as I say, sir, we do not have any of that analysis before us today. Some modelling should have been done weeks ago, and permutations should be available for us to consider today, so that we are not shooting in the dark, or just dealing with supposition or on-the-hoof analysis.

775 I will go on to say a few more points about the caveat, sir, that I have been presented with. This does present me with a dilemma, sir. Four school sites or three school sites? I am acutely aware, of course, the construction industry needs a boost, a stimulus, and that would certainly be provided by a rebuild of La Mare de Carteret School. On the other hand, I understand the rationale behind the three-sites proposal, and I suppose the comfort I can take from that is that significant remodelling works, extensions etc. would need to take place on the three sites. I agree with the
780 point Deputy Stewart made yesterday. I think the construction industry, the local industry, would prefer a measured supply of work, rather than work coming in one big hit. So that is a point in its favour.

785 However, sir, there is another problem for me, I am not going to vote for anything, whether it is the three-school model, or the four-school model, whether it is to rebuild La Mare de Carteret, or a proposal that will lead to remodelling, or extension works at the other three sites, unless I can be assured that the bulk of that work is awarded on Island, and the bulk of the money stays on Island (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) I am not just thinking about the local industry when I say that. I am not just thinking about local businesses and local employment. I am thinking about the benefits to the wider economy, and to associated businesses, merchants, suppliers, consultants,
790 fabricators, and I am thinking about the tax take.

795 Sir, it is not good enough to me to be told that Guernsey-registered companies are interested in these projects. That is not good enough for me, sir, because Guernsey-registered companies can bring in lots of non-local labour, and they have done in the past. I need to know that this work is going to go to proper, locally based companies that have a large degree of local employment.

I have always reasoned, sir, soundly in my opinion –
Sorry, I will give way to Deputy Sillars.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sillars.

800 **Deputy Sillars:** Sir, I have said before, and very recently, that the two tenderers are absolutely Guernsey companies, so I can assure you they are very much Guernsey companies. They are not registered, they are very well known. If I was to say who they were, which I cannot, you would know instantly they are very Guernsey companies.

805 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I thank the Minister for his interjection. I understand the point that he is making, but it does not change the fact that even what you might call a local *bona fide* company can still attempt to bring in non-local traders and non-local trade persons. I understand that when it comes down to skills that are rare on Island, or skills that we need that we do not
810 have here. But so often in the past we have seen, what you might call run-of-the-mill tradespeople brought in to work on these projects, and that is no good for the local industry, that is no good for local employment, that is no good for the tax take ultimately, or the skills base.

815 But, sir, I have always reasoned, I think soundly in my opinion that Guernsey, in effect, is an isolated economy. Money that is spent off Island is usually gone for ever. Its value and added value is lost to the local economy.

Now sir, some work was done a few years ago at Commerce & Employment in regard to what they call the multiplier effect. The findings showed that every pound spent on Island could be

worth between £5 and £10 in the longer term, with the benefits being spread far and wide within the local community. The action of allowing contracts and work to disappear off Island could be judged to be an exercise in false economy when all those points are taken into consideration.

Now clearly, if they are local contractor, or a developer, or a trader, if they are putting forward outrageous or unreasonable sums, then that cannot be countenanced, but we have to accept that the local cost base is higher, and I am concerned that for the fact say for a few thousand pounds, millions of pounds can disappear off Island. As I say it is short sighted. It is false economy, the value and benefit of that spend is gone.

I need to be assured, as much as possible, that whether I vote for this amendment, or the other one, so four sites or three sites, the bulk of the work and the spend will stay on Island. If not, I will vote for neither. Because this is a serious issue, sir. Education is clearly a very serious matter, getting education right is clearly a very serious matter, but so is the prospect of tens of millions of pounds disappearing off Island, sir. It has done so in the past, and that will happen in the future if we are not careful.

Now, Education's Vision, in part, is about acknowledging, and facilitating, the strength and the abilities of young people, our young people. That will mean helping a not insignificant number of them to get ready for vocational careers. Many of those jobs will have links to the local construction industry. What is the point in doing that – and I agree with it in principle – if so much work and so many of the projects that they could be involved in go off Island? What will be the point in skilling up large numbers of young people when considering that scenario?

Sir, we need to see and understand that connection. It is not enough to say local companies will be doing these jobs. We need to know that a significant number of local traders and local employees will be involved in these projects.

So, sir, four sites or three? That to me sir in part, depends on the analysis, the data, the possible permeations, and none of that we have before us at the moment, so it makes it very difficult to make these choices, sir. In addition it depends for me on whether the bulk of the work and the money stays on Island. So, it is a very hard decision to make based on assumptions and guesswork.

Thank you, sir, we need that information. Thank you.

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

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

Deputy Langlois: Yes, please, sir.

Deputy Hadley: Mr Bailiff, through you, I would like to apologise to Members if I repeat some of the information that the Minister gave. Inevitably as a member of the Education board we are both accessing similar papers at The Grange, and I had no idea what he was going to say.

The Education Department has been developing its policies, as directed by Resolutions of the States, and the Education Department has been consistent all the way from 2013, seeking a 600-pupil school at La Mare. Treasury instead has asked for a 600 high school, then a 480 pupil high school, then a 960 high school, and now none at all. Ten out of ten for unpredictability! I wonder what Deputy St Pier will suggest next.

When a second look was demanded by the Chief Minister, he assured us that it would not delay the rebuild. As has been mentioned, but it did, at a significant cost, it delayed the rebuild by a year. Treasury then demanded that we look at the option of a 960 school, again, at a considerable cost. Now, despite all of this, Deputy St Pier suggested yesterday that we do not rebuild La Mare at all. He said we do not need to spend £64 million on a dwindling number of students. Now that is totally misleading the Assembly, because, Mr Bailiff, he knows very well that we will not save £64 million by not building La Mare. We only save the cost of building a high school and the enhanced sports facilities. That would seem to be around £27 million, but in fact it would be rather less, because a new scheme to build the other facilities, including the primary

870 school, pre-school and autism centre would have to be totally redesigned. There would have to be more extensive site works after the demolition of the old buildings, and replacement by a much smaller set of buildings.

Of course, as has been mentioned – I am sorry to repeat it – but if we do not rebuild La Mare, we will have to extend Les Beaucamps, St Sampson and the Grammar School, at a probable cost of around £12 million. So to answer Deputy Lester Queripel’s point, it is not *probably* going to cost more, or *probably* not save anything. It is going to cost *a lot more* to follow the option that Deputy St Pier is suggesting.

Of course, the issues of where the work goes for these rebuildings, I do not think it matters much whether you extend the existing schools, building classrooms there, or indeed build a totally new school at La Mare. It has been mentioned that we would have to compulsory purchase land to achieve the objective that Deputy St Pier is suggesting, and, of course, that is deeply unpopular in the Island. This Government has rarely used the powers of compulsory purchase to purchase land. It is not popular with the public. So, in addition to the cost of £36 million we have got the land costs, and we all know that the cost of land at the moment has gone through the roof – another own goal.

Worse still the Department are not even certain that we can do it at all. We, like anyone else, have to apply for planning consent, we have to consult with the Fire Department, other States’ Departments, there might have to be, because of the scale, environmental impact assessments. The design brief of the architects, and the drawing up of plans, even before a planning application can be made, will probably take a year or two. Even if the required planning consents were obtained, and the schools were enlarged, we have not got, as the Minister has said, fit-for-purpose facilities, because we are adding bits on to the schools. The ancillary parts would be the wrong size, the library, sports facilities, catering areas, assembly halls, would all be inadequate for the enlarged schools. And all of these inconvenient truths have been totally ignored by Deputy St Pier. These complicated factors either have not been thought of, or they have been completely forgotten.

Now, I would like to ask Deputy St Pier when he sums up, to give categorical assurances and answers to these most basic issues, such as will the building regulations for the additional students be satisfied? Will there be sufficient ancillary services for the additional students? Lunch, toilets, room in the school hall and for public examinations.

Now, Members will recall that the Nicholls Report recommended that a move to a three-school model needs to be given very careful consideration. *Very careful consideration*. We have had this suggestion recently at the start of this debate. The Department’s policy letter presented and costed two or three school models, as we were required to do, but we dismissed them as impractical, and not best value for money, and it restricts flexibility for the future. Instead Deputy St Pier and his colleagues have been working behind closed doors, and present an alternative three-school model at 4.45 p.m. on Thursday afternoon without any engagement with the Education Department at all. Is this the future model for the Policy & Resources Committee, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) which Deputy St Pier is campaigning to be the President of? Is this the monster that we have unwittingly created? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

But, back to the proposals for Deputy St Pier, we have no evidence, no detail, and nothing for us to read or prepare for. Education were again told we only gave Members four weeks to read the policy letter. Well, Members, we have had 18 hours since we heard about this proposal to close La Mare High School as the preferred three-school model. I am not sure if that is very careful consideration – the very careful consideration that Mr Nicholl’s had in mind when he wrote his report. This is policy making on the hoof. This is the worst kind of decision making, and very poor corporate governance. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We should be ashamed of ourselves if we allow this amendment to be supported.

I would ask Deputy St Pier whether he would think that any actions that lead to decision making like this, on such an important issue, without such information, just a speech, would be

acceptable from any other Deputy other than himself. The scheme is absolute madness and instead of completion in 2018, it will be at least 2022 before the various rebuilds were complete.

925 When does Deputy St Pier think that the students at La Mare High School would finally be in their new school under his proposal to close our most successful 11-16 school on the Island? When he answers that question, I would like to know his best guess, in response to the question of whether he has sought professional advice from States' Property Services. We would end up with two new schools, which would not be able to function properly, and a 37-year-old school which is approaching its end of life with undersized classrooms and mismatching facilities.

930 You may recall that the Department's capital bid to repair the Grammar School's leaking roof was rejected from the last capital prioritisation process, and we are having to spread this over many years from routine capital. But this just highlights the folly of what he is proposing. He should be looking at the costs, over a sensible time horizon, and not just on the here and now.

935 What is the replacement cost for the Footes Lane site that would be needed in say 10 years' time? What is the asset life of that site? This is not about investing for the future, and providing flexibility, this is saddling future Assemblies with constraints and no room for manoeuvre. The Department's proposals gave the future Assemblies an opportunity to be flexible and live up to the future. If necessary, a school closure could follow when the time is right. Closing a school at the low point of our student numbers is not the right time.

940 He is also forgetting, as the Minister has said, that you do not run schools at 100% occupancy. The usual, and appropriate, approach is to run with 10% excess of normal operational use. His modelling completely ignores this. He has also quoted a mythical figure of 375 students in Year 7 in September 2016. This is wrong and a misrepresentation of the truth, which has been pointed out to Deputy Adam repeatedly, yet it fits his argument. Deputy St Pier chooses to use an incorrect figure. What is the excess capacity he is assuming at the schools? I hope he will answer that when he sums up for the debate.

950 La Mare is now a centre of excellence, with staff and students proud to be there. If ever I wanted to use the expression, 'pulled themselves up by their boot straps', it would be now. It is not just the board that is proud of this school, but I believe the whole Island. And now Deputy St Pier is saying to them, 'Well done chaps! And as a reward you can stay there until 2022 when we will close the place down.'

955 Now, Deputy St Pier may be seeing the error of his ways, the danger of on-the-hoof, back-of-a-fag-packet calculations. He might now suggest – and indeed, he has suggested, as others have suggested – that we do build La Mare and close one of the other schools. This is what Deputy Le Lièvre said.

960 As I said, the only one you could sensibly close would be the Grammar School, which is now 37 years old, near the end of its design life, and has smaller classrooms than we would accept today. But we have been told by many Members of this Assembly that we must not damage the Grammar School. So you have got a binary choice: you can close La Mare, the centre of excellence, or the other centre of excellence.

965 I have lost track of the number of times during the previous two days when the Education Department was criticised, and condemned for not listening to the consultation process. If I remember correctly, I think Deputy Perrot said that we told that we were the worst States because we do not listen to the public. We were told countless times that 61% of the respondents wanted to keep selection of some type, even though we explained why we could not deliver that model. Well, 70% of the respondents to the consultation said they want to keep four schools. Now, my maths is good enough to know that 70% is more than 61%, but now, of course, those supporting Deputy St Pier's proposals, who argue that we do not listen to the public, will say that this Assembly should ignore what the public say in expressing their desire to keep four schools.

970 I must say, I smiled when Deputy Kuttelwascher mentioned that our proposals were at odds with Service Guernsey and the public service reform. The four school model was going to be wasteful and not deliver a reform dividend, which was not right. But I would suggest that the

Education Department's proposals are, in fact, wholly consistent with Service Guernsey and public service reform agenda.

975 Deputy Kuttelwascher, as a member of Treasury & Resources, not unsurprisingly, will remember the value for money theme. I am not surprised, however, that he has forgotten about the customer focus theme. It is about giving the public the public services they expect, not just deciding what we should give them. Seventy percent of the respondents wanted four schools, which we are in effect giving them. Deputy St Pier is in effect saying, 'Tough, you are having three, even though it means we are going to spend more on capital expenditure extending three
980 schools, instead of rebuilding one, because I am right and very clever.' Deputy St Pier, government is all about people and serving the people – remember, we are talking about people.

985 Before I come to the end, I would like Deputy St Pier to provide some clarity on one further point in his closing address. I was not quite sure what he was committing to in the event of the three-school model being approved. Is there going to be a primary school, pre-school, primary communications and autism base, and community facilities built at La Mare? Is that still on the cards, or is he going to ditch that as well?

990 The States has agreed to these in principle but these commitments appear to be worthless now. I am just concerned with some guarded ambiguous language in his opening speech. If these, or some of these, are going to be the subject of a magical disappearing act, then I think the community, staff, and parents need to know about it now, rather than be disappointed at some time in the future.

995 Finally, I wish to comment with my HSSD hat on, and touch briefly on the Children and Young People's Plan. A key element of the Plan is to engage and encourage the youth voice. I would like to congratulate the Youth Commission, the Home Department and the Education Department, and everyone else involved in the Youth States last week. It was a huge success, with an opportunity for our young people to express their views and be heard. A number of speeches were made during the debate on education, and every single one who spoke about the federation, and the federated courses available, were enthused and appreciative, and spoke highly of the courses and wanted more of them. The computing studies course Deputy St Pier criticised
1000 in his speech has in fact been very successful, with higher than average results for the course. In this instance, once again, I would suggest our model, with breadth of curriculum, better pastoral care in smaller schools is customer focused.

1005 I would encourage Members to listen to our young people, and also listen to the answers from Deputy St Pier, because if it sounds too good to be true, it probably isn't. Deputy St Pier said that if the four-school model goes through it will be the worst decision in his political career.

Now, a book I commonly read, I would like to quote to you – Luke 23, verse 34: (*Laughter*)

'Father, forgive them ... they know not what they do.'

The Bailiff: Deputy Spruce.

Deputy Spruce: Thank you, sir.

1010 I have to say I am really disappointed by the level of exaggeration being expressed in this Chamber, especially by the last speaker, with regard to this policy letter. I will try and stick to the basic facts.

The Department recommend the retention of the four-school model. That is their favoured model. They do this in spite of the cost implications.

1015 The Department in their own report have dismissed out of hand Option C, even though the three-school model is significantly less expensive to build, maintain and staff. This is not a new idea, this is in their report. They seem to suggest that Option C is dismissed because they do not have the resources to manage the scale of change. Well, in my view, they should just staff up and start planning, especially given the huge opportunity that exists to save very large sums of money
1020 and improve curriculum choice.

1025 With the proposed model we will have students wasting valuable time bussing around the Island to attend their non-core courses. All because the school sizes are not large enough to support the required staff at each location. When I read this report, I said to myself, why is it that the Education Department see no need to secure a reform dividend? The fact that we have this option before us provides us with a golden opportunity to not only improve educational outcomes, but it has the potential to kick start a large reform dividend in education.

1030 This Assembly has already agreed that the entire Civil Service will undertake a huge public service reform agenda, thereby releasing a large financial saving, and improved service to our community. It will affect thousands of staff, so for the life of me I do not understand why Education are concerned about the impact on their staff, any more than anybody else.

1035 We have agreed that HSSD will also work through huge change management programmes, not only to release large cost savings, but to enable them to provide a more efficient service at lower cost, and all of this is being done solely to improve efficiency and reduce the cost of providing services to our taxpayers. But even given the fact that these huge transformational decisions have already been taken by this Assembly, this Education Department remains oblivious to the opportunities that exist to reform Education's offer by moving to a three-school model. They appear to have no concern about the capital costs associated with implementing their chosen four-school model. They obviously must believe that they need not contain their annual operational costs or their capital expenditure.

1040 Option B, their chosen model, will cost approximately £30 million additional capital expenditure to implement, when compared to option C in their own report, the three-school model. The forecast annual revenue expenditure will cost at least £3½ million per year more than Option C. Could we not all do an awful lot with that £3½ million saving?

1045 So you get the picture. Everyone else has to transform and become more efficient. Everyone else has to accept budget freezes, and unless we can achieve that it remains difficult to introduce any new services that remain outstanding. From where I sit it is apparent that the Education Department – sorry –

1050 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Conder.

Deputy Conder: I thank Deputy Spruce for giving way.

He said a few seconds ago that the option that the Education Department is proposing will cost £30 million more. If he is able to, would he be kind enough to articulate that and break it down as to how he derives that figure.

1055 **Deputy Spruce:** Well, I do not have the figures at my fingertips here today, but we all know the significant capital costs savings. From where I sit it is apparent that the Education Department believe that they should be immune to the financial pressures of all other States' Departments. Even when their –

1060 **Deputy Sherbourne:** Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

1065 **Deputy Sherbourne:** To make a claim like that, when in fact it is well documented that the Education Department actually has done extremely well with its attempt to meet the target for FTP ... We are fully aware of the requirements that this Assembly has set, and have worked to that.

1070 **Deputy Spruce:** I do accept you have done very well over the past few years, but this report is more costly with the four-school model than three. That is a fact, and it is included in your own report.

1075 So, to me it is just not acceptable that this should be allowed to continue. It has to be understood that a golden opportunity exists to rethink how best to use our Education Estate, which when linked to a three school model will not only be more curriculum efficient, but will save huge capital expenditure costs, and reduce annual operational expenditure. It would also improve outcomes for children. There would also be no shortage of pupil capacity with the three-school model.

1080 We must remember that over capacity already exists in our States' system, and if we built a 600-pupil school at La Mare we would only increase that further. We have to also remember that if we build La Mare, as proposed, we will have to close another school. You cannot get away from the fact that we will have massive overcapacity, costing a fortune to our taxpayers and community. So, sorry, I am trying to make a point here. The reality of the situation, even though the Education Department do not accept this point, is that there will be massive over capacity, costing us a small fortune per year to operate. So, the Grammar School will have to close, or another school will have to close in due course. If that happened that would probably limit the amount of capital expenditure that would have to be applied to the redevelopment of the College of Further Education, but this is a big picture issue. Just do not get away with the fact that one school will not close.

1090 Another point I would like to make, is that if we were to expand the other schools slightly, the children that currently go to La Mare will have a swimming pool facility at each school, which they are not getting with the rebuild. They are just getting a great big sports hall. So that is a benefit.

1095 Members, I could go on, but I am sure you get the picture. We must remember that this is not a late in the day three-school amendment, as has been portrayed by the Minister of Education Department. We discussed this 12 months ago. This has been on the cards for a long time. The problem for Treasury has been that the Education board have just failed to listen to any other alternative opinions. In fact, this report is practically identical to the one that was produced 12 months ago. Their mind is closed to change. So, whatever the board members say, I do not believe it is correct to ignore the capital, operational, and educational benefits of a three-school model.

1100 So, I urge you to support the amendment before you, and then we will get on to deciding which school is to close – or which school does not get built.

The Bailiff: Deputy James.

1105 **Deputy James:** Thank you, sir.

1110 Sir, surely, the future building provision of our schools was going to be entirely dependent on whether Guernsey retained the 11-plus. Now we voted upon that, 26 of you voted for that, and that is the democratic process. If you recall one of the questions that I asked, posed to this Assembly, was how many of those 26 people voted for the abolition of the 11-plus based on moral grounds or potentially financial future implications? Maybe some voted for one or either, maybe some voted for both. However, to use that awful expression, 'we are where we are'.

The inevitability for me, when you look at the current overcapacity of our schools, *surely* it makes sense to go for the three-school option.

1115 What I find interesting, sir, is the mixed messages that we receive from the Education Department. My mind goes back to their reasoned arguments to close St Andrew's Primary School. What was their rationale for the closure of St Andrew's Primary School? Falling pupil numbers and pupils do better in larger schools. (*Interjections*) Have you forgotten that? (*Interjections*) Absolutely, pupils do better – and in addition, the school had glowing reports before it was closed. That did not stop the Education Department forging ahead with the closure of St Andrew's Primary School. So we are hearing contradictory arguments and rationale now for them to retain their four-school model.

1120 Also, sir, we hear the Minister of Education now quoting from the consultation document to support their arguments. So, sadly we get mixed messages, and this takes me back right to my

1125 first speech on this. I could not support the Education proposals, because I did not like the report. I felt it had loads of gaps in it, and now I think that the debates we are now having are almost the inevitable consequences of having what, in my personal view, was a flawed report before this Assembly.

1130 So, I would say, you know it makes sense to go for the three school model, whatever those schools are. Overcapacity is not acceptable. I would ask you, if any of you were running a private business, if you were running a hotel, and you were running with 50%-60% bed lack of occupancy, you would close your business. You know it makes sense, the three-school model.

The Bailiff: Deputy Adam.

1135 **Deputy Adam:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, I am going to start with a slightly different tack and actually look back in history. Looking back over history may be tedious, but at times it is illuminating.

1140 In my speech about selection, I stated Education's plans in 2001 were derailed by the Torode amendment. (*Interjections*) What were Education's plans for the secondary schools if the 11-plus had been abolished in 2001? Well, they were as recommended by the Barnett Report of April 2000: three non-selective secondary schools, each designed for approximately 850 pupils aged 11 to 16.

1145 Now, again as Deputy James said, sir, we are where we are, unfortunately. The reason for this, in that report it is clearly stated as the most effective provision both from an educational and a financial perspective. The recommended sites were Les Beaucamps, Grammar existing school with extension, and a new site in the north of the Island. They actually suggested Les Nicolles Vinery, but we know the prison is there now. So it is St Sampson's.

1150 The total costs quoted in that document estimated, I hate to say it, £40 million. How much has Guernsey lost? How much have we spent over the years? The revenue costs for the changed system would reduce money-wise in 2001 £2 million a year. And we cannot even say it is £2 million if we change now. I do not quite understand that.

1155 As I say, the Torode amendment changed all that. Education was instructed to retain the selective Grammar School, develop three new high schools, and develop an improved College of Further Education. This is a legacy that the Education Department has adhered to, I might say, almost with blinkers on over the last 15 years. Successive Education boards – and I might criticise myself and if Deputy Langlois was in the Chamber, he was on the board as well at one stage – have agreed to new buildings. Sixth-Form Centre in 2005, Princess Royal Centre for Arts in 2007, St Sampson's High in 2008, and Les Beaucamps High in 2012. This Assembly, despite what Deputy Jones said, sir, about selection or non-selection, has accepted non-selective secondary schools. I now believe that this Assembly should show leadership on a future way forward for both financial and educational benefits. We have the opportunity to rethink the overall Education estate, mistakes may have been made. Should we continue making them? This *may* mean consideration of any new build.

1160 The present T&R, along with the Education board, commissioned a report, as has already been mentioned both by the Minister of Education and by Deputy Hadley, in relation to development of La Mare de Carteret site by an educationalist, an architect and an accountant, three people, and it is called the Nicholls Report. Now, Deputy Hadley, sir, has already mentioned this report and he quoted from it stating, 'Consideration of a three school model should be very carefully taken.' He actually suggested it should actually be considered by the Education Department. In the report they, to my mind, have not truly considered the three-school model as suggested by the Nicholls Report two years ago.

1175 The Nicholls Report also stated quite clearly, Guernsey is operating small schools, no benefits of economies of scale, difficult to deliver the best educational opportunities. The option to close La Mare de Carteret Secondary School would maximise use of existing asset base, and educationally would provide larger school rolls and deliver curricula more effectively. That was in

the report. That was then put to one side of that report, because they considered it would be very difficult to do it.

1180 Just as Deputy James said about St Andrew's Primary School, it was a difficult decision. It took two times for it to come before this Assembly before they had the courage to make that decision, because – I repeat what Deputy James says, simply because I was going to say it anyway! – they wanted bigger schools. At least two-form entry, if not three-form entry, because it gave better curricula, better spread, and better for the teachers and children.

1185 Now, Deputy Lowe stated she was not aware of the possibility of not building La Mare. Well, as I have said already, there was the Nicholls Report, there was a question-and-answer for Deputies and stakeholders issued in May 2015. I have to accept that my opinion – and probably I should not say this, but my opinion – about a year or so ago was to have three secondary schools using St Sampson's, Beaucamps and La Mare, and a tertiary college i.e. combining post-16 and A-level students with the College of FE using what is called the Grammar School and the Les Ozouets site. Unfortunately the most recent reports suggesting tertiary colleges are not glowing, and it is suggested we do not have sufficient numbers to have a successful tertiary college. But that would have been a very cost-effective way of providing things.

1190 One thing that has stayed consistent over the last 15 years, when many things have changed within education and how education is provided, is that the size of secondary schools should be between 600 and 850 pupils. That is the consistent thing. Both from an educational perspective, and to be cost efficient, this is the value for money option.

1195 We have had a lot of discussions about numbers – numbers of pupils. Now, Deputy Hadley said that I was quoting 375 starting in September at La Mare de Carteret School and this was wrong. Well, I apologise, that is the figure I was given for La Mare. It is quite interesting what has been happening in the past as well. I think it was Deputy Trott who was Minister of T&R in 2007, and they blocked and restricted the building of St Sampson's High. They removed a class at the end of each limb downwards, and therefore instead of having a 960 school we went down to a 720 school, and that was supposed to save money, and people argued whether it did or not.

The next other slight –
I will give way to Deputy Dorey.

1205

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey:

Deputy Dorey: Thank you.

1210 It was not to change the number of pupils. It was to change the number of classrooms because it was so over-specified for the 720. It was still built for 720, and it had the 16% above the UK buildings standards at that time. Since then the building standards for UK schools has dropped by a further 15%.

Deputy Hadley: Point of correction, Mr Bailiff.

1215 I did not rise earlier because I did not want to stop the Deputy's flow. But the Department *have* considered a three-school option, I can testify to being at numerous meetings when we have discussed this. If the Deputy had listened to my speech, he would have heard us say that it is not *feasible* to contract and go to the other sites.

1220 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Adam.

Deputy Adam: Thank you, sir.

1225 Sir, can I just comment on what Deputy Dorey said about St Sampson's School being built, I think he said, 16% or 17% larger than it should have been. That is a very interesting comment, sir, because what the present T&R board was saying to the Education Department was that La Mare de Carteret School was being built 18% above the recognised size. So maybe the present T&R

board is not that much out of kilter with the previous T&R board, actually looking and assessing the cost-effectiveness of things.

1230 **Deputy Hadley:** On a point of correction, Mr Bailiff.

What Deputy Adam is quoting is UK standards. Those are not the standards that have been agreed for the use of our schools.

The Bailiff: Deputy Adam.

1235

Deputy Adam: Thank you, sir.

As Deputy Hadley says, I am quoting what is recognised as a reasonable size for a 600 school floor area, and it was agreed with an independent report by the architect that the 600 size school was generous up to 19% excess of area. I might add, sir, it has to be that if you are going to have a 960 just by adding on classrooms.

1240

Again, Deputy Dorey may stand up, because Les Beaucamps was built probably in the wrong order, because La Mare de Carteret School was recognised as the poorest quality school something like 10 years ago, and I think it is unfortunate that the boards have been advised. But Les Beaucamps School initially was planned as an 800 school and revised downwards, because of projected numbers, to 660.

1245

Now, Deputy James also mentioned the numbers of students and how well assets are used, and I think Deputy Queripel said this as well. This is a problem about playing around with numbers. We have a rough idea of numbers in five years, because we know the intake of the present primary schools, and they can calculate onwards from there, and it is meant to peak round about 2025 or 2026 and then the graph actually goes downwards quite significantly. But I do not know how accurate the figures are. But if there are four schools, it is probable that the total number of places will significantly exceed the number of students for most of their lives, not the time when there is a large number.

1250

I will give way to Dr ... not Condor – that is what smokes ...

1255

The Bailiff: Deputy Conder.

Deputy Conder: It is Deputy Conder; it is not Dr Condor. *(Laughter)* Thank you. I thank Deputy Adam.

1260

Could I ask Deputy Adam, does he recognise and acknowledge that we need a minimum total of 2,350 places to cope with the number of 11-to-16-years-olds coming through our current system? If he does accept that, would he recognise our schools would be 100% full at that number, and there will be no allowance for future population growth, which is a policy of this States, no space for pupils moving out of the colleges to take up places at the school, nor even any of our current special place holders?

1265

So, could I ask him again, does he recognise that we need a minimum of 2,350 places to cope with the 11-to-16-year-olds coming through our system, and at that number we would be 100% full, with no spare capacity for any contingency? If he does accept that, would he accept we are not massively overprovided as a number of previous speakers have commented?

1270

The Bailiff: You switched your microphone off for a moment.

Deputy Adam: Sorry. Thank you, Deputy Conder.

I am sure your figures are correct, but I am sure someone else might be able to produce other figures, sir, and that is what I am saying is that how accurate are figures going forward to 2025 and onwards?

1275

First from five, from the time they go into reception, you can have accurate figures going forward, but the delivery in Guernsey can vary by 100. Your assumptions about people coming to

live here will depend both on the economy of Guernsey, and I accept you probably want 10% leeway, which is what schools are normally built for.

The Bailiff: Two people are standing, I do not know who you are giving way to.

Deputy Adam: I will give way to Deputy Domaille. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Domaille: I do thank Deputy Hunter Adam for giving way.

Just I have actually quoted the figures, and actually it is quite opportune perhaps for a member of Education Department to raise this afterwards. But according to the report that was done in February 2015, the total number of places that are available are 3,580, of which 1,000 are in the colleges, which means that there are 2,580 places available across the States' secondary schools, and at that time there were just under 2,000 on the roll. So, actually at that time, again, there was something approaching 400 vacancies. Now, I do not believe those figures will be significantly different now.

Deputy Adam: Thank you for that information.
Sir, I will give way to –

The Bailiff: Deputy Conder:

Deputy Conder: I thank Deputy Hunter Adam again, sir.

The point is, it is just the same figures I have mentioned earlier, does he recognise that we need a minimum figure of 2,350 to cope with the number of 11-to-16-year-olds that are currently in our system? It is not about fluctuations we knew they are there, they are born, and they are in the system.

Deputy Adam: Sir, as the Deputy says, he has got these figures, I have some different figures. I am sure the Education figures must be accurate.

Sir, I will move away from educational aspects on to capital expenditure. My concern about this report, and someone did say it at the beginning of it, that actually, as the Minister said, we are only asking for capital for this budget. That is true, but then he said, we need to spend £10 million on the roof of the Grammar School, but we are having to take that out gradually over time. My concern is that we tend to concentrate on what we are debating – in other words this report here, this school, and the cost of this school. What I would like to know, what are the other costs that are just round the corner? We have been told that the Grammar School is 37 years old, it is going to need –

I will give way

The Bailiff: Deputy Hadley. Can you put your microphone on if you are going to speak?
(Interjections and laughter)

Deputy Hadley: Deputy Adam is just asking what are the costs around the corner. Well, I told him! If we save the money from not building La Mare, we have got to pay £12 million to extend the three other schools, so we are going to spend far more money not building La Mare than if we build it. We have told him.

Deputy Adam: Can I thank Deputy Hadley for that information, I was fully aware of that. But obviously he has *forgotten* the potential £60, £70, £80 million that you want for the College of Further Education! *(Interjections)*

1330 **The Bailiff:** You do not *have* to give way, Deputy Adam, if you do not want to. (*Interjections and laughter*)

Deputy Conder: It is a point of correction.

1335 **The Bailiff:** Oh, it is a point of correction – you do have to give way.

Deputy Conder: Sorry, that oft-quoted figure of £67 million has no substance at all. There has never been a tertiary institution costing at £67 million, other than the figure I believe Treasury & Resources chose to quote. There is a figure of £20 million for moving from Delancey/Coutanchez to Les Ozouets, but this £67 million figure, or whatever it is, needs to be scotched. There has never, ever been any substantiated costing to move the college to one site at the cost of £67 million. Please do not quote it again.

1345 **A Member:** Hear, hear.

Deputy Adam: I will give way to Deputy Le Clerc. (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

1350 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Sir, I would just like to draw everyone's attention to page 1536, paragraph 10.8 because I had that in my own speech, where it clearly says:

'This option then requires the redevelopment of the Les Ozouets site (£67m)'.

That is in Education's report.

1355 **Deputy Adam:** Sir, may I thank Deputy Le Clerc for confirming that actually I was not quite talking nonsense. (*Laughter*)

The College of Further Education must be upgraded. They are in huts, and you will be told all this when it comes along. The next Assembly will be asked for that money.

We have got, as I say, a Grammar School, it requires either refurbishing or rebuilding. It is 37 years old. That will be a sum of £5 million to £50 million if you are going to refurbish it. It will need new boilers etc. It needs a new roof. But not building La Mare de Carteret may save some capital expenditure. It will not save £64 million. I agree with that completely, because I personally ... Again I go back to the Nicholls Report, they state quite clearly that having primary schools in the vicinity of the children attending is very beneficial and provides a community centre. But secondary schools, because the children are no longer children but are young people, it does not seem to matter so much if they travel to that school. But primary ... I personally, would suggest the primary would certainly have to be built.

1365 So sir, after all these interruptions, in conclusion I suggest you support the amendment to consider this sensible option of having three secondary schools, because that is what has been suggested for many a year if we remove selection. I accept it may not appeal to you to constrain Education's aspirations, but it is more cost-effective, value for money, whatever terminology you wish to use. Many of you consider we must control our expenditure. We had a statement saying exactly that from the Treasury Minister – Tuesday morning it was – and we seem to forget so quickly. We seem to forget so quickly. What was the '*Enough is Enough*' campaign saying. They were the ones that were actually suggesting when they first met that we brought up La Mare and the cost of La Mare capital spend.

1375 I strongly believe that if you do not support the amendment, you must be able to make a strong case to spend taxpayers' money without the true evidence base that not having just three secondary schools is the most cost-effective way of spending money and providing the education that we all want for the people of Guernsey, which is essential for a thriving economy.

1380 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

1385 Those who are familiar with *Channel 4 News*, will be well aware that they sometimes do a fact check, and I would like to try and take that theme on in this speech, at least in the first part of my speech.

1390 Four minus one equals three. That is a simple fact. Education cannot say they did not know that the proposal involved a school being closed. They did not know which one, as this amendment is not stating which one is going to be closed, but I congratulate Deputy St Pier for being open and transparent, for explaining which is the likely one to be closed. But they cannot say this came as a surprise to them.

Deputy Fallaize: I am grateful to Deputy Dorey for giving way.

1395 I agree with his crediting Deputy St Pier for being open in his opening speech. But would Deputy Dorey agree with me, that actually Education policy in terms of which sites ought to provide which schools is not going to be determined by Deputy St Pier today, or on any other occasion, it is going to be determined by the States, and that what we are having to debate is the principle of three schools or four schools, and not Deputy St Pier's own personal ideas about the future Education estate?

1400

Deputy Dorey: I totally agree. Thank you.

The excellent UCL report, which I referred to in a number of other speeches during this week, on page 1703 of the Billet, tells us the optimal size for schools, which should be within the range from 600 to 1,000. I am not surprised at that because when I went to the presentation which was given by the head teacher at Beaucamps before the last debate we had, she presented this diagram, which probably most of you cannot see, but it is about year size, it is about year size and the percentage of students achieving five A-C including English and Maths, and there is a clear indication that bigger year sizes achieve a higher percentage of grade A-C including English and Maths.

1405

1410

Next fact. We have four States-funded secondary schools aged 11-16 age group, and there are currently 2,036 pupils. The capacity for those four schools is 2,580, and with the proposals we will still keep four schools of the same size. So the fact is there are 544 empty desks within our schools now, 11-16 schools. Both Les Beaucamps at 497 and La Mare at 413 are significantly below that optimal size. The predicted peak of pupils when we debated this last year was 2,371 and this diagram was the graph that was used when we had the independent review, which shows the fact that there is a peak, and that the school population is predicted to fall after that peak. It rises then it falls.

1415

But when I asked Education for the latest estimates, that peak has now fallen from 2,371 to 2,343 in the latest. Deputy Conder previously talked about 2,350, but the actual number was 2,343. So, at this new peak under a four-school model, the fact is we will have 237 empty desks. That is at the absolute peak. Remember, it is rising to that and falls after. To me it is not sensible to build schools which are designed to last 60 years for a peak of school population.

1420

Deputy Hadley spoke about 10% and you need to have 10% empty, but interestingly, I think Deputy St Pier referred to this. I have got the figures since 2005 for the school population of the 11-16 schools. In 2005-06 Grammar School was over the 600 number of pupils. In 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2012-13 St Sampson's High was over their 720. They went up to 774 so we have been quite comfortable running schools not at 10% below, but quite a few percentage points above what their capacity is.

1425

So, we should be building a school for that peak. The minimum we should be looking at is five years either side of that peak. The number of pupils will be around 2,300 then. So with a four

1430

school model we will have 280 empty desks. On average La Mare and Beaucamps will be still below the optimal size, and the Grammar site in the 11-16 range will also be below the optimal size. So we will have three of the four 11-16 schools below the optimal size.

1435 But interestingly, it will be an expensive mistake to have such overcapacity, but in Dr Nicholls' review, he said that schools which are significantly over capacity do not have the vibrancy and buzz that help to make a school an enjoyable place for both students and staff. He said that in relation to some of our existing schools – (*Interjection*) Sorry, under capacity, sorry.

1440 So, the conclusion is the waste of capital cost operating expenditure to build a four school when there are now a lot of empty desks, and still at the peak there will be empty desks.

Deputy Hadley talked about the consultation, but the consultation results were based on keeping selection. So, in relation to a system without selection, you cannot then rely on those results (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1445 Yesterday we agreed there should be sets where appropriate, as a result of removing selection. We will have the full range of academic abilities at our high schools, and if we keep the same number of pupils, by keeping four sites, we will increase the ability range within each set. The main point of setting is to minimise the ability range so all pupils understand their subject and are still challenged. We know from the UCL report that children of the same ability perform better in grammar schools than comprehensives. That was their conclusion. So it is important that we

1450 minimise the ability range, so that we can minimise the effect on performance. Because in my view that is what is crucial in terms of teaching. A teacher teaches to the middle ability in that class.

Also our schools are going to have to broaden their curriculum to cope with students who are good at modern languages, who are good at maths, who are good at sciences, who have strong practical skills, all need to be catered for. Not just in Years 10 and 11, but in Years 7, 8 and 9.

1455 Delivering that broader curriculum will be so much easier in larger schools when you increase the year size but not the class size.

Deputy Sherbourne: Point of correction, sir.

1460 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: The claim that Deputy Dorey has just made with regard to teachers teaching to the middle ability – I would like him to actually explain to us where he has got that evidence from, because differentiation now is part and parcel of every teacher's toolbox.

1465 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey:

Deputy Dorey: I was on the Castel School Committee for 15 years, I have spoken to head teachers then, I have spoken to teachers, I have had three children who have gone through the school system, and that is the message that I have constantly been told by them. That is by teachers, that is what they have to do.

1470

Now, I would like to comment on the hard federation. I spoke to a secondary school teacher, who does not work in the States' school sector, soon after the proposals were published. He could not believe the proposals. He said the schools worked so hard to create a community. You cannot achieve that sense of community when pupils and teachers have to travel to other sites for certain lessons, and some having to move completely. He stressed how important the community was to the overall success of the school. He also expressed the importance of staff-to-pupil contact time outside the classroom as an important part of learning. If you have to go to lessons at another school, you will not have that opportunity, and Deputy St Pier spoke about the problems with that happening, when in fact some of them were actually missing one lesson.

1475

1480

There are many other problems with the hard federation, in addition to those outlined in Deputy St Pier's speech, and which were mentioned in some emails. I would just like to read a few

of them. One of them was from somebody who was experienced in operating the existing system and he outlined the points I have just made:

'Both the students and the staff involved in these courses have expressed concern about the lack of access to support and guidance between their weekly lessons, and it is yet to be seen if this will impact on educational outcomes.'

1485 So, he has got a serious concern involved in that. Again another teacher said:

'A school is community, staff know the students, the parents and the support staff. If you have children moving round you lose that.'

He talked about medical details of the students involved, transport issues, rapport with unfamiliar staff, disciplinary issues, parents' evenings, reporting systems, remembering books and kit for lessons. The teacher I spoke to said:

'If I have to move schools, inevitably I am going to forget something at one of the lessons.'

This teacher also goes on to conclude:

'Good teachers will not like the concept.'

1490 If you are going to close a school, the only logical outcome is not to rebuild La Mare, because of the condition of the others schools. I am pleased we are finally making the decision in the correct order.

In July 2013 debate on Education's Vision, I said the States need to decide on the system of secondary education before building La Mare. I was right then. It is disappointing that it has taken
1495 so long for this to happen, and we have wasted so much money on design costs in the meantime. But let's design schools for the system, not build schools and try and fit them in to the system. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We have a chance today to decide on a three-school system. Let's then make sure we go away and design the schools for that.

1500 Deputy Sillars, in his speech, said we need to make the right decision at the right time. This is the right time to make the decision. Now we decide the system on the number of schools, then which schools at a later date. Though, I think it is most likely to be the system as outlined by Deputy St Pier.

1505 By having three schools we have the opportunity to save capital expenditure, save operating expenditure, and most importantly, as explained by Deputy St Pier, improve the education outcome for the pupils. I have tried to add to that as well.

The Education Department themselves in their May 2015 report on the redevelopment of La Mare accepted the case for reducing the number of schools through their Propositions. In fact, they went further than that. The wording they used was: 'There is a strong case for rationalising the Education estate', and they would look at the option of moving from four to three. That was
1510 one if the Propositions in the May 2015 report. So Education cannot say it is a surprise to them, because they were putting the case forward then in that report.

I conclude by saying the proposals from the Education Department seem to be a compromise so that they can end selection without finding the best solution. I strongly urge Members to vote for amendment B2, three 11-16 schools. Most importantly for education reasons, but with the
1515 added advantage of saving capital and operating expenditure.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb. Deputy Bebb.

1520 **Deputy Bebb:** Sorry, sir, I did not actually hear you there. Thank you.

Members, yesterday I was in the library with Deputy Brehaut, and he suggested that maybe we should look at the Billet on the year that we were born to discover what was being debated back then. I was born in 1974 and so I pulled through the Billet, and there was a proposal to build the

1525 King Edward Hospital, and there was also a proposal in relation to the cost of La Mare because La Mate was to open in September 1974.

1530 Now analogies have been made through this debate so far of a comparison between education and health, and I would suggest that the King Edward Hospital has been closed. Those services that were offered there are now being delivered through modern facilities elsewhere. I would suggest that the same logic applies to what needs to be done in relation to La Mare de Carteret.

Nobody in this Chamber disagrees that the building is no longer fit for purpose. Nobody disagrees that children should be taught in the modern facilities the same as other children on this Island, and indeed the way to make sure that other children are taught in those facilities is to teach them in those facilities.

1535 But I then went over to look at the 2001 papers concerning the debate that everybody talks about, about education and what happened, and of course, the claim that the La Mare de Carteret campaign have had of 'remember the promise'. Well, it is interesting that I look at the paper, and I see that following as part of the review of secondary education, the Council commissioned the National Foundation for Education Research, Britain's leading educational research institution, to survey Islanders' views on the current system, and going on in order to talk about the opinions being not particularly different to where they are today. It eventually comes to the conclusion. Its final recommendations for a non-selective secondary system were: the creation of three 11-16 high schools of a maximum size of approximately 850 pupils. The four existing secondary schools and the Grammar School would close, and the three new high schools would open on the site of the Grammar School, Les Beaucamps and Belgrave Vinery, or a suitable site in the north of the Island subject to consultation with other States' committees.

1540
1545 Now, at no point do I think that the Education Department have explained why their model for a comprehensive system, which they supported in 2001, has changed. What has happened since then?

1550 The other thing that I found quite enlightening when I looked at the 2001 reports and, of course, the consideration and what happened eventually in debate to agree to all these rebuilds, is that I thought to myself, what were the financial circumstances of 2001? I turned to the accounts that were agreed in 2001, they were obviously 2000's accounts, and I see as the headline figure an operating surplus – something I am sure that all of us, not least Deputy St Pier would be pleased to see again. However, an operating surplus of £53.2 million per annum. A year and a half would pay for more than what the Education Department are proposing at La Mare de Carteret.

1555 The world has *changed*, and it is time that we realised that the world has changed. We cannot afford to be making rebuilds for smaller schools. The Education Department's report that they have produced has stated that schools should not be half empty. In order to create a better education environment, if I remember correctly, the report stated that they should be fairly full. And of course, therefore I am coming to the conclusion that in order to find full schools, why are we building what would be fairly empty, especially when we look at the places that are available in schools today, and at the peak?

1560 I would also go so far as to suggest that, of course, this idea that we build in order to accommodate the full peak and then extra is not necessarily so. Nobody, I hear, complains about the educational quality of what is being delivered by The Ladies' College, and yet the Ladies' College have, for a number of years, been delivering quite a lot of education from Portacabins. Not ideal, but not exactly as if it would be unreasonable to cater for the peak, which we keep hearing about. It is also not unfeasible to consider use of the colleges in order to accommodate that peak. I do not believe that it is right for us to be considering rebuilding a school that would be, at the moment, less than 400 pupils.

1570 Now when we talk about a comprehensive system, Deputy Dorey is quite right and, of course, evidence from the so-called educationalists, which is not a term that I particularly like, but these show that if we have larger schools then it becomes better and easier to set with more targeted lessons.

1575

1580 As for this claim of teachers not being able to move from one school to another, I beg to differ. As I said in my interjection to Deputy Sillars, I have nephews who currently are taught in North Wales with schools 25 miles apart, and a teacher that teaches the same subject in both of those schools. Twenty-five miles is a far greater distance than any distance between the schools here in Guernsey. To imagine that because of having three separate schools this cannot happen is false.

No, I am not giving way to Deputy Conder, I think there has been enough giving way –
(*Interjections*)

1585 Oh, given all the protesting, I give way to Deputy Conder. (*Interjections*)

Deputy Conder: Best moment of my four years. Thank you very much! (*Laughter and interjections*) Thank you Deputy Bebb, very gracious. I have almost lost the point, but –
(*Interjections*) (**Deputy Bebb:** Indeed!)

1590 Given the point that Deputy Bebb made just now, in respect of the ease of moving between three schools, and the great advantage of setting, and the ability to set where numbers are larger, would he not agree with me that there would be even greater advantage if we had one school with four campuses when teachers can so easily move across the Island as he suggested?

1595 **Deputy Bebb:** May I suggest that it might be easier even if the one school model were to be favoured, that it be on three campuses, reducing the distance. I do not think anybody could disagree with that. As Deputy Sillars said in his opening speech to this debate, oh so long ago, nobody is entitled to their own *facts*, and that includes the Education Department. (*Laughter*)

1600 The truth is we have to deal with the reality. If we were to look at what the Proposition says ... Now Deputy St Pier may have said which one he favours, but that is obviously not what we will vote on. Let's return, because it was a fair while ago to what the amendment states:

'That 11 to 16 education in the States' sector shall be provided in three schools of a broadly comparable size (with at least one'

– of course, we can read into that that more than one is possible –

'making provision for ages 16 to 19 (sixth form))'.

1605 No decision is being made today, according to this amendment, on which school would be closed. Indeed, if this amendment passes, which I sincerely hope it does, I can feel that there is no option but to direct the Education Department to evaluate what would be the best system for delivering three schools. There is no other option available.

1610 Now, Deputy Dave Jones, I believe, in his speech, made reference to the possibility of the future States, the next States deciding to return to selection at 11. Now, I believe that that would be a grave error. I think that the debate on 11-plus has been had. However, it would still be the case that an educational model with selection is still possible with three schools. The question of setting, once again, is made better by having three schools.

1615 Setting happens today. We know from Deputy Sillars' point on other amendments that setting happens today, so setting happens with four schools, but it is fair to say that, of course, given the smaller size of the schools, the ranges within each set will naturally be necessarily broader than if the school sizes are increased and therefore there is a greater possibility for setting. Therefore, I really struggle on an education basis, and on a financial basis, to understand why we would not go to a three campus model, or three school model – both of which would be possible with this particular amendment.

1620 I would suggest that three schools is where the wish of this Island would probably be. This one-school, multiple-campus model has not been sold. I do not believe that the Education Department have entered into the *Realpolitik* of the situation. They have not entered into the *Realpolitik* of what is being sold and what was being bought by the community, but I do believe

1625 that if we are to make the right decision, and it is going to be the right decision, not one which will have been come to as a rush, as some might like to say; one that will have been brought by considered conversation and debate in this Chamber that the right decision is to make that decision of reducing schools.

I would further suggest that Deputy Sillars rather betrayed part of the fear of the Education Department in his opening speech on this amendment, that they feel incredibly bruised from the closure of one school, and I can understand that. But the truth is we must make the right decision again. We have once in closing a primary school, and when we closed that primary school, one of the main reasons was in order to have a two-form entry. How can we have the decision that two or greater form entry is the right solution for primary schools, but a difficulty in setting because of the smaller schools is the right choice in secondary schools. It simply does not add. We want a continuous education movement, and we do. We have 85% today who go on to receive over-16 education. We want to have that continuous.

1635 Removing the 11-plus is one step. Closing St Andrew's was one step. The next step to have effective setting is to reduce the schools to three. That would provide a better continuous educational system, and it is obvious to most, though it is understandable why the pain of closing one school may lead to reluctance to close another in the same term. But Members, £53 million in surplus is not what we have any more, and we have to deal with the reality of our financial situation, as well as our education system.

1640 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Are you rising to speak, or ... ?

1645 **Deputy Sherbourne:** I was rising actually to ask Deputy Bebb to give way, but ...

The Bailiff: He has sat down now.
Deputy Paint, you have been waiting a long time.

1650 **Deputy Paint:** Sir, I feel like I have been led into a possible £40 million trading trap, savings trap, by only having three high schools rather than four. I can assure you it is not going down very well with me. It is a very difficult decision to make, and I am not too happy about it.

I have always been one to try and save taxpayers' money in an honourable and democratic way, and not by breaking long-standing promises. But I have to question how honourable this debate has actually been. I find this debate going, as my very good friend, Deputy David Jones, has already said, with a large use of smoke and mirrors.

Why are we not surprised that this Assembly has definitely been called, by the general public, the worst States ever. I can understand why.

1660 As an example, on Wednesday I gave an apology, if I was wrong that is, because it was said that no new grammar schools had been built in UK since the Thatcher era. On taking further advice I discovered that that was true. But what was not said, as far as I can remember, but just as important, is that one grammar school in Kent has obtained permission by the UK government or the county, I am not sure which, to build an annexe to that existing school. That annexe is not in the location of the existing school but about nine miles away. Is this not a new build, or is it just a way of getting around, or over, existing government rulings?

1665 I understand that several UK counties are also using this tactic to try and extend their grammar schools. England has 184 grammar schools in existence, and that is more than 20 years after the Thatcher era. The only thing that one can assert from that is that the grammar school door has been well and truly left wide open over there.

1670 In Guernsey, the grammar school door has been closed for the foreseeable future. I therefore feel I have to withdraw the apology I gave on Wednesday.

I hate using the UK as an example, simply because we are not in the UK, and quite honestly, for one I do not want to be there – particularly if tactics like these are being used to press particular agendas forward, as it appears to be in this debate.

1675 Sir, on reflection, perhaps Deputy Lowe's sursis was the right way to go. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I do not know which way I will vote in this. I may abstain as a protest on the way the whole business has been conducted. I will listen to the rest of the debate, and see which way I will go. Should a motion be put forward to throw out the whole Education proposals, I will be with that proposal.

1680 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

Deputy Le Clerc: Thank you, sir.

1685 I just wanted to apologise for being late this morning, and the reason I was late because I was doing my volunteering at Amherst – Max's Marvellous Maths. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I think it is time that we did a little bit of maths in this room, and in this Assembly, and perhaps if you have got paper and pen we could do 'Miche's Marvellous Maths'. (*Interjections*)

1690 If we look at paragraph 10.8, the Department's preferred option over four sites for a 600 school would be ... If we say £69 million, if we take the figures from the back, if you add in the £67 million redevelopment of Les Ozouets site, and minus £2 million, with my maths and if I have used Deputy Lester Queripel's calculator, his new one, I make that £134 million. (*Interjection*)

1695 Now if you go to 10.9 and you look at the three-school option, Option C, there is a £12 million cost for the additional capital of redeveloping to a 960 school at St Sampson's High. There is a £17 million cost for the redevelopment of the Les Ozouets site, and again you minus the £2 million from the release of the sale, and if you add in the £77 million that we would need to do the 960 place at La Mare that comes to £104 million. So even with a rebuild of La Mare with the 960, we would still be saving ourselves £30 million on this rebuild.

1700 So, I think my maths are right. I hope they are. So, all I am saying is this amendment does not specify which schools we will close, which schools we will retain. So for me, this option is the right option to vote for. Vote for the three schools because we need to look at all the figures, and there is a way that we can still build La Mare and still have some long-term savings that we can use for other capital projects, as well as the savings that we will use on the general revenue costs.

So, thank you, sir, I will be supporting the three-school amendment.

1705

The Bailiff: The Chief Minister.

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

1710 I rise just to echo Deputy Le Clerc's comments, which I think are absolutely pertinent to this. I refer Members to the comment in the policy letter from Policy Council on page 1770 and I quote – it is to do with three or four secondary schools and it in fact answers the questions that Deputy Bebb was raising, because Education were tasked with going away and looking at this question, and they have responded. Policy Council comments:

'The Education Department believes that the single secondary school should operate from the existing four sites with associate sites incorporating St Anne's in Alderney and the secondary special schools, Le Murier and Les Voies. However, following the debate of the rebuild of the La Mare de Carteret Schools in May 2015, the States made Resolutions recognising that there was "a strong case for rationalising the education estate" and requiring the Department to include in this current Policy Letter "at least one option for moving from four to three secondary age schools".

The Education Department has fulfilled this requirement, concluding that there are two realistic options for moving to three secondary school sites; either with a 16-19 Sixth Form College at Les Beaucamps or with a Tertiary College on the current Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre site. However, the Department is not recommending the closure of any of the current secondary school sites (nor a single Tertiary College).'

1715 However, you can see there that there are two preferred options were this to be the case,
neither of which involves La Mare de Carteret being closed. Now, I think that is very important
bearing in mind the comments that Deputy Le Clerc has just said in terms of savings. Whichever
way we go there are savings. Now, those savings can be used to invest in education or in other
things in a far more effective way in the future. I want to invest in education. I want the best
education we can manage to provide, and I believe we can do so, in Guernsey for this current
1720 generation and the next generation.

It is not just about bricks and mortar, as many people have said. But, it does involve us using
our monies wisely. As Deputy Bebb pointed out, we are no longer in the era where we have even a
surplus at all. We are perhaps moving towards a balanced budget, but the days of £50 million
surplus have completely gone, and therefore we have got to be very careful in the way in which
1725 we invest our resources. Not just capital resources, but effective revenue resources year on year.

From my point of view, I have been convinced, for some years now, that larger schools, and I
am not talking about the size of schools that occur in the UK – my wife went to a grammar school
that became a comprehensive school eventually, and it was in the high 1,800 to 2,000. We do not
need to go anywhere near that. But having the opportunity to set effectively, where you have got
1730 enough of a cohort each year coming in, even if there is, and I hope there will be, an increase in
the birth rate and a larger population in the future, for the next generation, that is really
important, but we have got the scope to do that with a three-school model, and therefore I am
supporting this amendment.

I am still supportive of La Mare de Carteret School, and whatever the case is, and I reiterate
this, the primary school definitely needs to be rebuilt. That is, in my mind, without a shadow of a
doubt, that is necessary to do. Of course, it will be a lot easier to do if you are talking about that
site and you were not to rebuild the secondary school, I accept that, but that it not in my agenda, I
am looking at what Education have already stated, and if we vote for this amendment, they would
1740 have to go back and work out how their preferred option would work and bring it back to this
Assembly.

So, I urge Members to be serious about this, but to focus primarily on the benefits for the
future education of our children, and not just on the emotion surrounding the closure of a
potential school.

Thank you, sir.

1745

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir.

I will have to admit to taking a broad picture of the situation we have been in for the last few
1750 years. Education have not always helped their case. With hindsight perhaps the decision to go
ahead with Beaucamps was wrong, although I supported it at the time, because the school was in
a bad state physically, and to a certain extent demoralised. However, I think the school should
have been bigger from the start, and it is an argument I put across to my colleagues that it is
always better to err on the size of capacity.

Some speakers mentioned Elizabeth College a few days ago, about how it went through a bad
1755 patch, when it had only two pupils back in the day, 1800, but the visionary States of the 1820's,
who contributed to building the sort of Downton Abbey style gothic edifice, must have had
optimism in their sights, because there were only a few pupils at the start but it became very
useful when we had 700 later on.

I do not think we can be that scrupulous about predicting the future number of children on the
1760 Island, patterns change, fertility rates change, technology changes. The pattern is now to have
children at a later age than was the case a few years ago, and we have a new population policy,
whereby people predict that we may need to import younger families and so on, and if that is the
case then we have to bear that in mind.

1765 I would go further, and say the problem with Education is they have not always been
consistent in their arguments. For example when Deputy Sillars and other Members were strongly
unified in putting forward the case for the closure of St Andrew's School, it was not really just on
1770 cost grounds. It was based upon the educational arguments that a larger school gave a better
environment for learning and teaching, and that smaller schools were perhaps no longer the right
way forward. Now, of course, that point comes up again here, and we will hear those arguments,
we have heard some of them already. I would also argue that Education's point about retaining
1775 the four campus, we have had a hint that the human resources elements of that demand
continuity, which is of course partially undermined by the radical change in restructuring the
grammar system to a new non-11-Plus selective system. Indeed Deputy De Lisle was criticised,
maybe he went too far, for suggesting that people might be drawn to one school over another
because of the very good reputation of all our Island's teachers, but it has to be said that the
1780 future will not be about just continuity on sites. It will be different. The vision is for it to be
different, and that is precisely the point, so we should not be stuck on the arguments that we have
seen in *The Press* in this recent month that people are worried about the future, because there is
bound to be changes as a result of the decisions we have already made, especially if we stick to
them.

I must admit the last few weeks has seen me attracted to the three-schools option. The three-
schools option, as Deputy Bebb has pointed out, probably makes financial sense. Deputy Le Clerc
1785 is well known for her expertise on boards on financial and corporate governance matters, and I
am sure her maths is broadly correct, that there may well be a £30 million saving, or whatever,
along those lines. Frankly, maths might not be my specialist subject, but more to the point, I do
not think any of us are in a position to know.

Treasury & Resources have criticised the Education Department for the rather jumbled figures
perhaps in these documents, but they have not as yet, as I understand it, put forward revised
1790 figures. So the whole matter is extremely speculative, and I think factoring in the cost of disposal
of sites is very random at this point, because none of us know where that would go, especially if
Deputy Parkinson is successful, which I hope he will be, in maybe developing beyond the tertiary
college to perhaps more of a university style approach for Guernsey in the future, which we also
have to consider when we look at these sites. That is why premature decisions would be false at
1795 this stage.

Would three sites be better educationally? Possibly. I do not think we have enough evidence at
this stage to know one way or the other. That is why we should have gone down the sursis route,
or the other amendments that we had on day one. (**A Member:** hear, hear.) The setting idea
might work better in a three-schools context, as would, perhaps, heavy investment in IT
1800 equipment, or science laboratories, or music, arts, drama, whatever. But we are at this place today
after many years of battles, of reports, of consultants, of millions spent on the design process, and
we came up with a package which included a sports centre, an autism centre, a new primary
school, a new secondary school. When I supported Deputy De Lisle approach to get independent
voting on those, and perhaps even a more fiscally conservative model, of just going for the
1805 secondary school that has been promised for a decade, the States said no to that. There were only
two of us who voted on the second one. So suddenly today, yesterday evening, La Mare de
Carteret is possibly not ready to be proceeded with.

The difficulty I have is although I can see a case for a three-school model, I can also see a case
for a four-school model, not necessarily the one outlined by Education, because it may well be
1810 more useful to have four separate schools that work together in a federation – 'ever closer union',
to adopt a phrase that possibly Deputy Jones would not like (*Laughter*) – rather than the just one
school model.

But I am still going to oppose Treasury & Resources for a number of reasons. The speech
Deputy St Pier gave last night was one of the best speeches I have ever heard in this Chamber, I
1815 would put it in a class along with the kind of politicians Deputy Trott knew when we were first
young Members of the States. It was extremely well thought through and put across, maybe a bit

strong in parts, but I think it goes – (*Interjection and laughter*) Well, the adjudicator might give it a distinction, who knows? But I do not think the people of Guernsey would necessarily give it a distinction, because it only passes one test, and that is the possibility of saving capital expenditure. Education is much more than that.

1820

When one looks at the reports that we have, and that is all we have to go on, we find that in Treasury & Resources' summing up of these matters, they make it extremely clear that they prefer a three schools model. There is no doubt about that. That is not a novelty, that is not a surprise. Education would have been naïve to have thought that that would not be an issue in this debate, especially given the two- or three-year history.

1825

But if you turn to page 1767, although it is very carefully worded and rarely talks about sites, in the top paragraph, it says:

'The Treasury and Resources Department remains concerned about the quantum of capital investment sought by the Education Department and particularly so in the preferred Option B model. In examining the short to medium term capital requirements of Option B versus the three school models, there are considerable differences. In addition to the £64million plus inflation sought in order to rebuild for a 600 place secondary school at La Mare de Carteret, Option B requires a further investment of £67million at the College of Further Education's Les Ozouets site. This compares to Option C that requires £72million to instead build a 960 place school...'

The salient point is there, they mention Les Ozouets site. We come on here:

'... an estimated £12 million to extend St Sampson's High School ... and a further £17 million to convert the Grammar School site into a tertiary college. This represents a saving of £30million ...'

1830

We, as Members, the Douzaines, the people of Guernsey, the parents of La Mare de Carteret, the teaching profession, everyone who consulted in Your Schools Your Choice, were given a clear message here from Treasury & Resources, that they believed the best option was to convert the Grammar School site into a tertiary college, thus releasing maybe Les Ozouets down the line. That is clear that they intended us to consider a new La Mare de Carteret School complex. That was the message that they sent out.

1835

If you asked me, would it be a potential scenario for Footes Lane area to become a tertiary site or sixth-form extended site including the old Grammar School, I would say yes, that is a feasible option. If somebody asked me would Les Beaucamps make a good sixth-form centre, we know from the material in Education that they actually find that to be the cheapest option, if I have understood the figures right. The St Sampson's option they dismiss, but I think the location of that school is difficult for the integration into the transport arrangements compared to the other sites, so I think there is a logistical difficulty with St Sampson's being integrated into a federation.

1840

But nowhere has there been any prior knowledge from Treasury & Resources that they wanted to end the La Mare de Carteret project, with all of its breach of promise, with all of its letting pupils' moods down, and demoralisation, a school that has now achieved excellence, a school that we see in the papers has been highly praised for the work it has done – 'high praise in school report for La Mare', 'school celebrating after inspector's glowing report', 'successfully developed the school's vision to attend, aspire and achieve', and so on – 'driving leadership forward'. To lose that would be a tragedy, but more than that, we have another problem here, that we promised the best possible, modern, 21st century education facilities for families in the future. That will disappear in the process.

1845

We will also lose traction in the construction industry, and related fields, and we will have lost potential with looking at the future options for the College of Further Education and created further uncertainty. That is not good government, that is letting the side ... How can one have confidence in Treasury & Resources Department if they keep on changing their position?

1855

Before I sit down, as time is running out, perhaps. I would make a further observation. I was on team with three of the Treasury & Resources members in the last three days, Deputy Spruce, Deputy Kuttelwascher and Deputy Perrot. They all argued, if I am correct, in supporting a further chance for the 11-plus system, for a selection of some sort. If they had been successful we would

1860

have been back to the good old days of the Torode amendment and the need, at least, for a school that focused on a grammarian type academic regime and other schools.

1865 As a majority of Treasury & Resources were clearly conservative in that respect, favouring to a degree the *status quo*, how is it now we have a position for three schools and the overturning of La Mare de Carteret idea? It really does show that we should have supported the sursis from day one.

A Member: Hear, hear.

1870 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Yes, sir.

1875 Before we break for lunch, I wonder if consideration could be given to Members, and indeed, yourself, sir, to be able to continue this tomorrow rather than wait until Saturday and for you to be able to establish if enough staff would be available, because I know some Members have discussed it this morning, that they do not wish to make a break of a few days. They would rather finish the education debate, would be nice to think today, but, if not, certainly tomorrow, sir.

I just throw this into the arena now for consideration.

1880 **The Bailiff:** Yes, well, let's see where we get to this afternoon. I do not know whether we have got the staff available, as I said to you, I have asked for enquiries to be made. I leave it for Members to think about the idea, and bear in mind that there is a possibility that there might be a request to come back tomorrow. But I do not think we need to take that decision sitting here at 12.30 p.m.

1885 Deputy Dave Jones is suggesting we could come back at two o'clock. I will just put that, see if there is any will to do that. I put to you the Proposition that we return at 2.00 p.m. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: Well, that is clear. We will come back at 2.30 p.m. and we will see where we are at 5.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.34 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

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

1890 **The Bailiff:** Members, we continue with the debate on amendments B1 and B2 proposed by Deputy St Pier and seconded by Deputy Le Lièvre.
Are you standing to speak or just standing, Deputy Fallaize? Standing to speak.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

1895 I think I am right in saying that I have supported the Education Department on every occasion that it has come to the States during this term, on higher education, primary schools rationalisation, various other things I cannot recall, pre-school twice – or was it three times? – but today I am afraid I cannot support them. I think that there is much that is of value in their policy letter, and obviously I supported them over the last two or three days on the issue of selection

1900 and non-selection. But, I do think on this issue of the number of schools, or the number of sites,
they have made a major blunder.

1905 Since the Torode amendment of 2001, the States have effectively been building schools and
constructing education policy around them. The opportunity the States have with the amendment
laid by Deputy St Pier is to reverse that, and instead to construct education policy first, and then
to build schools around that policy.

Now, I do not have a bag packet on me, and therefore I am not going to try to design or
redesign the secondary Education estate, and I do not think the States should be doing that on
the floor of the Assembly. In fact, the amendments B1 and B2 can quite easily be debated without
referring to any of the existing schools or sites.

1910 Deputy Hadley, I think, hit the nail on the head this morning, when he said that the Education
Department has been faithfully following States' Resolutions, and they have, the Education
Development Programme One, as it was called, which was to do with the schools redevelopment
programme. They have followed, successive Education Departments have followed it to the letter.
But they have been following a Resolution based on a selective system. A selective Grammar
1915 School and three selective high schools, if that is the right way of putting it. I am not quite sure if
the Education Department understand what they have achieved, or what they appear to have
achieved, this week, by arguing successfully for the abolition of selection at 11. But, it changes
absolutely everything in terms of the Education estate.

1920 What is required, through the debate on amendments B1 and B2, is that the States need to
determine their policy on whether the new non-selective system of secondary education is best
delivered in three schools or in four schools, or three sites or four sites. That is it. That is the start
and finish of this aspect of the debate. We are meant to be here debating strategic education
policy, and we have heard from members of the Education Department about the provision of
toilets and power points. (*Laughter*) I do not entirely blame them, the Education Department,
1925 mainly because of the position that the Torode amendment put them in, actually have been
obsessed with buildings, completely obsessed with buildings. Now, in fairness, the present
Department has made great strides in other areas like raising standards, but in terms of secondary
education, and structural changes, they have been obsessed with buildings, and they are still
obsessed with buildings, even now. I do not think they realise it, I do not think that is the way they
1930 will remain, but at the moment they are still obsessed with buildings.

In our current selective system, I am very much in favour of four schools or four sites. Basically,
because if there were only three we would have a relatively small selective Grammar School, and
two quite large secondary moderns, around 900 students each. Now I have always felt that those
secondary moderns with 35% of the children showing the highest aptitude at 10 or 11 taken out
1935 of them, quite quickly would become unattractive schools in our community. So that is why I have
always favoured four schools in a selective system.

But, in a non-selective system, the arguments are tipped, well not just on balance, but there is
a compelling case to go to a three-school, or a three-site, option in a non-selective system. We
are told by the Education Department, there is likely to be a peak of 2,300 students, I think it is in
1940 the year 2026. If we divide 2,300 by four, because they want to have four schools or four sites, we
come to schools with an average population of 575. Now, what is the Education Department's
own advice about the size of secondary schools? We are told in the policy letter where they
analyse various options for the estates, ideally secondary school population should be over 600
pupils in a school in order to deliver a broad and balanced curriculum efficiently. That is the advice
1945 of the Education Department. They tell us under one of the three-school options that larger
secondary schools could deliver the curriculum more efficiently, that potentially there would be
less capital expenditure required, and that larger schools could provide a broader curriculum, with
more choice and they could improve standards.

That is for schools above 600, and yet what they are proposing is a system where schools
1950 would have an average of 575 students at their peak, with 2,300 students – that peak lasts about
10 years. Generally, we will be planning for about 2,200 students. Divided over four sites, that is an

average of 550 students per school. The Education Department's own advice is that that number of students is insufficient to provide the broad, balanced curriculum which they desire.

1955 One of the advantages of having quite fixed views about selection at 11 is that one does not have to spend too much time thinking about it during the run up to this debate, and it has meant that more time has been available to consider other issues. I have spent quite a lot of time talking to education professionals about, in particular, the size of schools. I have to say that the overwhelming advice is that the proposals of the Education Department are for schools which are too small. One letter we received, I think all Members received, stated that:

'At the moment in the relatively small schools it is possible to provide a sufficiently broad and balanced curriculum because none of them need to provide for the full spectrum of pupils in terms of academic ability. However...'

1960 This senior leader in one of our schools goes on to say:

'I do believe 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 a comprehensive intake, I believe we would need an absolute minimum school size of 600 and an ideal size of 720 or 840.'

1965 The Education Department likes to talk about school capacities, because it does not seem quite so bad when you do that, because it is 600 at La Mare, and 600 at the Grammar School, and 660 at Beaucamps, and 720 at St Sampson. But look how many children are actually in them. We have secondary schools at the moment, which are smallish even by the standards of primary schools. If you draw up a list of the largest schools, including secondary schools and primary schools in the table. There are three primary schools which push two of our secondary schools, half of our complete provision, down into fourth, of fifth place, sixth place. It is insanity. It is absolute madness to be doing this, and the Education Department is proposing to perpetuate this problem. I do not understand, I genuinely do not understand that. I have asked my friends on the
1970 Education Department to explain this to me, and I genuinely do not understand why they have resorted to this policy of one school on four sites. I do not know what advice they have been receiving.

1975 In 2001 when the Education Department laid its proposals for a non-selective system before the States, they advised the States, quite categorically, that increasing pupil numbers in each school by replacing four secondary schools with three will greatly enhance the opportunity for improving curriculum flexibility, widening the use of setting, and providing more specialist teachers in schools. Falling 11-16 populations will leave the four existing secondary schools with unviable numbers and increased difficulties in recruiting specialist teacher, and providing a broad curriculum and a wide range of qualifications.

1980 I find it hard to believe that the advice has changed so dramatically in the intervening years. As has already been said, if one looks back at the history of this, the Education Department did propose three 850-student schools in 2001, and it then, in later proposals, went to 720 I think originally, and then went back to 660 and 600, purely because of falling pupil numbers. It was not because they did not think that those schools were capable of being built on those sites. An
1985 argument has since been created that some of these sites are terribly restrictive, you could not possibly extend them in a way which would allow an extra 100 or 150 students to be admitted.

1990 But none of those arguments were advanced by the Education Department all through from 2001 until today. The argument put forward for reducing the capacity in those schools as they were being developed was falling pupil numbers. Maybe the Education Department disputes this, I do not know. I think Deputy Conder is replying for them. Perhaps he will stand, or Deputy Sherbourne might stand, perhaps they will refute this, but my understanding is that all of the international evidence suggests that the optimum size for 11-16 secondary schools is between 600 and 1,000 students. Now, if that is wrong, perhaps Deputy Conder, or Deputy Sherbourne, can either stand now and correct it, or when they speak they can correct that. They are proposing

1995 secondary school sites with an average number of students lower than the lowest recommended size.

I think also, sir, that one has to remember that the Education Department confederate without a States' Resolution, they did not come to the States asking for a Resolution when they introduced what they now call 'soft federation'. There is nothing in Deputy St Pier's amendment B2, which is

2000 the three schools, which precludes federation. Nothing at all.

The other thing is, I just do not think that the one school on four sites model will work. I mean –

I will give way to Deputy Sillars.

2005 **Deputy Sillars:** Thank you, sir.

I only stand because you did ask if there was evidence for small schools. If I could just read the Institute of Education, through you, sir, the Institute of Education evidence – a large review of 40 studies on secondary school size, Leithwood & Jantzi came to these conclusions on strong evidence:

'Smaller schools are an advantage for most types of student outcomes, including performance, but also attendance, engagement, behaviour and participation in extra-curricular activities.

Larger schools may be able to offer academically successful students a wider choice of subjects. However ... Curriculum breadth can be achieved in a school as small as 500-600 students.

Students who may struggle with school and children from disadvantaged backgrounds do better in smaller schools. More advantaged/high achieving students are not disadvantaged ...'

2010 Thank you.

Deputy Fallaize: Well, sir, that flies in the face of all the evidence which has been... It flies in the face of what is in the Education Department's policy letter. Why did they not say then that they believe that small schools of fewer than 600 are the best possible option?

2015 They tell us in their policy letter that schools of fewer than 600 students are restricted to the breadth of the curriculum. So, I think if that is their position I think they are now changing their position at the eleventh hour (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and I think we could do with some clarity on that, when Deputy Conder sums up.

2020 Now, he might say, well, actually, this is one school, across four sites – I will give way to Deputy Conder.

Deputy Conder: That is exactly what I was going to say. (*Laughter*)

2025 **Deputy Fallaize:** Okay, well I think the problem is that the Education Department's advice up to this point has been contrary to that, which is why, I suspect, that they are going to lose on this debate, very heavily. If their advice is now changing, then they have, I am afraid, misled the States in their policy letter.

2030 Now, they might say well, it is going to be one school with 2,100 to 2,300 students across four sites. They have not been able to persuade me that one school on four sites is going to work. Not at all.

2035 When Deputy Lowe, I think, has mentioned this on the media, we did a forum with the Grammar School sixth form, and the students were asked, several dozen students in the room, 'If you had to make a choice at the start of Key Stage 4 between doing absolutely the subjects you wanted to do but having to move sites to do them, or making some concessions on your preferred subjects and staying in your present school with your peer group, what would you choose?' Two of them said they would move sites. I think that the bond between peers, contemporaries in schools, is so strong, loyalty to schools is so strong that they just will not move.

2040 I suspect deep down that the Education Department perhaps believes that there actually will not be that much transfer at Key Stage 4, but if that is the case, the only way that they have been able to come up with, to potentially to broaden the curriculum offer, which is transfer at Key Stage

4, the opportunity to transfer at Key Stage 4, will not actually operate in practice. Students will, perhaps by their own choices, tie themselves to their sites with an average number of students of 550 and they will have restricted opportunities.

I will give way to Deputy Sherbourne.

2045

Deputy Sherbourne: Thank you Deputy Fallaize for giving way.

Does Deputy Fallaize agree with me that in fact for maybe two or three decades now, many, many hundreds of young people from our high schools have actually been travelling to the College of FE for the various link courses which are provided as part of the 14 Plus curriculum. That has worked very well, very effectively, and has led to pathways that youngsters have been educated at the College of FE and into employment. So the actual model has been in operation for a long time. I would accept that the actual model we are running as a federation is a more extensive provision than that, but it is the same model that has been in place for a long, long time.

2050

2055

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, I think if one –

Deputy Conder: Could he at the same time explain to me why he is so concerned that movement between campuses would not work in Guernsey, when Deputy Bebb described earlier how it works in areas where he has –

2060

Deputy Bebb: Point of correction.

I pointed out how *teachers* move.

2065

Deputy Conder: How teachers can move between campuses, if that is more effective, or students in other areas of the United Kingdom can move between sites. This is not a matter of timetabling –

2070

Deputy Fallaize: No, I think it is a totally sub-optimal model. I think the Education Department started with a piece of paper at the top of it saying 'we must rebuild La Mare de Carteret School'. I think they then had another line underneath it which said 'we do not want to close any existing secondary schools', because – I am not giving way – that will upset particular school lobbies, and there will be too much opposition and we might get our non-selective plans through. The only way that they could find to broaden the curriculum in their very small sites was to have this, what they now call 'hard federation'. I genuinely do not understand any other way in which they could have come up with this kind of solution – which, I am afraid, has been completely rejected by the community.

2075

Now, maybe it is because – no, I am still not giving way – they have not promoted it well enough. But how many votes are they? I mean, let's be honest, Members have stood with them every step through their journey in the reform of education, and delivering their Vision, how many votes are they going to get for their one school on four sites model. It will be interesting to find out. But I think that their model has been completely rejected by the community.

2080

The people who are enthusiastic about it are the people who desperately want rid of the 11-plus. When people have called me and said I am very much in favour of the Education Department's proposals. I have said why, and almost without exception the person has said because I am against the 11-plus. There are many people in our community who would vote for almost any option so long as it removed the 11-plus, I am one of them. (*Interjections*) No, I am not alone. I do not think there is very much enthusiasm at all for one school on four sites.

2085

So, there is one, one argument in favour of one school on four sites, which is to do with disruption. It is the best argument that the Education Department have for this proposal. Clearly, not having to close or merge any schools would cause less disruption in the transition phase from the selective system to the non-selective system. How much weight should be attached to that? Well, the difficulties associated with the closure of St Peter Port will inevitably live long in the

2090

2095 memory, but equally, the Education Department does have recent, and I think quite successful
experience, of closing or merging schools. Schools do open, they do close, they do merge. We
must have an Education Department that has the capacity to cope with school closures and school
mergers. If we have not, we have a serious problem, and we have to provide the necessary
support and resources to allow them to do that.

2100 We cannot possibly just accept the argument that it is potentially disruptive to change the
Education estate in any way. Because if we do that we are setting it in tablets of stone forever.
Education was very open minded about primary school rationalisation, and I think they ought to
be, similarly, about secondary school rationalisation.

2105 So, I think, weighed against the difficulties of closing or merging schools, I think the arguments
in favour of three schools are absolutely compelling. If you divide 2,300 by three, that is the
predicted peak of pupils, you get an average size of 765. Well, despite what Deputy Sillars has
said, I think that the overwhelming consensus obtained through international evidence is that
between 700 and 800 is just about ideal for the size of a secondary school between the ages of 11
to 16. So we are not talking about very large schools. We are not talking about schools of over
1,000 or 1,500 or 2,000 plus, like you would find in the UK. We are actually talking about schools
which were they in the UK would be graded as small to medium sized, if we go with three schools.

2110 To finish, sir, there is one reason above all why I favour three schools and not four, and it is to
do with the confidence of parents. A non-selective system requires children whose parents believe
they would previously have been selected for a place at the Grammar School or the colleges to go
to a non-selective comprehensive. My view is that if those children are spread over four sites, and
if you work out the numbers you could end up in a year group with perhaps 15 to 20 of those
2115 children in a year group at a school, I do not believe that is a sufficient number of the children of
the highest aptitude, to give effect to the very principle of all-ability education, at least partly,
where the children of higher aptitude can have a very beneficial effect at lifting the standards in
the whole school. I just believe that the students will be too few, and it will be too diluted – I will
give way to Deputy Dorey.

2120 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you.

The school size point is covered in the UCL report, and there are a number of different
research papers which are done which they summarise, but they reached their summary, and it is
very clear and I will read it out it is on page 1703:

2125 'Research evidence strongly suggests that secondary school size has an optimal level of between 600 and 1000, with
smaller schools in this range being better for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds.'

That is the overall summary of all the research papers on this subject.
Thank you.

2130 **Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, I would like to make a point of correction if I may.

The Bailiff: Deputy Hadley.

2135 **Deputy Hadley:** Deputy Fallaize said that the Education Department started with a blank sheet
of paper on which they wrote at the top rebuild La Mare. That is absolute nonsense. The
Department was acting under a States' Resolution to rebuild La Mare.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

2140 **Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, sir. Deputy Fallaize said that he would give way, so that is why I
stood up and continued.

2145 I would like to ask Deputy Fallaize if his views have changed, because in 2014, two years ago, when the development came up for La Mare, and when the famous amendment said go back and look at this value for money, I quote from *Hansard* here, and I want to know if his views are still the same, he states here:

'Deputy Le Tocq said that in 2001 he would have favoured, or did favour, a three-school model rather than a four-school model and I am entirely in agreement with him. In fact, if I could have got away with it, I would have favoured a two-school model, with two 11-18 schools with sixth forms and all children able to benefit from having a sixth form attached to their schools and from the full range of facilities available.'

I just wanted to know if he was still of the view that a two-school model would be his preferred option.

2150 **Deputy Fallaize:** Oh yes, absolutely. But that is not on the table, and I know full well that it would not be possible to get that through the States. So, it is true to say that the three-school option represents, for me, a compromise, as I think it does for some other Members as well. So the answer to Deputy Lowe's question is, yes.

2155 So, the problem is the confidence of parents, and if this does not work from the very beginning it is going to collapse, because the confidence of parents will drain out of the system. I do not believe that the very small secondary schools, which the Education Department is proposing, are going to be capable of retaining the confidence of parents, who believe, who believe, that their children would previously have been educated at the Grammar School, because I think there will be too few of them spread around the various sites.

2160 In response to Deputy Hadley, what I said was that it was my belief, this is replicating what Deputy Perrot said a couple of days ago, it is my belief that the Education Department started with a blank sheet of paper which at the top of it had two ideas, one was we must rebuild La Mare and the second was we do not want to close any existing schools, because we fear the opposition that would create.

2165 Now, just finally, sir, this must not be a debate about which school should exist, and which school should close – that is not laid out in the amendment. I know that Deputy St Pier yesterday said his preferred option was the closure of La Mare, but it is not for him to make that decision, he would accept that. It would be a decision for, well, a future States now. But the Education Department's own policy letter sets out three-school options which it obviously considers are viable, and it says in big bold writing at the bottom of page 1604:

'The above options are just some examples of things we might do in Guernsey but these are not necessarily the only options available.'

2170 There are a range of options available under a three-school model. I share the Education Department's vision for a top-class education system. I fear that they are going to undermine that objective if they try to spread our students over too few sites, and it is for that reason – educational reasons primarily, not economic reasons – that I support a three school model, and if the Education Department wish to protect their proposals at the end of this debate, my advice to them would be to support a three-school model when we go to the vote.

The Bailiff: Deputy Langlois.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you, sir.

2180 Sir, Members will know, I sat on Education for two years, together with Deputy Fallaize, and those of you who were around at the time in the last term will know that the two of us agreed on virtually everything ... Oh sorry – (*Laughter*) it says 'nothing'! It says 'nothing' here. (*Laughter*)

2185 Can we have no doubt about it today, make no mistake this time, I agree with every word he has just said. It was a superbly reasoned case, it is absolutely the right answer, and we must support this amendment.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

2190 **Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you. Yes, before I go on to my prepared remarks, I would just like to
say a couple of words about Deputy Fallaize's as usual eloquent speech. One point I would make
is that he calculates that if the Grammar School pupils were spread amongst the four high
schools, I think he said there would be 15 of them in each school, presumably per year. But, of
course, a far larger number of students in Guernsey are assessed at primary school as being
2195 suitable for a grammar school education, and who then do not get to grammar school. Those
children also will be in the high schools, and I believe that the percentage of the total cohort,
which are assessed as being suitable for a grammar school education is somewhere around a
half – something of that order, so I do not think there would be any problem in even the smaller
schools that Education are proposing, in finding pupils to fill the more academic or able sets.

2200 The other point I would make is prompted by Deputy Fallaize's admission that he would
actually really favour two schools of presumably close to 1,200 pupils. He made a lot of capital out
of arguments that the ideal size of school is whatever the number that he came up with – I think,
600 to 1,000, Deputy Dorey suggested – and Deputy Fallaize has candidly admitted that his
preferred solution would fall outside that range by a considerable margin. So, I actually find it a
2205 bit strange that he is arguing on the grounds of apparently educational excellence for the three-
school model, when he is quite willing to admit that he would actually prefer a model which, on
that criterion, would be very sub-optimal.

Indeed, I do want to focus on the educational arguments in this matter. For this purpose I am
going to assume that, roughly speaking, we need to accommodate something like 2,400 pupils in
2210 the States' secondary sector going forward – obviously the numbers will fluctuate, nobody has a
crystal ball, we do not know exactly how many pupils, and it might be 2,350 it might be 2,400, but
for the sake of round numbers, I am going to say 2,400. Therefore the options that we are
debating here are, effectively, either to have three schools with an average size of about 800
pupils, or four schools with an average size of about 600 pupils. I am not going to get bogged
2215 down in the exact quantum of those numbers.

Now, Deputy St Pier, and others, supporters of the three-school model, have claimed that the
three larger schools would produce a better educational outcome, because they would have more
flexibility in setting and potentially broader curricular. That kind of reasoning certainly held sway
amongst educationalists from the 1960's onwards, and led to a very considerable expansion in the
2220 size of average schools, not only in the UK, but in the USA, and other countries. But since 2000
there has been a swing back to support for smaller schools, led by educationalists who argue that
the alleged dis-benefits of a narrower curriculum are outweighed by other benefits. Proponents of
smaller schools point to a greater sense of belonging, for students, teachers, and parents, leading
to reduced rates of absenteeism, better behaviour, fewer discipline problems, and so on. There is
2225 empirical evidence to support the view that smaller schools produce the best academic results. I
looked at the *Daily Telegraph* league tables of the top performing schools in England and Wales
at GCSE in 2015, and the average cohort size of the top 10 schools in the list was 123, equivalent
to a total student body in a five-form school of 615. Now, many of those schools also have sixth
forms, and indeed some of them have junior schools, so one cannot compare total school size,
2230 you can only do this by cohort, but the average of the top 10 performing schools in England and
Wales, last year, with a five-form equivalent was 615 pupils. The GCSE cohorts in those schools
varied from 92 to 155, to give you the range, that is equivalent to a five-form equivalent size of
460 pupils to 775. All of those numbers are below the average 800 size that Deputy St Pier and
other opponents of the Education proposals would advocate.

2235 Moreover, we do not have to look very far for examples of good small schools. Here in
Guernsey we have three colleges, two of which, at least, are known for their academic prowess,
and which achieve absolutely excellent results close to 100% at GCSE (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

and those colleges are, of course, fairly small schools. I believe we are talking about 300-400-pupil schools. Again, clearly, in some cases they have junior schools, and sixth forms and so on. I am talking about the band of the student body between the ages of 11 and 16.

2240 Clearly, there could be an argument about to what extent can those be treated as all-ability schools, and I touched on that in an earlier speech, as Deputy Fallaize well knows, they do take students who did not pass their 11-plus, but they do have entrance exams, and we can say that they are selective schools, but clearly at the moment with a fairly broad range of selection.

2245 Now, I think it is therefore unsurprising that the Education Department's consultation revealed very strong support for the retention of four schools, amongst teachers, and parents alike. This would be the fulfilment of a promise that the States, effectively, made to the Island in 2001, and it should be remembered that the spirit of the Torode amendment was that pupils in the high schools should have facilities at least as good as those in the Grammar School. The Grammar School, of course, is a relatively small school, built for 600 pupils, currently with something less than 500 on the roll. I suggest it was implicit in that promise that the States made in 2001, that the size of the schools, as well as the size of the classes, would not be vastly greater. I do not think that the model that Deputy Fallaize would prefer of two 1,200 pupil schools, compared with, for example, the colleges, where there will be a number of bursary place holders, I do not think that would be providing the children of Guernsey with equality of opportunity.

Deputy Fallaize: On a point of order.

That may be why it is not being proposed.

2260 **Deputy Parkinson:** Well, it is not being proposed, as Deputy Fallaize rightly said, because it would not stand a cat in hell's chance of being passed. But nevertheless, nevertheless, that was his preferred option, and it remains his preferred option.

The Education Department's proposals, of course, are an attempt to have the best of both worlds. (*Interjections*) They propose four smaller campuses forming part of one larger school, and the idea, clearly, is that the institution would have the flexibility to set appropriately and to deliver a broad curriculum, while retaining the ethos and family atmosphere of the schools that this single school would replace. Now, I have to say this is where I start to get uncomfortable with the Education Department's proposals, and where frankly I am not in agreement with them. I would prefer to see four independent schools in a federation that was working properly, rather than one school on four campuses. I think that the proposed solution risks losing the benefit of the community loyalty to their school, and could impose undesirable restraints on what should be the autonomy of the management within each campus, or as I would prefer to call it, school, but that in a way is an administrative detail, which the next Education Committee can consider as their plans develop. Whether there is a one school on four sites, or whether it is four schools does not greatly impact on the infrastructure requirements of the new system. What I do agree with is the concept of retaining the family ethos within each of the schools, while creating the flexibility to deliver a wider curriculum with more appropriate setting. I just believe that this could be achieved in a properly developed federation.

2275 I also think we may be missing a trick here, the four schools, as conceived in the report before us, are essentially supposed to be very similar to each other, they are delivering the same curriculum, and by and large they will have much the same facilities, but I think it would have been an interesting variation on that theme to have given each of the schools a bit of a specialism, or character, of its own. I do not think they all need to be clones of each other. I think there would be benefits in a structure which allowed one school to become a centre of excellence, for example, for sport, while another school becomes a centre of excellence for the arts. In that kind of model, children could be given a choice at 11 of the school which most closely fits their interests and their aptitudes. This would get away, to an extent, from the conveyor belt approach from primary school to secondary school, which seems to underpin the education proposals. But, again this does not fundamentally effect the decisions we are asked to make today. What we are

2290 asked to do is create four schools, clearly, if one of the schools becomes a specialist centre for sports, or another one becomes a specialist centre for sciences, then the facilities of those particular schools may need to be adapted to their specialisms. But we are essentially here arguing about whether there should be four or three.

2295 So I am going to broadly support the Department's proposals, and therefore reject the St Pier amendment, and I do so, frankly in the knowledge that the structure proposed by the Department is likely to be more expensive to build, and will require slightly higher running costs. As I have said I would prefer to save the costs of the executive head teacher, and the bureaucracy that would inevitably develop around him or her, but some additional revenue expenditure would be implicit in operating out of four sites rather than three. I take this view because I am convinced that the
2300 four-site option would deliver a better outcome for the Island's children, and give the Department the best chance of meeting a challenge of getting Guernsey's results into the premier league of schools in the British Isles. That surely is what we all want. This is the solution that the Island was promised, and this is the solution which the consultation tells us the Island wants. I believe it is time for us to deliver on that promise.

2305 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: Thank you, sir.

2310 Members, I shall not be dwelling on data and figures, because there have been one or two really useful and helpful speeches today on this topic, and many of the points made that I really could not disagree with.

I do thank Deputy Adam who actually explained historical perspective which I actually would like to develop. I thank Deputy Bebb, also for the bit of research that he did. I suggested to him that maybe he would like to continue that research past 2001, and find out what happened in the
2315 intervening period, because that is where I come from, and why I welcome the opportunity to explain to you how we have reached where we are today. Because it is not on data, it is to do with a process that started in 2001, where *bona fide* proposals, backed up by researched, backed up probably by the majority of the population, going on the research that was done that, was stymied by an intervention of two pretty powerful politicians of the time. I was dismayed, at that
2320 time, that the proposals failed, and I had to accept, like so many people that have been involved in the profession, that the *status quo* was going to be maintained. Let's move on, let's improve things, let's continue with the job that we are, basically, asked to do. It was a big disappointment, because I think most people realised that it was a step forward. So what happened?

2325 The first investment in our education system was nothing to do with our high schools, which is what the actual amendment specified, it was to do with the Sixth Form Centre. That was the first bit of capital investment in our infrastructure. That was followed by the investment in the Princess Royal Performing Arts Centre, which, actually, was supposedly providing the new College of FE which would have developed at the Ozouets site, with a meeting place and a focus. It has been an incredible focus, and facility for the Island, I do not think anyone would deny that, but that was
2330 not the purpose for its actual construction.

So, we reached 2007, I think something like that, 2008, this is from 2001 amendment, when we embarked on the first of the three high school rebuilds. The first one, as you all know, was St Samson's High, and the proposal at that time, and this is where I will defend Education of the
2335 time, was to build a 960 school at St Sampson's in line with their thinking of a three school solution. What was the outcome, as a result of debate, I do not know whether Deputy Trott was in a senior position at that time, but the outcome was that they would reduce the size of the school down to its current 700, 750, not the 960 it was proposed. It was penny pinching of the worst kind in my mind, and it started the rot with regard to the possibility of this community moving to a three school option. Then, mysteriously, Les Beaucamps was built. I say mysteriously, because I
2340 quite expected, like most people, that La Mare de Carteret, which probably should have been the

first to be rebuilt, was put back yet again, and Beaucamps was being proposed for 800 or 850. What happened? The usual States' penny-pinching decisions to reduce that to save money.

2345 Now, we have had really good buildings, there is no doubt about that, it was excellent, and then we had this hiatus, probably brought about by the financial situation, one has to accept that has an impact, and we are now debating, 15 years after that decision, the final rebuild. That was the 15-year process. In my previous speeches, I have actually indicated the time delays in any initiative in this Island, with regard to improvement of educational opportunity for ordinary people in this Island, not just the selected few. I have illustrated that quite well, and the book that I mentioned to you, if you care to read it, illustrates it even more.

2350 So, here we are, I thought it was a great shame that in presenting this amendment, Deputy St Pier, who I have a great respect for, should have focused on La Mare de Carteret. Let's just step back a little bit, to the closure of St Peter Port, a school that I had many, many years' investment and love for. There was not one bleat from the community when the proposal to close St Peter Port was made – not one, either in the States, or in the community. A sad, sad reflection on the thinking of our community, because that school was valued by many.

2355 I was privileged to work there for a long period of time, privileged to go back later as its head teacher, privileged to work with the people that eventually elected me into this Assembly. That was the reason that I stood for St Peter Port North, instead of my residential address which is Castel, because of my affection for those people, the warmth I felt for them, and the actual life that I had during those years learning about an element of Guernsey society that I really did not know. I got to know those people really well, and the problems that they were facing, day in and day out.

2360 That school did a wonderful job. It actually, as well as actually achieving quite good GCSE – sorry, yes GCSE in those days – results, did much more than that. It kept the lid on social issues. I do not know if you remember, or even are aware of this, but that school was handling something like 12, 13, 14 housing estates, some of the most challenging families in the Island, the expertise amongst the staff was absolutely incredible, but there was not a bleat from our community, not even from the people that actually had been helped by the school. It saddened me at the time.

2370 But what saddened me even more was what happened to the young people from St Peter Port after that event. They were distributed to two schools, St Sampson's High, and La Mare de Carteret. It coincided also with the work of the Housing Authority extremely brave developments down at Le Bouet and the associated estates, but thereby hangs a tale, because the redistribution of some of those challenging families coincided with the move of some of those youngsters down to La Mare de Carteret.

2375 What happened as a result of that? Those receiving schools were thrown up in the air, the chemistry was wrong. Suddenly St Peter Port youngsters, feisty lot they are, great, great young people, were moving down to St Sampson's High, and, of course, St Sampson's High had its fair share of that northern brigade, that are also quite feisty people, and what happened? There were problems. Anyone who knew anything about education of groups of young people together, would have known that. It was managed well by the teachers, no complaints from me, but not by the administrators. Why Les Beaucamps was not involved in that, what should have been a three-way split, I have absolutely no idea.

2380 Deputy Parkinson talking about perhaps the percentage of bright youngsters who would transfer to the high schools, we had the reverse there. It was not the fact that they were not bright kids, they were just feisty kids, moving into an environment they were unsure of, fearful, real challenges and problems. And surprise, surprise we ended up in 2011 with the worst GCSE results this Island had ever seen – surprise, surprise! The decisions made by this Assembly, indirectly, actually, created that situation – procrastination in the rebuild programme, and the way that that was managed.

2390 Now we have a situation where both of those schools, St Sampson's High and La Mare de Carteret, have both turned themselves round, both have had first-class validation reports. St Sampson's High, the largest of the high schools, has finally become the top performer in the high

2395 schools on GCSE results, overtaking Les Beaucamps. The work by the teachers over the last four to five years has been incredible, and you recognise that, I know. I know you all applaud them, you have supported and offered them accolades for the things they have achieved.

2400 I do not know how many of you follow the schools on twitter, or any social media, but that is the way to follow our schools now, believe me, and if you actually do follow on social media, you will see the sort of things that are going on, day in day out, the achievements of those young people. So as an Education board we see these things, we take note of them, and we decide, well, yes, we have got a real responsibility here to spend public money properly, we have a responsibility to ensure that our capital investment is correctly focused, but we have also got this situation where we have got our high schools now working at an incredible level. They will work and work and work, they will improve.

2405 Deputy Parkinson, the speech he made where he wanted assurances, he would support the abolition of the 11-plus but he would hope – obviously he cannot enforce it himself – that we could achieve 60% pass rate in those schools by 2019: that is achievable. I would say there is even more in the future. Lift aspiration, expectation, for all our children, that has been my belief. And I believed, rightly or wrongly, you will probably determine this with your votes – well, you *will* determine it – rightly or wrongly I felt that the size of the schools, the actual investment required in them, to me became almost secondary. I did not want any of our schools to go through the trauma that St Peter Port School had to go through, and the impact that the closure of that school had on other schools.

2415 You are talking about a different ball game when you speak about closing secondary schools than you are with primary schools. I do not like closing any school, but I was convinced we did the right thing with our primary rationalisation, and I was convinced by others, because I knew deep down that, and Deputy St Pier actually challenged me on this, if you remember, in his opening speech, 'Look into your heart Deputy Sherbourne,' he said, 'Look into your heart, you know deep down that this three school solution is the answer.' Educationally, yes, yes, yes, but in terms of the wellbeing of our young people and our community, all the other things associated with these proposals, and any change, for me they assumed a great import.

2425 So that is why I stand here now supporting Education's proposals, but recognising that there is another argument, extremely well expressed by other Deputies here, and I cannot hand on heart stand here and say no, the three-school solution will not work in Guernsey. It is not right, and that is why our proposals are a step in that direction, they leave the door open for that to happen at the right time. We have just had a period of four or five years where we have had two of our high schools struggling to find their feet again, and they have done it brilliantly. That is why the Education board has come to the conclusion it has.

2430 So, once again I thank those Deputies that raised the historical perspective, because I have lived through it. In fact, I felt so old when I read Rosemary Crosland's book, because I remembered so much of it, I lived it from the late 1960's onwards, and I identified with just about everything that she has written. So there we are.

2435 I think recruiting for me – this is the last thing that I want to say – recruitment of teachers is crucial, because we all know the good leadership and excellence in the classroom, excellent teaching and learning, are the secret of a really good outstanding schools. We can have outstanding schools, we can have them. We have them actually, we have got two primary schools that are classed as outstanding on Ofsted measure, the other day, it might have been Deputy Perrot, actually, claimed about the failing comprehensive system in the UK. I do not know if people are aware, but in the last two to three years, over 50% of the schools that Ofsted have actually inspected in the UK, are outstanding.

2440 The reality is that things are moving at a pace there, and we need to emulate that, we need to achieve those standards of the very best there is of the UK, not measure ourselves by national averages. That is the second time I have said that in two days, but I honestly, honestly believe that. If we are to recruit teachers, we have got to offer something a bit different, and I believe that the sort of federation approach, it does not matter whether it is called a soft or hard federation, it is

2445 the sort of federation that Deputy Parkinson has described, but that is an exciting possibility. It may be challenging, a bit much over four sites, I would accept that. It is a challenge, but the concept will attract teachers, because teachers like those sort of challenges, let us be part of something we can grow and –

Yes, I will give way.

2450

Deputy Fallaize: I am grateful to Deputy Sherbourne.

Something he has just said, has made me think that, I would wonder whether he would have any views on whether the federation, whether soft or hard, could work adequately over three sites, or whether he thinks that the three-site option would be restricted to three independent schools.

2455

Deputy Dorey: Point of correction.

I think, he said about the results from the high schools. I have got the results from Education's website, in 2015 Beaucamps got 42.3% of pupils who got grade A to C, including English and Maths. St Sampson's High got 32.9% and La Mare got 32%. I think he said St Sampson's had better results. Beaucamps was better, and if you go back from 2011 to 2015 Beaucamps has had better results than St Sampson's for all those years.

2460

Just one other matter he went through the details of the schools that had been built, I think he missed Le Rondin, which was also built in that period.

2465

Deputy Sherbourne: Thank you for those corrections, I am not going to criticise – Are you asking me to give way or are you making – ?

Deputy Lowe: If you would not mind, sir.

2470

I just wanted to take the opportunity – not 'sir' – just promoted you to 'sir', Deputy Sherbourne! (**A Member:** He's a teacher.) It is your school teacher days! (*Laughter and interjections*)

I just wanted to take the opportunity to promote La Mare for last year, the first high school ever to have every pupil get a GCSE, beating all other high schools.

2475

Deputy Sherbourne: Thank you, Deputy Lowe. I accept your evidence, I have obviously made an error there.

The point is –

Deputy Sillars: Sorry, sir.

2480

Just to correct that, it was 2014. You were absolutely right, Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: Oh, I got something right.

Deputy Sillars: Yes.

2485

Deputy Sherbourne: Excellent!

Deputy Dorey: That is not correct, sorry.

2490

In 2014 Beaucamps had 53.8 and St Sampson had 52.2. Beaucamps had better results in that year.

Deputy Sherbourne: Okay, well, I did not expect this to be a competition on results.

The bottom line is that our young people have been doing brilliantly, and even more brilliantly over the last four years. There has been a great improvement.

2495

Just finishing off with regard to the recruitment. As a teacher working in Guernsey for as long as I did, you needed excitement from time to time, you needed stimulation at various stages of

2500 your career – everyone needs it, in any profession. I was very privileged to have worked at St Peter Port School, to have run the local teachers' centre and the in-service training there, at the times of my life where I needed something to give me a focus, to drive me on, was right for me. I was very fortunate, and I believe we have a responsibility to provide those sort of opportunities for all our teachers, where you can have a varied career, and if there are exciting developments and initiatives underway in any community, teachers will go there. It is not just academic excellence.

2505 **Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy Sherbourne, I think he perhaps forgot my intervention, because others rather cleverly came along and also intervened. I asked him whether he thought there was any reason why a federation, hard or soft, could not work quite adequately with three sites, or whether it could even be slightly easier with three sites than four.

2510 **Deputy Sherbourne:** Thank you, and I do apologise Deputy Fallaize, you are quite correct, and the answer is quite simply, of course. Of course. We have made no bones about that, we recognise the federation will work, as long as more than one school it becomes a federation, so I really do not see that there is an issue there at all.

2515 So, I have come to the end. I mean, these are really important debates, and honestly the level of the information, although inaccurate in some ways – obviously I am guilty myself – putting that aside, I feel that the debates we have had over the last couple of days have been civilised. I have totally disagreed with so many things that I have heard, and people will be sitting here today disagreeing with me, that is fine, but it has been civilised. And yet for Guernsey it is the most important debate, or series of debates, that we will have had for many, many years, not just these four years but I would say since 2001.

2520 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inglis.

2525 **Deputy Inglis:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I certainly would like to thank Deputy Sherbourne for agreeing that three sites will be able to cope with the needs of the new regime.

2530 I am really grateful to Deputy St Pier, being very brave yesterday, as we all know, and putting to us the concept that really is an economics lesson. We have been talking about the schools and how wonderful they are, but they are not going to be there if we cannot afford to pay for them. It is really a case of understanding that we have got the clash of what we want, and what we can afford.

2535 I think part of the *[Inaudible]* started four days ago, in that Deputy St Pier gave us a statement on the overall financial position, and it is not good, and we know that it is not going to get better, because of the world that we live in, which was highlighted by Deputy Bebb. It is something that we need to come to terms with, if you have not got it, we cannot spend it. It is clearly something that, I think, Education has not bought into.

2540 If I can take you back to 2013, when it is fair to say some of us were very naive dealing with the capital allocation debate, but Education came to us and said we want to rebuild La Mare de Carteret School, that is all it was, the school, and there was budgeting there for £25 million. Now we are talking about £64 million, because there are things way beyond specification that we were expecting, and if anything, I find that very, very difficult. I want to see La Mare rebuilt. I want to see three progressive high schools that will provide us with succession leading in to the next 30 years. It is alarming to understand and know that the jewel of the Grammar School is now very tired, and is in need of a lot of money being spent on it. I remember when my son went there, I felt so proud for him, joining the school four years after it had been opened. It had been run in and he got the benefits of all the new teaching methods etc. But now it seems it is a difficult place, it is going to have to have money spent on it. So the economics of the world we live in has got to be paramount in what we decide we do.

2545

2550 As I say I am for the three-school option, and I am for rebuilding La Mare de Carteret, unlike Deputy St Pier, who has now become the bad boy, and he is the front page of *The Press* saying he wants to take away La Mare, I did not want to lose selection. So we have clearly got different views on how education will go forward. I have accepted what happened yesterday, but we need to now think about the best way that we can (a) afford it and (b) give our young people the best opportunities.

2555 Now, I feel that is possible, and it is interesting, isn't it? Deputy Lester Queripel highlighted what the Head Boy of La Mare de Carteret identified as something that could become an economic disaster. I would strongly suggest that Education take him on as a (*Interjection*) non-voting member of that – because he is very switched on. The school clearly is developing talents there that recognises the day and age that we live in.

2560 I think, the final element I would like to put forward is there seems to be a lot of misconceptions about the federation, I have heard that it is not working, it has been running for two years and it has been going through, shall we say, teething problems. The principle certainly sounds good, but I would ask Members to look on YouTube at Google Classroom, it is only a minute long, you will be amazed how that can help and work within our education system. This teaching with no walls is really something that will come in the next 10 years as being the way forward. I can tell you now there are teachers within this Island developing that, but they cannot use it, so they know clearly where the future lies, and working with the students they are actually pioneering something that I am sure will be of great use to us, it is going to cut down costs and it is working in the mechanism that they are going to handle in the future.

2570 So, in conclusion, it is a shame that Deputy Sherbourne talks about the States' penny pinching, I do not think it is penny pinching, it is being realistic thinking about where we are and how much money we have to spend. The revenue source will reduce, there is no doubt about it, and we need to look at our spend, and spend accordingly. But, certainly, I would like to see three high schools that provide us with succession for the next 30 years.

2575 Maybe, through you, sir, I would like to apologise to the 150 emails I have had today, I just cannot get back to those people, like many of us, and confirm that I support what they are asking – in other words they do not want to see La Mare closed. It is an integral part of that community, it is the only high school that is built around a community, and the community needs it, and it is very important that we cut our cloth to suit, and make sure that they can have those facilities.

2580 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Lièvre.

Deputy Le Lièvre: Thank you, sir.

2585 Members of the Assembly, there comes a time when loyalty, even when combined with the strongest desire to achieve a specific goal, no matter what that might be, has to give way to what promises to be, or at least could be, a more pragmatic and logical way forward.

2590 Now, my reasons for signing the St Pier amendment is very simple, I do not like the one school four sites option, and this is not a piece of insincere double dealing on my part, as implied this morning, Why don't I like it? Well, I believe when put to the test it will not function as hoped for, it will not have the outcomes we all desire. This option looks clumsy, it sounds clumsy, and it looks like it relies very much upon students opting for choices fairly evenly distributed across the Education Estate, in a manner that will result in the efficient use of four sites.

2595 More importantly, or possibly as importantly, I think it underplays those issues that are of paramount importance to some 14 year olds when making life changing decisions. If they realise what those are. Let me expand very briefly the four-school option will, we are told, provide for some students to stay where they are, it will provide for other students to move around in a pick and mix style or provide for some students to up sticks and move to one or other of the other three sites. Now for some students the limited curriculum provided in their small school will suit them ideally, others might be less well catered for but decide that they cannot really be bothered

2600

to travel hither and thither and persuade teachers and parents alike that they are best left where they are, when the real reason was that they would prefer to stay with their friends. For some students the curriculum will definitely not suit their needs and they will opt for the travelling option. We do not know how frequently they will need to leave their campus, but it is possible that their particular selection of subjects could involve travel over three campuses, where no combination of two schools exactly meets their needs. Time spent learning will be substituted for time spent travelling, whizzing around in all weathers, dodging the traffic, and generally risking life and limb. St Sampson's High in the first part of the day, with a dash to Les Varendes late morning, and a final thrash to La Mare de Carteret for the last lesson of the day.

Finally, we have the student whose option is at another school, for this student the option will be to leave his school after nine or 10 years with his friends and travel, possibly by him or herself, to another school where they have no friends and not even any acquaintances. Perhaps we are too old to remember, but often our school friends become our friends for life, we make new friends, that is for sure, but most often those friends we make for life are made in the hugely formative early teenage years, and we will be asking these young students to put all that to one side, because the small school they attend does not offer the same opportunities as the small school two or three miles down the road.

Again, I can see young students making sub optimal decisions, for the wrong reasons, in our eyes maybe, but not in theirs. I have this bizarre vision that we are in the central control room in La Couperderie – like Biggin Hill in the midst of the Battle of Britain, (*Laughter*) co-ordinators are shunting around little cardboard cut-outs of young men and women on scooters as they travel from one zone to another, whilst at the same time ensuring that the tutor teacher is similarly logged travelling from A to B to meet the needs of another small batch of scooters making their way to yet another decision. Now bizarre that might be, surreal it might be, but this is going to take a significant amount of administrative time and effort to make sure it works. I feel sure that is the case. Maybe I am totally and utterly wrong, and I leave it to Deputy Conder to tell me that is the case, but for me, it just does not hack it.

Of course, the three-school option still includes some form of soft federation – still a bit of whizzing around, but nowhere as much, because the schools are, wait for it, larger, the curriculum is broader and the opportunities for the students greater. And none of what I have said involves not building La Mare de Carteret. It simply needs this Assembly to decide whether we have three or four schools – nothing else.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gillson.

Deputy Gillson: Thank you, sir.

I think first I just want to remind everybody that we are talking about Propositions and not – we vote for a Proposition and not the proposer's speech, and the Proposition before us is about a three-school option, not explicitly closing a particular school.

So I have got a couple of comments on the Minister's speech this morning. He made mention about saving money with a flatter management structure, but Deputy Sherbourne has confirmed that each school will retain their own head teacher, so that it is not going to be that much more of a flatter structure.

Also the Minister went on to speak about the three schools operating in competition. Why would that be? Why cannot they still work together? They can still work in a soft federation, three schools, just as easy as four. I do not quite see where he was coming from on that one.

But, sir, the number of secondary schools, or how many sites a single school has, is obviously a key issue, and my support for the three-site option, or three-school option, is not only for financial reasons. There are some very valid educational reasons, which I will get to in a moment. But, sir, some of the speeches have suggested or implied that financial considerations should not be part of the equation, almost treating finance as a dirty word – well, this is wrong. We live in a world

where we have limited funds, we do not have enough money for all the capital projects we have in the pipeline, so it is right that we consider finances. The public, I think, expect us to consider the financial implications, but I do agree it should not be the factor, but it is right that it is a factor.

2655

So, we obviously have to look at the Educational Estate and I think we cannot consider it without considering and including the College of Further Education, because currently we have a grammar school which is fit for purpose, providing secondary education, we have a brand new Beaucaemps, we have a relatively new St Sampson's High School, a La Mare which everyone, I think, agrees is not suitable, and a College of FE which needs upgrading. If the decision today is to opt for a four-site model, we will have to build a new school at La Mare and a new College of FE. If the option is to go for a three-school model, this will mean possibly extending one of the existing schools, and building the College of Further Education. So it is important that we do just look at the costs for a minute.

2660

Now on many occasions, people refer to the Island as being a wealthy Island, and it is true there are wealthy people, but it is also true we are not a wealthy Government. The Budget report we approved last year projected deficits for the next three years, and identified, and we know that we do not have sufficient capital reserves for the existing capital pipeline projects, and indeed, earlier this week, the Treasury Minister told us that the financial results for last year are worse than expected. We are not in days of plenty, so we have to use money wisely and get value for money.

2665

2670

So, as I have said, I think we cannot look at secondary education and building needs without also considering the College of FE, and the Education Report costs La Mare project at over £60 million and Further Education at a £67 million build. Now, I find it strange that Deputy Conder and Deputy Sillars when he was on the radio, have distanced Education from that estimate. I find that strange to hear because the report, as Deputy Le Clerc said, that number, that cost, is in the report. Section 10 of their own report states, and I quote:

2675

'the redevelopment of the Les Ozouets site (£67m)'.

Now there is no mention in the report that Education do not agree with that costing. There is no mention that this is a T&R estimate which Education disagree with, there is no mention of any other estimate. There is not even a little foot note saying this is a T&R number Education dispute it. But there is nothing in there.

2680

I will give way.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you, sir.

It was a point of correction, but thank you for that. We rather assumed that everybody knew that – we may have been wrong – that the £67 million came from consultants within T&R, and that was to actually go from three to one on the LOC Site, the CFE site, and to demolish everything there and to completely rebuild. That came through as a proposal.

2685

As you know, and we have said this in the debate, we had only recently asked for the £5½ million to move out of Delancey back to the LOC, which this Assembly permitted us to have, so thank you very much for that, and also we are in the middle of dealing with T&R for it is about £22 million, if the figure is right, to move the Coutanchez site back up to the LOC site. Things have moved on. That original figure, we knew – and we assumed that everyone else knew, maybe I am wrong – that that was an original, somebody working on behalf of T&R, but not a member of T&R.

2690

2695

Deputy Gillson: I apologise for my lack of being psychic, but I read your report, and the report dated 8th January, which gives a number in there, as I quote, of £67 million without anything in there giving anyone indication that is not the right number! I think I can expect to believe what is in a report from Education Department is something that they actually agree with. *(Laughter)*

2700

Is there anything else in the report that *(Laughter)* I bet you do not agree with that I should ...? I have not got a crystal ball, I am sorry.

2705 Keeping a four site structure would result in having to build a new school, and since we cannot spend money twice, it means that some other capital project will not happen. Possibly not building the College of FE as you might want, possibly the bombshell today of the Grammar School roof needing to be rebuilt. We know that the rebuilding of La Houquette, that is a school that is past its sell-by date. There are a lot more projects, but the three site money would create a saving, that is for sure.

2710 Now, the hang-ups of finance, we have to look at the operational effectiveness of the structure. Now, from an operational point of view, is it easier to provide a broad curriculum to service a broad range of needs on a larger than a smaller site. The Education proposals are for a single school over four sites. Having four sites creates operational issues with staff, students, both moving, the range of curriculum, clearly, the more movement of people you have the less efficient the school, and the less effective the education. Now it is possible students may move in their lunch hours, but this means that there is less time to socialise with their friends, or when I was at school less time to do my homework. But if you are going to have movement, surely, the fewer sites you have the better. So, in terms of just operational matters a three-site model has to be better. It is bound to be more efficient, because there is less movement. Now, it has already been mentioned by others, that having three sites they will be slightly bigger schools, they are not big by UK comparison, they are still quite small, but they will be able to offer the bigger curriculum, 2720 they will be able to offer better setting, so not only is there less need to move you actually have on the site more facilities, so it creates less movement.

2725 Now, the Minister, and others, have mentioned about uncertainty if we decide to close a school, and there is an element of point, but I think actually it will not create ... if we make a decision to close a school down then there is a period of uncertainty until it is made, and then there is a period of transition. Once you have made the decision there is a period of certainty, and then there is a period of disruption, as Deputy Sherbourne has said, and that has to be managed. Indeed the Education Report gives some uncosted suggestions, golden handcuffs, things like that. Now, the Treasury Minister has also said that he would place a consequential amendment to ensure there is sufficient funding, I would certainly support that.

2730 Now, mention has also been made of St Peter Port School and the merger, and issues surrounding that school, and from what some people have said it makes it sound like it was an absolute disaster. I just want to quote some words that the head teacher said, this is from *The Guernsey Press* of 23rd May 2009:

'We are not experiencing any problems at all, not all, it is rumours, and I think it is appalling. There have been no problems whatsoever between St Peter Port and St Sampson's students. The pupils have worked very well together. The transition has been very smooth and we have been impressed by their maturity.'

2735 So, there may have been some problems, but I think the media did overstate them, in the words of the head teacher.

2740 But I also looked at the 2011 St Sampson's High School validation report, which of course, was just at the end of the first couple of years of the school opening, and they said that there was an issue of not enough raw data about students being used, and that the data they had not being used effectively. So, if we come to say right we need to just move a school there will be disruption, but what is different between now and when St Peter Port School closed is that the effective use of student data is embedded in all the high schools. Education have told us that before. Education, hopefully, will have learnt from closing St Peter Port High School – in fact, I think they have, because as Deputy Fallaize said, there was a very good example of the way the primary school was closed, there was guidance for every single student. Now we have got to make sure 2745 that happens, and as we have said, there has to be sufficient resources, so it can be managed. But, I think in some ways the decision to retain four schools actually creates uncertainty because we know that the capital reserves are not sufficient for everything, so there is uncertainty over which capital project ... Will the College of FE get all the money it wants? Will La Houquette be redeveloped? Will Grammar School get a roof of the adequate quality?

2750 Also, I suspect that if we stick with the four-school model, what will happen is, when the next Education Department comes back with plans for College of FE they will have to look at the idea of dropping one of the high schools because of the capacity, so there is still going to be this uncertainty, but probably as long, if not longer.

2755 Now, a lot of people have talked about capacity numbers and I have got ... I think I can speak with a little bit of some accuracy on these numbers, because the Education Department kindly sent me the spreadsheets of raw data that they have, which underline the graphs that they have in the document, in the report. So far a lot of the considerations have been about the States' Secondary Estate, and given that we are an Island, and to state the obvious, land is limited in supply, we need to make best use of it. I think that we should consider the whole Island
2760 Secondary School Estate. This means not only looking at the existing States' schools, but the existing three colleges, and the total capacity of the Island.

Now, between the colleges they have an existing capacity of a little over 1,100 students. Those are buildings which currently exist or are four or five months away from existing in the case of Ladies' College new build, but they effectively exist ... in the case of the Ladies' College they are
2765 actually owned by the States. Not only that, the States is underwriting part of the loan that is being used to buy them, and I think I am right in saying, that some of Elizabeth College's buildings may well be owned by the States. If we consider Education's preferred option of four schools, it produces a total capacity of 2,580 places. If we add to that 1,100 existing places at the colleges, that gives a total capacity in the secondary school sector of 3,695 places.

2770 Now according to Education's projections, the year 2026 will see maximum demand for secondary school places. With a demand of 3,262 places. Now, Education have said they would like to see a 5% margin, safety margin on their numbers, and fair enough, that brings the total maximum demand for the next 40 years of 3,354 places, and that is, I just repeat, that is Education's own numbers, because I have got the raw data from them. So, when you compare the
2775 total Island capacity of a four site model, we have a surplus of 341 places. That is 341 places which will never be filled under the current projections.

Now, can you imagine if someone came here and said, 'We are going to build an office block for civil servants and 10% of the desks we are going to put in are never going to be filled – we have no plans to use 10% of the capacity, we are just putting that in', it would reach an outrage.

2780 I will give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, Deputy Gillson for giving way.

2785 I have heard this expression a few times today about these 'empty desks'. Well I know quite a few of us in this Assembly are not close to schools, because we are in the older generation. They got rid of desks years ago. It is tables, where actually you can sit four or six you have not got empty desks. You have got a table which can accommodate from one to six.

2790 **Deputy Gillson:** Actually, it shows you were not listening to me properly, Deputy Lowe, because my reference to desks was my analogy of civil servants. I did not use desks, I know people use desks, bench tables in schools, but there is still a capacity number.

Now, it makes no sense to deliberately create a total Island educational estate which is well over 10% margin on the maximum capacity, when that capacity includes a 15% safety margin.
2795 That means the years outside 2026 the excess capacity is huge. Some people may say, 'Ah, well, we should not include the colleges in this.' Well, why not?

I think I am right, in the last year or so each member of the Education board will have agreed with working closely with the third sector. Well, what are the colleges if they are not third sector? They are all not-for-profit organisations, and so, as I said, it seems crazy to build in a capacity
2800 which is way over what we are going to need as an Island.

2805 Sir, I know that the Minister has often said, the cheapest option is not the best option, and he
is right about that, it not necessarily is the best option, and I know the debate is not about closing
La Mare, but the Treasury Minister mentioned it, but actually if it was not to rebuild La Mare, that
is actually not the cheapest option. The cheapest option would be Option C, which is to rebuild La
2810 Mare and have three sites consisting of Beaucamps, La Mare and St Sampson's and use the
Grammar for the College of FE. Now, in the T&R letter it indicates that Option C would save
£30 million in capex, and I think Deputy Le Clerc mentioned that, but that assumes, you spend
£12 million extending St Sampson's High School, which when you look at the total States' Estate,
the total Island Education, which you do not need to do. So, actually, if you went with Option C
that would save £42 million of capital expenditure. Now, if costing was the – I will give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Conder.

Deputy Conder: I thank Deputy Gillson.

2815 If this is an unfair question please I quite understand, but the amendment does say at least one
school would have a sixth form attached, in the model he has just described how would he
achieve that outcome?

2820 **Deputy Gillson:** You interrupted too early, because I was saying if you went for the financials
that would be the option, but Education in their report have identified that tertiary colleges are
not as beneficial as having a sixth form centre attached to the school, which is what this
amendment recommends. So it is not an amendment that is going for the cheapest option. It is
going for an option which balances getting the best sixth form model with considerable capital
expenditure savings.

2825 Sir, now, I notice that Deputy Green has not spoken yet, I suspect after this part of my letter he
will jump to his feet, because he published a letter in Monday's paper about the move from ... why
four sites is better than three, and so I am going to take the opportunity to just note a few
observations about this.

2830 The first point Deputy Green makes is reference to Dr Nicholl's observation that three schools
would be larger and more efficient, than one over four sites. If we accept this logic then one
school on three sites would be far more efficient, and of course, as Deputy Sherbourne has
accepted, there could be a federation of three schools, so actually what Deputy Green said in the
first paragraph of his letter actually supports a three-school site rather than a four-school site.

2835 The next point he made was about smaller schools having ethos and pastoral care. Now, 960 is
not a large school by any means, but the issues which Deputy Green addressed about ethos can
be obtained in 960 schools, it is all down to the internal structure, efficient use of house systems
for example. There are schools in England which have excellent ethos, and I would guess, I think a
pretty good assumption that we have got some teachers employed by Education who have
worked in school of that size and so will have experienced a school that size or bigger with a good
2840 ethos – I give way.

Deputy Fallaize: I thank Deputy Gillson for giving way.

2845 He is obviously right in what he is saying about schools of 960, but, of course, we would not
need schools of 960, if we had a three-school model. Would he accept that if we did have a three-
school model, the average size of schools would be round about the same size, or perhaps slightly
smaller than the Education Department have run in very recently at one of their high schools at St
Sampson.

Deputy Gillson: Excellent point, very well made, Deputy Fallaize, I do agree.

2850 The next point Deputy Green makes, relates to the benefits of staff working closely together,
team teach, work together, now again surely that is far better if you are working over three sites

rather than four sites. That is the third point that Deputy Green made in his letter on Monday which actually supports a three-site model than a four-site model.

2855 The next point he made was very interesting, that one school on four sites would offer greater opportunities for teachers to teach 11-18. I do not agree with the logic of that, because there is nothing in the report which suggest a one-school, four-site model will increase the number of sixth formers. Therefore the number of sixth form teachers will not need to increase. This means that if you increase the opportunity for teachers to teach at sixth form, then you have to reduce the opportunity of existing teachers who are teaching at sixth form. Because, obviously, if one
2860 teacher teaches 10 lessons, and you want other teachers to get involved and you are not increasing the number of lessons, someone has got to drop down. So, it may increase some teachers' ability to teach at sixth form, but those who are currently teaching at sixth form will have less of an ability. So, it is actually a four school structure will create uncertainty for teachers at the Sixth Form Centre, because they know Education have said that teachers in the other schools will
2865 be taking some of their lessons from them.

Deputy Sillars: Point of correction.

What we have seen is, within the high schools, their performance has improved dramatically, over the last four years, is more students going to the sixth form, so we anticipate in the secondary more coming out of the GCSE's with better GCSE's and going on to sixth form. There
2870 will be more students going to the sixth form than before, and we have found that progress, and that is statistically correct, over the last four years, sir.

Thank you.

2875 **Deputy Gillson:** Once again, I am not psychic – that little fact is not included anywhere in the report. (*Interjection*) Well, it is not in your report, we are debating on the report. So, I think that this decision, if we go for four schools, could create uncertainty.

Now the next paragraph, Deputy Green reiterated, the changes would enable savings identified by Dr Nicholls to be realised – interesting duplication, deployment of staff, flatter
2880 management structure. Of course, those are economies of scale. Those are economies you get when you reduce the number of business or units, so again, another point. So, far I think all of the points Deputy Green made in his letter supported a three-school or three-site model.

Deputy Green went on to consider overall secondary school capacity, and as I have mentioned just before, even with the safety margin, it means an overcapacity, a number of places which will
2885 never be filled amounting to 341, and that is having taken account of the 5%.

But, the next part of the letter was a real cracker, this was good. Deputy Green referred to the recent policy change to consider policies to increase the Island's birth rate, which is true, but the projected peak number of students is in 2026, which is 10 years away, so unless some babies are
2890 born at the age of two, they will go to secondary school after the peak year. So any reference to the change in policy will not affect capacity, because they will go to secondary school after the peak years, so that was okay. That is the first point that Deputy Green made that did not argue for a three-school model, but it also did not argue for a four-school model either, it was basically pretty irrelevant.

Now, quite rightly, Deputy Green then went on to express concern over disruption, and this is a
2895 very serious concern. I have been a little bit light hearted, but I would not want to be light hearted over this issue, because this is a serious issue. If we go to a three-school model it is absolutely essential that it is planned properly. Now Deputy Sherbourne, when he referred to the closure of St Peter Port, it was very revealing when he said it was not the teachers, it was the administration around. Now I think Education took that on board with the way that they put the administration
2900 around St Andrew's children in terms of merging. So I think Education have demonstrated ability to be able to close a school, and an ability to focus on the children, and we have to make sure that there are resources there to ensure that that happens. Okay it is an additional cost, but it is short-term cost, and it is a short-term one which we have to take, and make sure that we do

ensure sufficient resources, because it is important that the people who are involved in the transition of students do not lose out in any way.

2905

Deputy Green went on to costs, including the extension of St Sampson's High School, which I think when you look at total estates, the total educational estate for the Island, there is no need to rebuild St Sampson's High or extend it.

I would also say that Deputy Green made some notes about the hard federation of one school, but as Deputy Sherbourne said, they can be achieved with three schools.

2910

So, in short, sir, I think Deputy Green submitted to *The Press* on Monday a real cracking good letter, I support everything in it, because basically it supports the three-school model over a four-school model. There is nothing in that letter which actually said a four-school is better than a three-school.

Sir, when we consider the existing estate, we can make better use of the existing estate on a three-site model. The operational efficiency of co-ordinating the schools, and them supporting each other, is easier with a three-school model. The timetabling will be significantly easier on a three-school model. The teachers' career paths will be better on a three-school model. The ability for teachers to work together – three-school model. It will also save money, but I think educationally – three-school model.

2915

Now, I do not want to harp on about La Mare. I just want to make one point. Some people have mentioned a promise was made in 2001. That is true, but what has changed? Pupil projected numbers have changed. Zero-10 has happened, the 2008 financial crash has happened, and we have got insufficient capital reserves. But, also, let's think about the 2001 decision, what it actually was. It was to rebuild three high schools in return for keeping the 11-plus. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.) (Interjections)** Now, all of Education and about 25 others of us, are happy to break that promise in terms of the 11-plus **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** and so those two went together, and the world has changed from 2001. We are in a different place, not only financially, but also all of the evidence regarding the four/three school model. Three school model will be better. There is only one reason to rebuild La Mare, that is because 16 years ago it seemed the right thing to do. We need to make sure that we offer the medium and long-term best interest for the Island for education, and it is clear that the better option is from the three-school model – and I am looking for a bit of paper that I seem to have lost, because in the report somewhere, I apologise for not being able to quote it, there was something from the educational leaders, and in the paragraph quoting them, they clearly said that a three-school model will deliver better educational outcomes.

2925

So, it is a difficult decision, nobody particularly wants to close a school, or not rebuild a school, but it is the right decision for Guernsey, the numbers and pupil projections indicate, and as Deputy Fallaize said, four schools of 500 does not really make sense, that makes it very difficult to start staffing and attracting teachers. Now, I know that the technical ... say it is one school over four sites, but realistically most teachers will stay in one place, they will work in the school on the site, and to have effective schools of just 400 does make it very difficult.

2930

So I think it is not an easy decision, but I urge Members to support the amendment to go for a three-school model.

2935

Thank you, sir. *(Applause)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Thank you, sir

May I thank Deputy Gillson for his appreciative comments of my letter to *The Guernsey Press*, I am always pleased to receive fan mail, *(Interjections)* and I am grateful for his comments.

2950

Yes, of course, it is easier to achieve the benefits of the federation approach with three schools. But it does not mean that it is impossible to have some of those benefits, or many of those benefits, with four schools. It can be done with four schools, four sites, it can be done with three sites. The issue is, whether it is right to go to a three-school model now.

2955

I sir, have three particular questions that I want Members to focus on, and the themes really of the speech are these, I think, first of all, are we certain, today, that the disruptive effect that moving to a three-site model, that this decision undoubtedly will cause, is fully justified in light of what we think are the financial and educational benefits. Are we certain? What level of certainty do we have, today, in relation to that disruption? Deputy Gillson was fair minded enough to accept that there are concerns about disruption, and I thought he was entirely right to say this is a very serious issue, and it is, undoubtedly, this is the key argument against a three-school model. It might be that it is an argument which is not a game changer, but it is nonetheless a very important argument, and we have to have a level of certainty, I would suggest, if we are going to put that to one side in the interests of the overarching objectives that some people believe that a three school model will deliver, or possibly might deliver.

The second question, I think, sir, is, is it essential – not just desirable, but is it actually essential – today, to move to a policy of three schools, to move to a three site model today? Is it essential? It may well be desirable, it may well be merit worthy, but is it essential? I will come back to that in a moment.

Sir, the other thing I think we should consider is, to what extent should we have regard to the results of the public consultation on the number of school sites, and again, I will return to that in a moment.

Deputy Gillson reiterated many of the arguments that we have tried to put across in terms of a hard federation for four sites. I am not going to repeat those points, in the interest of brevity, suffice to say, and I think Deputy Parkinson probably made this point better than anybody else in this debate, which is the strong argument for a family ethos in smaller schools. I know that Deputy Gillson challenged this argument, but I would suggest, sir, that it is easier to achieve that in relatively smaller schools than it is to achieve in relatively larger schools.

The pastoral care is that argument, and there is something to be said for that, and again Members may have already made up their minds, but we do need to turn over these issues in our minds before we go to the vote, and the issue of the family ethos, the issue of the pastoral care are arguments that support a four-school model, the existing sites that we have, the links with the local community and all the rest of it.

So, I return, sir, to the three key points, and first of all, the first thing which I think does need to be considered is we should always try to guard against too much disruption in States' affairs, and guard against too much risk. That is probably the simplest way of putting it. When we try to do everything at once, it is rarely a good idea. We have already decided, we may well go on to confirm that decision, when we vote on the final Propositions, that we will be moving to a non-selective system. It remains to be seen whether Members will support that at the final analysis, and we do not know what political ramifications that may have in the future States, but nonetheless if we accept the assumption that that decision has been made, and that will be stuck too, that is already a big programme of change, which will require a transitional period of some substance, and by introducing an extra level of school closure the question can be said, quite properly, and can be put quite properly, quite reasonably, is this too much for the States as an organisation, the Education Department, as an organisation, to be taking on in one go.

Deputy Sherbourne and others have touched on the closure of St Peter Port and the ramifications that had. Undoubtedly there was a loss of some good teachers in that process, it was a big part in ... some of the adverse consequences of that decision did have an effect on results, on outcomes. Inevitably that is the case, which culminated with the reports by my friend Denis Mulkerrin and all of that. That was explosive stuff, and part of the reason, a big part of the reason was because of that decision, and that is something that we should not disregard lightly. So, the point is, sir, should we not be trying to minimise and mitigate those kinds of risks, should we not have that at the very forefront of our minds, sir, the disruptive impact that this will have on our students, on our parents, on our staff, on our community, more generally, is this fully justified, and can we have certainty in that. So, I do not think that we should underemphasise the importance.

I will give way to you, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

3010 I just wonder if Deputy Green would agree with me that the risks that he identified, which a
number of others have as well, are ones which can be mitigated with good planning and good
management.

Deputy Green: It is certainly the case, sir, that an effective plan can help to mitigate and
3015 minimise those risks, but that does not mean that they can be excluded entirely, and it does not
mean that all disruption will be negated, and we still have to come back to question, if you like, is
there going to be a residuary of this that we cannot mitigate against, that actually will affect
outcomes for students, who are in our schools now, people in our community now, and is that
fully justified? I am not saying I know the answer, but I am saying that Members should bear that
in mind.

3020 Secondly, sir, a problem I think with amendment B2 is that it has consequences for the
flexibility that the Education, Sport & Culture Committee, and States more generally, will have in
the future. Inevitably, by sticking with a four-site model now, you will always have the option in
the future to move to a three-school model later. That is inevitable, that has to be the case, and if
Members were to support amendment B1 now, which I will be suggesting that they do, you are
3025 not ruling out the possibility of moving to a three-site model down the road, metaphorically
tomorrow, further down the line. The four-site solution does give an added level of flexibility to
our successors, and it does not limit those options, unnecessarily, or unreasonably, and the ability
to not constrain your successors, I think, is quite an important objective.

I think, to be honest, sir, if I had known the extent of the legacy that had been handed down to
3030 the current Education Department, I may well have thought twice about my involvement some
four years ago. Of course, you have to deal with the legacy you have been given, but it is a
complicated thing, and when you join the States as a new States' Member you are joining a
moving train. But let's have some thought, at least, sir, for our successors, and in terms of the
flexibility of options in the future. I would say, sir, that it is easier to go from four sites, or four
3035 schools, to three sites or three schools in the future, if necessary, if absolutely necessary, but it will
be inherently difficult, if not impossible, to go from three sites back to four, if need be, if you vote
for amendment B2 and move today to a three-school model. It might well be that there is actually
no need to cross that bridge today, and to commit to that model today, when you can do it in the
future, and that is the argument for proper flexibility.

3040 The third point, sir, to what extent should we have regard to the public consultation on the
number of school sites, it seems to me, sir, that in this debate, quite simply the public reaction to
the Education Department's policy letter and proposals has centred particularly on the public
consultation results *vis-à-vis* the issue of selection at 11, and the introduction of selection at 14,
which we propose in terms of selection for pathways. There has not been an awful lot of light
3045 shed on the fact that we consulted on all four aspects of the policy letter, including the structure
of the Education Estate, and Deputy Hadley touched upon this a moment ago – sorry, it was this
morning – 70% of the respondents to the public consultation, in fact, did wish to maintain four
sites. Are we really saying that that is not significant? It has to be seen as significant, and the
reality is, sir, that the respondents to that public consultation had very little truck with the idea of
3050 a three-school model, notwithstanding the very persuasive arguments that have been made by
many in this debate. That is a reality.

And, sir, I was not going to mention this, but I think I am going to have to: I do not think that
we can disregard the fact that all of our email boxes have been going absolutely mad in the last ...
is it 24 hours? Maybe it is not even that, in terms of an absolute deluge of emails on this issue,
3055 and I am not going to go into the merits or demerits of the closure of any particular site, I do not
think that need to be done at this stage, but I do not think that we can possibly disregard that
flood of emails.

So, I am coming to the end now, sir. In summary, I would ask Members to, at the very least,
pause and really, really think before they vote on these amendments, and I would ask Members to

3060 support amendment B1, a four-site solution, because I think we should try to guard against too
much disruption. I think we need to maximise flexibility for the future, and for our successors, and
I do not think we should be too quick to disregard the fact the 7 in 10 people, 70% of
respondents to the public consultation wanted a four-site or four-school solution. That was a big
majority, and I would suggest, sir, that Members can support a four-site solution in those
3065 circumstances.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, Deputy James said the other day, a long, long time ago now, that she felt
3070 she had fireworks going off in her head. Well, I do not know, but if she is like me, after four days
of debate, those fireworks have turned to jelly!

Now, much of what Deputy James said resonated with me. That might well be because I have
more than once expressed to her my disbelief at the Education Department's hypocrisy when it
comes to the report now, and their arguments made to close St Andrew's School. (**Several**
3075 **Members:** Hear, hear.) We were told the reason for closure was falling pupil numbers, that there
would be a peak, and then the numbers would tail off. Here we are told we need four schools due
to rising pupil numbers. They want to retain four smaller schools rather than have three bigger
schools, when the reason for closing St Andrew's was that large schools meant better educational
outcomes and help recruitment.

3080 We were told during the St Andrew's debate that closing the school would not result in large
schools in the UK sense anyway, but a size to ensure better educational outcomes. To hear Deputy
Sillars earlier quote reports supporting smaller schools seems so, so ironic, and hearing others
quoting the advantages and disadvantage of smaller schools really gives a huge sense of *déjà vu*.
It does, however, support my point made the other day, that you can find an educationalist to
3085 support any argument you want.

Now Deputy Parkinson said he would like to see four schools and have each one specialise in
the arts or sport. Well, how would that work given the decision made yesterday, I think it was
now – it has been such a long time – to effectively result in selection for each school by catchment
area?

3090 All that aside, I think I should comment on a term used both in the run-up to debate, and
today, and that is value for money. It has been quite disappointing hearing some comments about
value for money, which have demonstrated a real lack of understanding as to what it means. Value
for money is at the heart of public service reform, and quite rightly so. On page 30 of that
document there is a diagram showing three interconnecting circles representing cost, quality and
3095 need, and the middle of it shows that where those circles interconnect we get value for money.
Value for money is not cost, Deputy Gollop. This debate is not about cost; it is about cost, quality
and need. Now I hear we should not be bothered about value for money when it comes to
education, health and social care, but this represents a complete misunderstanding of what value
for money means. You cannot just throw money at something, regardless of whether it is needed,
3100 or the quality of provision. This is an irresponsible use of taxpayers' money. That way leads to
financial meltdown.

I would remind Members, yet again, as I have done before, that in the consultation on the
Personal Tax and Benefits Review, respondents said overwhelmingly that they were not prepared
to keep on funding these services *ad infinitum*. Frankly, this report makes it impossible to
3105 determine whether the Department's proposed solution is value for money, it sets out little in the
way of figures, little on outcomes, and how this will lead to a better educational system, and that
is the problem.

In response to Deputy Gollop's accusations against the members of T&R who supported
retaining selection and now support the three-school model, well that is me. I supported
3110 selection, and I support the three-school model, but the fact is, you could have had a three-school
option under selection, as Deputy St Pier said in his opening speech yesterday. It would probably

3115 require more work, and the criteria for selection would need to change to make it work, but the point is, it could have worked. Sir, how can I, as Chair of the Public Accounts Committee, faced with this report, and at the same time seeing the potential for greater value for money, do anything other than to vote for the three site option? I cannot, and will be supporting amendment B2.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

3120 **Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you.

Yesterday Deputy Bebb and I both went into the library and we thought we would pull out Billets from his year of birth 1974 and mine 1963. He opened the 1974 Billet and arrived on a section on education and school rebuild. I opened the Billet from 1963, opened the page and it told me that 24 pensioners benefited from turkeys from the Labour & Welfare Committee from 1963, so no influence on this speech whatsoever.

3125 For the past 12 years, I have sat in this Assembly, and I have listened to a number of – dare I say, perhaps too many – speeches, some very good and some very bad, and heaven knows, I have to claim a few of the latter myself. Yesterday, we sat through one of the finest speeches delivered this term, it was the truth that hurt in a way that only a home truth can, and not only was the emperor referred to naked, we have to look to ourselves, each and every one of us, because we have been supportive, obliging tailors for quite some time.

3130 Elections are curious events. They deliver from the community the people's representatives and in this Chamber we then go on to elect those same people on to Committees, and how lucky we were to be able to elect the Education Committee that we did, and I stress I have 100% confidence in those political Members. Unfortunately, that Committee has come into this Assembly with more baggage than Terminal 5 at Heathrow, and by baggage I mean having to enact a number of Resolutions from a different time and a different place. Did even Deputy Torode or Deputy Berry believe in 2001, would they ever have thought, we would still effectively be debating the amendment or the consequence of that amendment from 2001 in 2016? Once the rebuild has over time, too long a period of time, become a focus for the community, a pledge had been made. There was a pact between the Government, we are told, and the people – a pledge that was made one afternoon, when those who supported selection believed it was going to be abolished, and something had to be offered up to the gods of secondary education. That last-minute amendment, and I stress the amendment, has been an albatross around the neck of the Education Department and the States ever since.

3145 Our high schools, and one in particular is now – there are others – a centre of excellence. That can happen when you put fantastic staff with brilliant young people – and we have brilliant young people on this Island, by the way, in abundance, and let's not forget that. You put those two, both the teachers and the students in the right facility, with the right staff, with the right tutors, the mentors, the learners, and they will deliver for you, and they will deliver for themselves. My plea is to my friends on the Education board, for when you are the middle of a storm, and perhaps it does feel like that for them at the moment, visibility can deteriorate, and perhaps tomorrow's horizons may not be visible any longer.

3150 I would just ask them to reflect for a moment, and just perhaps regroup, and I say it for these reasons. I have campaigned for the removal of the 11-plus for 16 years or so – I cannot compare with Deputy Sherborne's 47 – and yesterday it was consigned to history. Or was it? And this is the real dilemma I and many others face, for it is clear now, a four-school model with selection is where we could end up if we are not too careful. In the style of the best and worst television quiz shows in the 1970's I do not want my colleagues at Education to try for the boat, or even the caravan, or the family hatchback, only to walk away with the toaster. *(Laughter)* Three schools without selection is a prize, do not let it slip from your grasp.

3160 For the four days we have been in this Chamber we have been told, warned, that education is an election issue. Of course it is. Of course education is an election issue. But like many, I am

3165 prepared to step up to the plate and make those decisions, and face the electorate. That just happens to be called courage. I am not connected umbilically to Facebook and social media to the same degree as some, and I do not take any sustenance, solace, or comfort when some are calling for the electorate to consider their vote post this debate. Education can work with a three-school model. That is not, and should not, be seen as a bombshell. It is not a bombshell, it is something much smaller. It is a pin on the chair of financial reality.

3170 I did not anticipate saying any of that, and I am sorry to disappoint my good friends at Education, but I am now moved to support a three-school model.

The Bailiff: Deputy Duquemin.

3175 **Deputy Duquemin:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

If the Education Department were writing their own end-of-term report on Deputies, I think mine might even be one that I would take home to let my mum read, because like Deputy Fallaize during the debate on the closure of St Andrew's Primary School and St Sampson's Infant School I did stand shoulder to shoulder with them and would have got top marks for speaking with passionate support and voting accordingly.

3180 During this debate on the matter of the 11-plus and selection, I again stood shoulder to shoulder, speaking with passion and voting accordingly. Move to the top of the class, or perhaps a little bit behind Deputy Fallaize.

3185 But, sir, now is when the Education Department would be concerned I will blot my copy book. I will support the St Pier/Le Lièvre three-school amendment B2. But this, Mr Bailiff, should not come as any surprise to the Education Department, or any Deputy. During the debate at the end of May 2015, I asked the Education Department to seriously consider not rebuilding La Mare de Carteret High School. I was not the only one. Keep an open mind I said, not building La Mare de Carteret has to be just one of the carefully considered options.

3190 Deputy Fallaize was another to make it very clear the benefits that may come from three, not four schools. Whilst I would not expect the Education Department to necessarily listen to me, or even Deputy Fallaize, I would expect them to have taken notice, or perhaps better notice of the States' Resolution that was passed at the end of that May 2015 debate. If Members want to be reminded of exactly what that Resolution was, it is repeated on page 1506 of this Billet.

3195 Sir, yesterday Deputy Lowe asked how did we get here, suggesting this amendment was like a bolt from the blue. Mr Bailiff, it is, as many Members have said, anything but. Deputy Adam gave us a history lesson which was very valuable, but the Resolution on page 1506 does say:

'To agree that there is a strong case for rationalising the education estate'.

3200 It also asks for a report that included recommendations on the optimal size, number and location of secondary schools. Sir, very explicit instructions, and at least one option for moving from four to three secondary age schools.

3205 Mr Bailiff, it was my fear in May 2015, and it is my belief in March 2016, like others, that as sure as night followed day the Education Department were always going to come back with a report that recommended the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret High School and four secondary school sites/schools. I am afraid, sir, they paid lip service to the States' Resolution, and they were dismissive. I was disappointed to be proved right. True, the Billet included Option C, which would have been the closure of the Grammar School site, where it would have been replaced with a tertiary college. True, it included Option D, closure of the Les Beaucamps site and its use as a sixth form centre, and it included not Option E because it was not given the letter Option E, but it did include the closure – sorry, not the rebuild – of La Mare de Carteret because that was described simply as not feasible.

3210 Sir, there are parallels to be drawn between this debate and the debate on the closure of St Andrew's Primary and St Sampson's Infant Schools that we debated earlier. It was a point, I think, made by Deputy James earlier. So, the premise that the Education Department relied on in the

earlier primary debate, was do not let your heart rule your head. Base the decision on what is rational, not what is emotional.

3215

As I said earlier, against some pretty intense emotional lobbying and speeches in this Assembly, I and many others were shoulder to shoulder with the Education Department when it came to St Andrew's and St Sampson's Infant School, but moving on to this debate, whilst the Education Department may argue otherwise, it is my belief that I am one of those that is now remaining consistent, and that they have let their heart rule their head. They have made a predetermined decision, based on what is emotional and not what is rational. The Education Department, sir, were always going to come back with a recommendation and a report for the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret High School and a four site/four school secondary school model.

3220

Mr Bailiff, I cannot praise the staff of La Mare de Carteret High School high enough for the incredible validation that the school has just enjoyed – truly fantastic achievement by the head teacher and her leadership team, all staff, all pupils, in a very short time frame. But I have to take issue with some of the emails that we have received overnight from some of the staff at La Mare de Carteret High School – not their fault, sir, I applaud their undeniable passion and their pride in the school, but let's not let this emotion get in the way of a very basic fact.

3225

I hope that the Education Department will not try and argue otherwise, because I would consider them to be more than a little bit disingenuous if they did, but the undeniable fact is that La Mare de Carteret High School will cease to exist under their proposals in this policy letter, as will St Sampson's, as will Beaucamps, as will the Grammar School. The one-school, four-site model put forward by the Education Department means that it will cease to be La Mare de Carteret High School and will become *de facto* the Cobo campus of a Guernsey school. Ditto the Grammar School for Les Varendes campus and so on. For clarity the Grammar School and all three high schools will cease to exist.

3230

In his speech the Education Minister spoke about keeping La Mare de Carteret School open, its ethos, and talks about the Education Department's four-school model, but, sir, he flitted, when it suited, between referring to them as a one-school, four-site model, and then minutes later referring to it simply as a four-school option. He even admitted himself it was semantics. I really, at some points, did not know what was going on, and I repeat the Education Department's proposal is to close these four schools, and replace them with one school. That is the fact.

3240

So, moving on, let's look at the reasons why we should all, including the Education Department's own members, I hope, one of whom should be sitting next to me, support the St Pier B2 amendment, the three-school option.

3245

Earlier, I said there were parallels between this debate and the debate on primary school closures, and I will focus, very, very briefly on exactly the two same main areas that I focused on in my speech during that debate. One, the financial folly of the empty spaces and two, improved outcomes. Sir, I do not think I need to read the next page of my speech because the case, sir, has been made very well by many Members, including Deputy Dorey, who does not do rounded figures. His forensic analysis revealed the folly, albeit to a few decimal points of accuracy. Empty spaces in the primary sector were rightly challenged by the Education Department, and they should have done exactly the same for the secondary sector.

3250

Let's move on to the all-important educational outcomes. The size of a school does have bearings on educational outcomes. Many have made this point very well, and just as in the primary debate, when advantages of multi-form entry over single-form entry were highlighted by the Education Department as optimal, there is clear evidence that there is an optimum size for a secondary school – 600 to 1,000 has been said by many people. Not one school of 2,000 plus, over four campuses. As Deputy Adam revealed, and I know Deputy Dorey shared this fact with me, it was potential that the pupil roll at La Mare de Carteret High could fall to as little as 375, and that was alarming.

3255

Deputy Sillars himself, the Education Minister, and I support him on this fact, has often spoken about the postcode lottery that determines what breadth of subjects are available in different catchment schools. The Education Department is aware of the problem, the challenge they have

3260

3265

to provide equality, and quality of opportunity, but surely, appropriate-sized schools, which is in this amendment, are the best solution, and not a hard or soft federation where we bus children around the Island, wasting time and money. Setting will also be easier in a three-school system.

3270 Mr Bailiff, building a school that we do not need, to create a system where we have to bus children around the Island, is illogical. It is a waste of taxpayers' money. For me, sir, it is vital that some, if not all of the CapEx saving from not building a school, and the OpEx saving from having three not four sites, maybe not building the tertiary centre, maybe not building a new sixth form centre, whatever it may be, and not busing children around the Island could be invested in better teaching, including, perhaps, more teaching assistants. I will seek some reassurance from the T&R
3275 Minister in his summing up, that this could happen.

The Chief Minister, sir, early this morning also nailed his colours to the mast in this regard. I repeat exactly what I said yesterday, teachers are our most important precious asset in all of this, not systems, not buildings. Once again, let's make certain that whilst we debate our secondary education, we let our head rule our heart and not the other way round, exactly as we were
3280 encouraged to do by the Education Department during the aforementioned primary debate.

One final point, if I may, Mr Bailiff, as a Culture & Leisure member and a commissioner on the Guernsey Sports Commission, I think it is only right and proper that I square the circle when it comes to the enhanced sports facilities that feature in the Education Department's plans for La Mare de Carteret site. Speaking against the De Lisle amendment to cherry pick from the various
3285 aspects of the La Mare de Carteret plans, I was at pains to stress that the premium for upgrading from standard secondary school to enhanced sports facilities suitable for, I think the phrase was, 'county competition' was less than £2 million. I said that if, and I repeat *if*, the La Mare de Carteret project went ahead in full, then this will be a premium worth paying and will deliver incredible value for money. But, sir, even for a sportsman, like myself, the enhanced sports facilities, as
3290 welcome and wonderful as they would certainly be, are not a *bona fide* reason on their own an excuse to build a secondary school that we might not need. There are other options, and I think it is important that we look at options C, D, and E. I would love the outcome for sport, but this would be a nonsense, a folly and certainly not how the new Education, Sport & Culture Committee should kick off its existence.

3295 I also want to make absolutely clear in the voting, which I will do today, there is no slight whatsoever on the head teacher, the teachers, the students and the parents of La Mare de Carteret High School, or any of the other schools. Many, many have kept, as Deputy Green said, my iPhone busy all day with emails, orchestrated or not, continually pinging in my in-box.

Deputy Sherbourne was right to shine a light on La Mare de Carteret High School's recent successes, and state very clearly that in terms of validation it is at least on a par with the Grammar School.
3300

The next comment is an important point, and it is this. There are many reasons why an earlier reincarnation of the Education Department should perhaps have built La Mare de Carteret High School before it rebuilt, or instead of rebuilding, Les Beaucamps. But, as much as we want to, Mr
3305 Bailiff, we cannot rewrite history. This is surely no reason for taking even a breath before collectively writing a cheque for something that we might not need. For the avoidance of any doubt, not building La Mare de Carteret High School, if that is what eventually happens, is no slight whatsoever on anybody connected to the school.

In summary, sir, an amendment for three schools is certainly not a bolt from the blue. If we
3310 were to accept the Education Department's proposals unamended, the Grammar School and all three high schools would cease to exist anyway. This should provide us with comfort, perhaps even more reason, if it was needed, to treat this three-school amendment exactly the same way that the Education Department had encouraged us to treat the primary debate, because we should always have the courage to let our heads rule our hearts, rational, evidence-based decision making, based on empty spaces that will not compromise, that may even improve, educational
3315 outcomes. That is far better than an emotional pre-determined decision that ignored the hard truths and challenges that it faced. The future of this Island, as Deputy Clerc so wonderfully

demonstrated in her stand-out speech this morning, just very simply shining a light on the millions of taxpayers' money that we could be spending, is best served by passing St Pier B2.

3320 Whilst agreeing with much of the T&R Minister's analysis in his speech yesterday, he also said that it was his most important in his last four years, and I would suggest that that computes that this vote, on this amendment, will be for all 47 of us, our most important vote in the last four years. Let's all make the decision with our heads and not our hearts.

Thank you, sir.

3325

The Bailiff: Deputy Wilkie.

Deputy Wilkie: Thank you, sir.

3330 Sir, the main issue I have with a three-school solution is the unknown and unintended consequences. Sir, I cannot articulate the risks of closing a school and moving an entire school of children between other sites better than Deputy Sherbourne, so I will not. I agree with Deputy Parkinson that there is substantial evidence that smaller schools give a better educational outcome.

3335 Now we have just completely redesigned our secondary education system by removing the 11-plus. Do we understand what this actually means in practice? It means for the first time in 113 years all the Island's schools, States and private, will be on a level playing field. Parents for the first time will be able to judge which secondary school will be the best for their children. This has been happening for some time in the primary sector. We know that parents will take into consideration the available schooling when choosing where to live. I think we can all agree with that. It would be quite logical to expect this to be the case with secondary schools.

3340 What effect will this have on the school catchment areas, we simply do not know at this stage. What if the States' schools perform on a level or higher than the private schools, and there is a migration to the States' school system, as has happened historically in other jurisdictions when this occurs? How will we accommodate those children in a three-school system? Again we simply do not know.

3345 We are belatedly configuring our education system to match the social and economic requirements of our society in the 21st century. I will predict that the academic requirements of our civil and private entities will increase, and technology will, and currently is, reducing manual labour jobs. So what does this mean in practice? It is quite conceivable that in the near future more children will be pursuing higher academic qualifications, and we have heard the Education Minister mention that already. Now the next logical deduction is that if more students are staying on into the sixth form, then student numbers will increase, and if we move to a three-school system how will we accommodate these extra students? We simply do not know. It is perfectly conceivable that under the three-school system we will have to spend £30 million to £40 million extra on a purpose built sixth form centre, because of the short-sightedness of the amendment, which as a consequence removes any flexibility from the system.

3355 Can I agree with this amendment B2 on the grounds of value for money? No, I cannot. In fact it may cause additional capital expenditure in the future. Can I agree with this amendment on the grounds of improvement in educational standards? No I cannot. Smaller schools provide a better educational result. Guernsey could be in a situation that without substantial capital investment, there will be insufficient capacity to accommodate a growing number of pupils because of educational success. Agreeing to B2 will remove any possible flexibility of options for a future Education board to consider.

3360 The three-school philosophy is basically being pushed by some Treasury members, judging by the speeches I have heard. Treasury and the movers of this amendment have not produced any evidence-based figures on closing La Mare de Carteret School, and it is no good saying this amendment does not close La Mare. That cat is well and truly out of the bag. There are no evidence-based figures on capital savings, there are no evidence-based figures on revenue savings, and they do not even know how much it will cost. This is crazy.

3370 If I went to the Treasury with a business case and said, 'I have got a really great idea', and they said, 'Well, how much is it going to cost?', 'I do not know', 'What are the capital savings?', 'I am not sure', 'Well, what are the revenue savings?', 'I have no idea' – I would be rightly laughed out of the room, sir. But this is what is before us, and this is what we are going to have to decide on right now. (*Interjection*) Absolutely. There are no proven educational or financial benefits to the B2 amendment. Sir, there are too many 'do not knows', 'have not thought about it', 'not sure of the consequences', to agree to this amendment (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Sir, I ask Members reject this regressive amendment B2 that promotes failure in education. Thank you, sir.

3380 **The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak? Deputy Harwood.

Deputy Harwood: Thank you, sir.

I would ask Member to focus on the amendment which is before us, following the decision – was it yesterday, or the day before? – to abolish selection at 11-plus, we now have a new education system, and the issue that we have to face under these particular amendments is, what is the optimum number of schools required to deliver that system?

3385 It is perhaps unfortunate the Minister of the Treasury & Resources chose to conflict this particular amendment and the rather simplistic binary choice of whether it is the four sites and one school or the three schools amendment, when he threw in his unnecessary comments about the La Mare de Carteret.

3390 But, sir, we are where we are, and I would ask Members to come back to the actual amendments which are currently before us. I support the three-school model. Others have already identified the educational benefits that derive from that. Indeed, members of the Education Department themselves do not necessarily deny the educational benefits that can derive from a three-school model.

3395 Others have also amply illustrated the financial consequences and financial issues. I think the case has been well made. Sir, to those who are wavering, can I just refer to the fact, and Deputy Sherbourne has actually made the strongest case really, for the concern about the disruption that would follow from moving to a three-school model. Sir, can I be reassured that if we look at the wording of the amendment, actually, firstly the amendment does not identify which school should be closed. It is merely identifying the optimum number of schools for delivery of the new non 11-plus system is going to be three. Also, and perhaps more importantly, it is not necessarily identifying the time scale within which that transition down to three should be delivered. So, the actual argument about disruption, and clearly they are well made, means that the Education Department or its successor, actually can identify, if necessary, a prolonged period over which to do the transition to achieve the three school model.

3400 So, sir, I do not accept that merely approving this amendment will immediately cause disruption. That will be for the Education Department and its successors to manage and to transition, and as others have said, they successfully managed the transition within the primary school sector, I believe that they can more than adequately manage a transition down to a three-school model.

3405 So, sir, the arguments have already been well made. There are educational benefits certainly from moving to a three-school model, I will not repeat those. There are financial benefits also, and I will not repeat those.

3415 So I urge all Members to look at the wording of the amendment, and to go fully and in support of the B2 amendment:

'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).'

That, I believe, sir, is the optimum model for the future delivery of a non-selective education system.

Thank you, sir.

3420

The Bailiff: I see no-one else. Well, Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: Thank you, sir.

3425 Very, very briefly. I think we have got ourselves into something of a corner, something of a mess, really. I was going to say, I think we started scaring the horses – perhaps more likely we have actually started scaring the Guernsey donkeys, because I think we have now got two establishments that are up in arms, two establishments that do not know exactly what is going to happen to them, and I think that over the next four or five or six weeks, we are going to have a terrific amount of lobbying, which is going to be over, during, and after the Election, which is going to result, I think, in whatever decisions are made today, being challenged in the next term of Government.

3430

I do have a feeling that perhaps the best thing to do at the end of, when we have debated this, is that we actually turn the whole lot out and go back to the square one, and actually let the next term deal with it, because I can see an awful lot of upset people, and an awful lot of people lobbying over the next six weeks on one issue, and I think there is a lot more than one issue that should be being lobbied about.

3435

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy O'Hara.

3440

Deputy O'Hara: Thank you, sir.

I have heard a lot of speeches, and I am being told to vote with my head and not my heart. Well, I am sorry, I cannot help being the way I am. How can we close any school down? How can we do that? I am sorry, that is how I feel.

3445

Now, you might not like it, but that is how I feel. We gave promises to La Mare de Carteret, and we are letting them down, and it is all right you laughing, Mr Deputy Stewart. *(Interjection)* This is how I feel, through the Chair, I am sorry. *(Laughter)* I am sorry, okay, I am going to vote to keep four schools. I think it is wrong, the Education Department have been messed around for ages, for the last two years. I will not give way, thank you. I just –

3450

Deputy Stewart: Point of correction, sir.

I was not laughing, I was just incredulous that someone can say 'how can you not ever shut down a school?' Things change, the population changes, it was just the incredulous statement, and I just could not believe it, so that it what I was doing, sir.

3455

Deputy O'Hara: Yes, it is very funny how you are laughing, when you ... Sorry, sir, through the Chair, he was laughing. *(Laughter)* Obviously he was incredulous, and he was laughing. You have got no room to talk!

3460

That is how I feel, and I am not going to change from my opinion. I think these schools should continue. It is a shame that – clearly it looks like it is lost and it is going to be three schools, but it is such a shame – when we have had two years of being messed around, for those people, those teachers, and everyone involved in La Mare de Carteret, and all of a sudden it comes just like that.

3465

Now, I have said before in this Assembly that T&R have had too much control over this Assembly for a long, long time, and quite right, I can understand that, but it comes to the stage where here we are again looking to close another school. I am sorry, but that is how I feel. I know someone might get up and tell me off and say, 'Well Mike, you should know better, this, that and the other.' I am not bothered. The money, to a certain extent, I want to try to get the schools built. If it means that the sporting section has to go, and I should not say that, then so be it. These children deserve what we have promised them – and we are not doing it!

3470 I know someone has said today that La Mare de Carteret ... we are not talking about one school, but come on, common sense will tell you that that seems to be where ... Through the Chair, Deputy St Pier has said it, hasn't he?

Come on, think about it! Guernsey is changing so much all the time, and here we are again – I will give way.

3475

The Bailiff: Deputy Hadley.

Deputy Hadley: Mr Bailiff, the money *does* matter. The point our Department is making, time and time again, is that altering three schools is far more expensive than rebuilding La Mare. Money *does* matter. The board are proposing the cheapest option. (*Interjections*)

3480

Deputy O'Hara: Thank you.

Well, listen, seriously, Members, through the Chair, the Island is changing all the time. It has changed more in these last four years than ever before. Every time we move we change things left right and centre. What happened to us as an Island? What has happened to us? We are letting things slip!

3485

I am sorry, but that is how I feel, and I will not change how I feel. I joined this Government 16 years ago to try and do my best, and I have done that, and I have no doubt you all have as well, but there are times when I have to think twice of what we do and what we do not do in this Assembly. And today is one of them. I will sit down, sir.

3490

I am going to vote for the four schools, and that is how it is.

The Bailiff: Anyone else? Deputy Conder, on behalf of the Education Department.

Deputy Conder: Thank you, sir, and thank you colleagues.

3495

Thank you for the intellectual rigour of the challenge you have given us, the quality of the debate. Thank you for your patience when I have interjected into various speeches and my colleagues, and your consideration in allowing us to make the points we wanted to. Probably the best example, or one of the best examples, I have seen in four years of how this Government and this debating Chamber works, and I am very grateful and humbled by it.

3500

Sir, I will try and respond to as many of the points that our colleagues have made, but if I conflate them, I hope colleagues will forgive me, because time is late, and we still have a lot of work to do. But if I miss out any points, I hope colleagues will again interject and I will give way.

3505

Sir, can I start, simply by reminding colleagues of what this amendment says, B2 anyway, which seems to be core of what we are talking about:

'That 11 to 16 education in the States' sector shall be provided in three schools of a broadly comparable size...'

First point, broadly comparable size, and here comes the important point:

'(with at least one making provision for ages 16 to 19 (sixth form.))'

Now, when we are considering these proposals, and this amendment, which is what we will be voting for, whenever we get there, we have to consider whether or not any of the proposals before us meet that criteria, otherwise we are voting for a different amendment. This is the amendment that Deputy St Pier and Deputy Le Lièvre have laid.

3510

I do start, sir, by saying we cannot put the genie back into the bottle. Deputy St Pier, in his excellent speech, made it quite clear that what he is considering, as proposer of this amendment, is that La Mare de Carteret will not be built. That will be the school which will be closed. We had better say it. It is not really very genuine to say we are not talking about a school being closed – if you are not going to rebuild it, it is going to be closed. If we are going from four to three, there has to be a school that is being closed.

3515

So I am going to start on that basis in my response in making the case that we cannot, and should not, close La Mare de Carteret High School.

3520 Deputy David Jones, sir, was the first speaker this morning, I think, and he reminded us, and indeed I reminded him this morning before we met, that in November 2014 he said, in his own inimitable style, 'I will only support this review if there is no delay and if T&R Minister can assure me there will be no delay in the rebuilding of La Mare.' He is a very genuine and honest man. I opposed that amendment to bring in the review. He voted for it because he was assured there would be no delay, and he made his views on what has happened very clear this morning. He
3525 used the term, he has been thoroughly led up the garden path.

Sir, if I just come back before proceeding with some of the other points colleagues have made, can I just make the point, and this is fundamental, in terms of the exact wording of this amendment B2, if you want to support one of the three school options outlined in our report, that is either using the Grammar School for post-16 provision, or using Les Beaucamps for sixth form
3530 provision, then Deputy St Pier's amendment does not allow you do that. Why? Because his amendment keeps the sixth form provision attached to at least one 11-16 school. The two options, and really the only two options, other than closing La Mare, in our policy letter do not allow you to do it, and if you want to check it, I would just refer you to page 1532, so if you were supporting a three-school option, and you are supporting the rebuild of La Mare, then this
3535 amendment will not allow you to achieve that. You cannot achieve, under this amendment, the rebuild of La Mare and a three-school option. That is why Deputy St Pier was so honest. He made it absolutely clear. This is about not rebuilding La Mare.

So the case I will make is why we have to rebuild La Mare, but why we can build it at minimum risk.

3540 Sir, as I said, many of the responses and many of the speeches, excellent as they were, are conflated into the responses, and I will respond to my friend Deputy Fallaize, to one of the points which he made, which I think was covered by quite a few colleagues. Deputy Fallaize said the key to the new education system working would be the confidence of parents, that he believed a three-school model would be essential for this. What Deputy Fallaize does not appreciate is that
3545 even with the best resources and implementation plan, the confidence of parents will dip if a secondary school is closed. It is completely different to closing a primary school below recommended size and a secondary school within the ideal school size. We are planning three schools of 600 and one of 500, which exactly meets the recommended size. I would ask Members to read page 1703 of the Billet in full, some Members have selectively quoted, the recommended
3550 size is 600 to 1,000, but for disadvantaged communities 600 or fewer. The only reason La Mare is so small now is because the facilities are so poor. We will move students into La Mare once it is rebuilt.

What has been one of the reasons why we have had this outstanding school report in terms of La Mare in the last few days? It is because, yes, the school is relatively small at the moment and
3555 the teachers can intensively look after those children – because they are from a socially deprived area, there is no sense in pretending anything less. Why have they got outstanding results? Because they have got a relatively small school to cope with.

What is the unique thing about our school system, our secondary school system? Small schools, local communities, pastoral care – that is how we have achieved this extraordinary
3560 improvement in results since 2011. Do not forget that, colleagues. That is what you put in jeopardy. That is what we put in jeopardy, if we get this wrong.

Sir, these two amendments are the most important of all that we have looked at over the last four days, potentially one of the most important we have looked at in the last four years. If we get this wrong, then we are going to profoundly damage secondary education for generations to come. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It is proposition B2 which is potentially so calamitous, being badly
3565 timed and completely unnecessary in terms of the need to make the decision now, in respect of how many secondary schools we need in the future. Let me make it abundantly clear, as we proceed to upgrade, and modernise, our system of secondary education for the benefit of all of

3570 our children, the last thing we need to be doing is closing one of our four remaining schools, with
all the attendant transition issues and disruptions to teachers and students life. Such a change
might come at a later date, but now is certainly the wrong time. Nothing could be more
irresponsible than to decide to close a school through an amendment such as this, and at a time
when we are proposing and gradually creeping towards a decision to change for better the
3575 system and structure of secondary education in Guernsey. To combine such a system change with
the closure of a school, which could potentially utterly disrupt the education of a generation of
children and their teachers, would be, in my opinion, outrageous. These are young children's lives
that we are addressing, not a few widgets that can be manufactured in a factory somewhere else.

Colleagues, does this not smack of the decanting of children from one school to another as if
we are pouring a bottle of wine from one container to another? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) The
3580 Treasury & Resources Department states in its letter of comment that:

'within its mandated responsibility, is commenting on the resource implications associated with the proposals. It is not
seeking to comment on their educational [benefits]'.
'

Yet, Deputy St Pier, the sponsor of this amendment, and our Treasury Minister, and all of his
colleagues who have spoken in commenting upon his own amendment have made the claim that
large secondary schools would bring educational benefits. They have commented on educational
outcomes, as they have every right to, but they claim that is not why they are laying this
3585 amendment. They claim Dr Chris Nicholls, the author of one of the most rushed consultancy
reports we have received this term, which in its preparation did not even include a visit to or a
formal meeting with the head of the Grammar School. This is not, or should not be, about large or
smaller schools.

In recommending creation of a one-school, four-campus model we have recognised the
3590 benefits of larger school in terms of the broadening the curriculum, increased opportunities for all
children, economies of scale in the use of physical resources, economies of scale in the use of
human resources, economies of scale in terms of school leadership and essential services, and
greater career opportunities for teachers. This debate should be about whether this is the right
time to reduce our sites, campuses, or schools, call them what you will, and what the
3595 consequences for our secondary education system of such a move would be in the short and
medium term. Note I have not said in the long term. That is where the issue properly belongs.

So, what are these options for three schools? I am not going to spend your time in looking at
numbers, we have discussed that *ad nauseam*, we can discuss those but sufficient to say it is all
laid out for you on pages 1532 and 1533 of the Billet.

3600 The first option, close Les Beaucamps and turn it into a sixth form college. That might work,
but it immediately separates the sixth form from its feeder school, or schools, and creates a new
management entity with no savings in infrastructure, and it does not fit this amendment.

Second, close the Grammar School at Les Varendes. That is perhaps the obvious accountant's
solution, freeing up Les Varendes site for part of the tertiary institution. That solution certainly
3605 would not meet the criteria of the amendment for three schools of broadly comparable size, but –
and this is the big 'but' – that should make all of us both within and without this Chamber sit up
and take notice. The Grammar School at Les Varendes closures option spells one incontrovertible
fact, the closure and immediate demise of the institution we currently call the Grammar School.
Do not be fooled that somehow this intuition could be recreated elsewhere. This option spells the
3610 end of the institution we currently call the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre based at Les
Varendes. In making its proposals, your Education Committee has been at pains to ensure that
those parts of our secondary education system that are unique to Guernsey, and have a unique
ethos and culture and a special role within our system, are as far as possible retained within our
one-school, four-campus model, notwithstanding that the intake of each school will change with
3615 the abolition of the 11-plus. History and experience has shown that where such changes have
occurred elsewhere the ethos, culture and uniqueness of the institutions is retained within the
new model and their infrastructure. The only way of guaranteeing the destruction of the

institution that is currently called the Grammar School is to proceed with haste to the three-school model in which an accountant-driven model could see the closure of the Les Varendes site and its conversion to a tertiary institution. For members of the Education Committee that is a price too high to pay.

3620

I will happily give way to Deputy Duquemin.

The Bailiff: Deputy Duquemin.

3625

Deputy Duquemin: I thank Deputy Conder for giving way.

Sir, during my speech I did make mention of the fact that the one-school, four-site model that was being put forward by the Education Department, which is what is in the Billet, which is what the recommendation is, would mean that, as I said in my speech, the La Mare de Carteret would cease and become *de facto* the Cobo campus of the Guernsey school and ditto the Grammar School would cease and become Les Varendes campus of a Guernsey school. I also mentioned in my speech that we perhaps would always want to rewrite history, but, sir, is the Deputy Minister of Education Department now trying to rewrite the Billet?

3630

Deputy Conder: If I understood the point Deputy Duquemin was making I would answer, but I am afraid I do not. I will happily give way again if he wants to have another go. (*Interjections*)

3635

Finally, finally, colleagues and most incredibly to myself and members of the Education board, at the eleventh hour, the third prospect we have, the third option, is that we do not rebuild La Mare. Apart from the obvious question as to what we have been doing debating and progressing it for the past three years, the La Mare project, which we have debated so many times before, which you have made so many promises and commitments – do you remember the ‘there will be no delay’ promise? – is an integral package of education provision, crucial to future development of primary, secondary, pre-school and autistic provision on the Island.

3640

It should, of course, have been the first build but that is beyond our remit. The simple fact is if we do not build La Mare for a minimum of 600, there simply will not be capacity within our system.

3645

But let’s stop and think what would happen if we decide not to rebuild La Mare High at this late stage – when we have gone out to tender to the market place; when we have submitted our detailed planning applications to the Environment Department; when under your instructions we spent several millions of pounds designing the buildings; improvements to the infrastructure; when we have consulted with staff, students, parents and neighbours; when we have a team poised and ready to get on with the much needed project. We now vote against building some of the facilities, that is what Deputy St Pier is proposing. He does not want to rebuild La Mare de Carteret High School, he said it yesterday.

3650

I will tell you what will happen. We will have to let down our children, young people at La Mare, yet again. We will let down our hard working staff at both schools, yet again. We will have to go back to the drawing board, yet again – redesign all of the buildings that are left yet again, go out to tender yet again, delay expenditure in the local construction market yet again.

3655

So what else would happen if we do not build La Mare high school? We would have to redesign the external areas and campus solution for the plant. The energy and plant centre is currently located within the high school itself. If the high school is removed, then we need to redesign the other elements as stand-alone buildings. We would need to reorganise the overall site strategy. This would mean the placing of the buildings, minus the high school, on the La Mare site. We would need to resubmit the planning application. We would delay the project because of redesign and planning, and it would cost more. We estimate the additional cost simply of taking the building out at £3.8 million, design fees of £700,000, inflation of £1.4 million, contractor overheads and profits and associated costs with economies of scale at £1.7 million.

3660

3665

But it also will, of course, impact on the proposal that we build these other facilities on this site, and on all our other schools too – all our other students and all our other teachers, not just those

3670 at La Mare. No high school, no sports facilities. No high school, no all-through centre for our
growing number of children with autism and communication difficulties. The growing number of
children and young people with these difficulties will have to continue to be supported in
3675 completely inadequate Portacabins at Amherst, and squashed into a tiny space at St Sampson's
High. Our excellent and dedicated support staff have to battle on knowing the facilities they work
in are doing nothing to help the difficulties these children experience. All the benefits of building
the communication and autism base as part of the redevelopment is lost without the high school,
as we need the primary and secondary base co-located to provide the continuity and stability for
those children. All gone, the opportunity missed.

3680 What about the impact on the primary school? I will remind you that we are replacing an
existing two-form entry primary school with another two-form entry primary school in a centre of
a pretty densely populated area. Next to one of the largest social housing developments on the
Island, it must be rebuilt. But this amendment again throws that into doubt. What is absolutely
certain is that it will delay that rebuild, yet again.

3685 So why are we in favour of building a 600-pupil school at La Mare as part of a four-site option?
Now lots of people have quoted research, most of them have been from the Institute of Education
Report. That report suggested 600-1,000-pupil schools are most effective. We are, of course, at
the lower end of this. We are proposing smaller schools of between 600 and 720 for a range of
reasons.

3690 Why are we proposing what many of you consider are schools that are too small? We have
listened to the public regarding their preference for smaller schools. A number of people have
mentioned the 70% public consultation. I am waiting for my friend Deputy Trott to remind you all
that you are suffering a democratic deficit for failing to acknowledge that. The benefit seen with a
smaller size is pastoral care is better, it is easier to treat students as individuals, and it is rooted in
the local community, a community that desperately needs that pastoral support, that desperately
3695 needs that small school attention that they can have.

Why have we achieved those results? As I said earlier we have achieved those results because
of the nature of the school we have got there now that we want to replace. Moving to 960 would
necessitate closing a school with the disruption this would cause – difficulties in recruitment and
retention, forced moving of children during the secondary phase, and the negative impact on
3700 education outcomes, as we have already heard with the closure of St Peter Port. But our plans
allow for the expansion of La Mare in the future, very easily if we need to, and I will come back to
that in a few moments.

3705 Why do we need to have a school built specifically at La Mare site? What are the benefits of
sitting next to one of our largest social housing developments? Well firstly, and of course, he is
not here sadly, but I looked for my very good friend Deputy Le Lièvre, who was my predecessor as
Deputy Minister of Education, this would have been so important to him. It is sitting next to one
of our largest social housing developments. Well firstly, it is what our Island Development Plan
describes as a local centre – an area where there are certain facilities, a doctor's surgery, a
pharmacy, shop, post office, restaurants, playing fields, community facilities, and a school. Plus, of
3710 course, a large number of people living here.

What about the impact of children living in the La Mare de Carteret area, just where are those
children in that area to go? The primary school, of course, is absolutely essential. That is not at risk
apparently, although it is at risk of delay. It is a social priority school in a high density housing
area. If that school is not rebuilt, it is difficult to say how many of those children will get to school
3715 at all. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We do have some limited flexibility with respect to buses, but this
is particular challenging at the beginning and end of the day. We can move children quite easily at
break and lunchtime, but the logistical arrangements of buses at the beginning and end of the
school day is a nightmare, especially when these buses are already on scheduled service. Our
whole development of La Mare, which you have seen so many times before, and approved so
3720 many times before, is based on having community school facilities and services where our

community in Guernsey most need them. Those arguments all apply at secondary and primary school.

3725 I am completely unclear just where Treasury & Resources are expecting these children at secondary level to go. St Sampson's High School is virtually full to capacity, based on its existing catchment area, and capacity. We have been oversubscribed at St Sampson's High School for the past two years, and have struggled to balance numbers. This is at a point when our secondary population is at an all-time low, as many people have said. It is expected to rise substantially over the next 10 years. There are more than 60 additional children in our current reception compared to seven years ago – that is just one year group.

3730 Therefore, I can only assume that the plan is to increase average secondary school class sizes to an average of at least 27 or 28, rather than the 24 they are at the moment. This is just an average. These figures make no allowance for the fact that from one year to the next the distribution of pupils across the Island does not fit nicely into catchment areas or primary school numbers which exactly fit our secondary school numbers.

3735 Sir, just come for a moment to this issue of spare capacity. Not all unfilled school places can be considered surplus. The Audit Commission advise some margin of spare school capacity is necessary to provide flexibility for unexpected influxes of children and expressions of parental influence. The Audit Commission does not recommend a single level of spare places that would be appropriate, but it is stated that 10% spare capacity is generally agreed as a level providing good use of resources, and an opportunity for parents to express a preference. Sir, if we were to close one school we make no allowance for the fact that we tend to teach our top set in larger classes. It does not deal with the issue that our school halls, our exam areas, our canteen areas, our fire regulations, do not allow for increased numbers. Let that be clear, the remaining schools would need to be expanded to a size they were not designed for, for the number of students who would have to be fitted into them. Without changing the building regulation, we cannot legally accommodate these numbers of students and staff.

3740 Colleagues, I spelled out, or tried to spell out, to you the very real and profound dangers inherent in rushing into a three-school model, based upon closing one of our schools at this time, but it is all so unnecessary. Let me take you back to one of our earlier debates in the Assembly when we, the Education committee, explained to you the inbuilt flexibility incorporated in the building of La Mare de Carteret as a 600-place student school, as we were recommending to you at the time. I clearly remember, and you might also remember, that we tabled a floor plan of a 600 La Mare design, and I waved it around and demonstrated to you how easy it would be at some future date to extend the school to a 960 build, if that is what a later Education committee, or our Government, decided was right for the time. That scenario still stands.

3755 We are advised that the additional cost in undertaking a two-stage development at La Mare de Carteret, should that need ever arise, from a 600 school to a 960 school would be approximately £800,000. That is the incremental cost at some future date of extending to 960 and yes, going down to a three-school model, as compared with *ab initio* building a 960 – £800,000. That is all of the additional commitment we would incur, at today's price.

3760 Can I remind colleagues, as a result of our collective procrastination to date – I am as much of that as all of the rest of you, I accept my collective responsibility for these procrastinations – we have potentially cost the Guernsey taxpayer an additional £4 million-plus in building costs, simply as a consequence of rising building costs, building inflation currently being far in excess of general inflation. The incremental additional cost of securing the flexibility of building 600 now, rather than 960 – which perhaps in other circumstances might be described as an interest lock, just to make sure you do not incur the additional costs – is small compared to the ever-rising costs of the build of a secondary school of whatever size.

3765 Colleagues, we started this debate about whether or not we need to build La Mare, and it is clear from what Deputy St Pier says, his preferred three-school model is not to build La Mare. The terms of the amendment he has laid do not allow him to meet the criteria of having a sixth form attached to schools unless he does build La Mare.

3775 Now, colleagues, what are the compelling reasons why we should reject this three school
model for now? If we approve my committee's plans for secondary education, as detailed in the
Billet, as amended, particularly the removal of the 11-plus examination, then we are embarking on
a radical change in the delivery of our secondary service, which is pregnant with the need for
carefully and systematically adopting new systems and practice. Why would we impose such an
unnecessary upheaval, with such uncertain outcomes that a school closure would impose at such
a time? How can it be correct, on the basis of this amendment, to decide such a radical change in
3780 our school infrastructure, such change that affects individuals? It is not simply a matter of
decanting one group of students from one school to another – it needs proper planning and
analysis. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

But most compelling, it is utterly unnecessary at this time. All of the Education committee's
plans embodied in this report allow for a future reduction from four to three campuses, or schools
3785 if you like. If the executive head, or the three heads, four heads, if the executive head or the senior
management team and the Board of Governors were to make such a recommendation to a future
Education committee, surely that is where the initiative for such a change should come from.
Those who are working at the forefront of the delivery of our education system, who know how
our system is best working for our young people, who know how new techniques for delivery will
3790 impact upon their need for discreet and specialist spaces, who can identify where cost savings can
be made in managing their budget – surely, these are the people and these are the processes by
which a decision to close a school or site should be made, not on the basis of an amendment
authored by the Treasury & Resources Minister and seconded by the former Deputy Minister of
Education.

3795 Sir, there is only one certainty in this debate. If this Assembly votes to close one of our schools
or not redevelop it, it seems semantics to me to try to differentiate between those two. If this
Assembly votes to close one of our schools and go for a three school model, there is no going
back. That school is closed. If in a few years we discover we have made a serious mistake, that is it.
My colleagues and I all believe that for the reasons we have explained, that for all circumstances
3800 we must rebuild La Mare Secondary School as an integral part of our secondary provision. To use
Deputy St Pier's oft-used phrase, it would be madness to do otherwise.

If however, we vote for amendment B1 and provide for four sites, the door is left open for
further reappraisal of our provision, when the rest of the proposed changes have bedded in, and
education leaders can judge how best we can provide for the future provision of secondary
3805 education. At that time, and only then, can we safely make an informed decision about how many
sites we need to deliver secondary education most effectively and equitably on this Island?

Colleagues, do not compound the error of previous Governments in devising not-fit-for-
purpose educational strategies on the hoof. Allow our future education leaders and future
Governments to make properly informed decisions as to the Education Estate and leave a decent
3810 legacy for the future generations of this Island's young people.

Reject amendment B2, the three-site option. It is unnecessary at this time and puts the future
secondary system at risk. Support amendment B1, the four-site model. It offers stability, flexibility
the potential for future adjustment and carries no medium-term downside risk.

3815 And most importantly, finally, finally, address the scandal of La Mare de Carteret Secondary
School that this States and previous have so shamefully allowed to drag on. A school and
community that for so long have been promised so much, and for so long have been told to wait
just a little longer, and now at this last moment have been told they have been sold down the
river, that those promises were false – how can we do that?

Support amendment B1. It is a pragmatic, sensible and honourable solution.

3820 Thank you, sir. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Members, I am proposing that we continue to sit to finish this debate. There is
only Deputy St Pier to respond to the debate. When he has done so, we will then have to take a
decision as to when we continue or resume.

3825 Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

3830 Sir, it is late, we have been debating this particular amendment now for 24 hours. It was 24 hours ago that I put a target on myself and made myself one of the most hated people in Guernsey, probably, with the speech that I made yesterday. I will attempt to be brief, and to run through some of the points that have arisen in the debate, but I am not going to obviously cite everybody.

3835 I think actually I will start with Deputy Conder, sir. He said listen to the education profession and they will tell us when it is the right time to close a school in the future, and as I said in my opening speech yesterday, sir, I have been listening to the education profession, and the education profession has been saying that the one-school, four-site model is not what they are recommending. As for a future decision, that kind of makes sense, you make the decision at some point in the future, but of course, by saying that, we are ignoring the fact that we are being asked to make a decision as part of this debate in relation to a significant capital project, and to de-
3840 couple those two, I would suggest, sir, is nonsense.

Deputy De Lisle asked, what about the other facilities that were going to go on the site? Deputy Brouard said, what about the costs, what would happen to that site? He mentioned the King Edward VII. Deputy Hadley also made the same point – we need to know what the cost-benefit analysis is, and I will return to that, because that is a recurring theme through a number of
3845 Members' observations and comments, sir.

Deputy Lowe said ... Well to be fair, sir, of course, I expect Deputy Lowe as the president of the management committee for La Mare to quite rightly adopt the position that she did. It is absolutely right that she should do so, and she would failing in her responsibility in that role not to defend the La Mare in view of the contents of my speech yesterday, so I must acknowledge
3850 that, and clearly it is right also that she would seek to engender support for that position.

She said why now? Why not two years ago? Sir, I think she should know, perhaps more than anybody, having been the longest-serving Member of this Assembly, that it is this States that have failed to make the decisions in the right order. We are living with the legacy of the decision of the last States, in particular, to go ahead with Les Beaucamps High School, and it is left to us in our
3855 last meeting to seek to unravel the mess of that decision at that time. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) She asked about the Castel Hospital site, what about housing there? That was on the front page of *The Press*. I can confirm there are no firm plans for housing at the Castel Hospital site. It is a possibility, no decisions have been made. If in the fullness of time housing is put there, clearly Education will need to consider the impact on their catchment areas. She said that 500 was too
3860 many at La Mare, but we are being asked to build a school for 600.

Deputy Sillars then, in presenting his Department's position, made a lot of points, and I clearly will touch on just some of them. In essence T&R gave us the money, the business case, said it was compelling, excellent value for money. Those reviews, of course, presumed that the underlying
3865 assumptions were correct. The people who undertook those reviews assumed that those underlying assumptions for the business case were correct. That is what we have been questioning for some time.

I felt it was a slightly bizarre role reversal, because the Minister for Education was arguing his case, certainly at the beginning, on financial grounds. He asked, how would we protect the education of the students that are there? Well, that very much, sir, is a matter for Education to
3870 make the proposals, and I will come on again to the consequences of a vote on B2 in a moment, because, again, it touches on costs and so on.

Deputy Wilkie, little information, made the same point as Deputy Sillars, there is no information on costs here. No, there is no information on costs, because what we are doing, what we are asking is for the States to make a strategic education policy. That is all that is being asked.
3875 There will be consequences from that, that the Education Department will need to work through.

We may ask them to make a decision on selection and no selection, and now it is on the number of schools that should deliver that non-selective education policy.

3880 Much play was placed by Deputy Sillars, and Deputy Conder on the reference to 'at least one' in relation to 16-19 provision. Sir, that is a phrase that has been picked up from their own Proposition 1b. I would suggest, sir, it is for Education to tell us whether they recommend one, two or three. It means what it says: at least one.

3885 Sir, we then had what Deputy Kuttelwascher would call the 'confuse and conquer strategy'. If there is a fighter aircraft under attack, it throws out a lot of chaff as a way of distracting the heat-seeking missile, and I felt that was what we got into. We talked about compulsory purchase of land, power points, muster points, toilets, we have had buses, and it explains, to me, sir, why the Department have got to, and how we have got to, where we have got to, because they have failed to focus and bring to us the broad strategic secondary policy decision. That is what we are looking to make here.

3890 T&R were then accused of being inconsistent – mention of 480, mention of 600, mention of 960 pupils at La Mare, which is it? We are being inconsistent. T&R have been consistent throughout this in the last three years. We have consistently said you should not put the cart before the horse. You need to make a decision on selection, then you need to decide the number of schools, then you can decide what and where those schools should be, and how they form part of the Education Estate. We have been very consistent on that.

3895 Chris Nicholls said that there needed to be sensitive planning, and very careful consideration. Absolutely, that is the next step.

3900 Sir, he said there was no opportunity to collaborate between three schools. Why? I think, that was addressed, actually, by members of his own Department, who conceded that there was absolutely no reason why collaboration could not continue between three schools. It is going on now, and it can go on in the future.

3905 Let's go back to this question of, why are there not any detailed numbers in here? What is the cost-benefit analysis? What are the consequences? I referred to it in my opening speech, sir. It would be my intention to bring a consequential amendment, and I am sure the Education Department will want to consider the consequences themselves. But my draft would say something along the lines of 'Tell Education to go away, come back and tell us the full details of the capital and revenue implications of implementing Proposition 1a', in other words a three school model. The policy letter should also include, if appropriate, any recommendations for the provision required in respect of any of the facilities previously proposed for that site, and so on. That is the way that we address this in a logical order. We make the policy decision, then

3910 Education go away and tell us show they are going to implement it.

3915 Much play is put on this '70% of the public favour the four-school model'. Deputy Parkinson mentioned it, Deputy Green mentioned it. Sir, I had an email from one of the participants in the focus group who said that 'We were at the focus group, where the specific question was asked, "Should we be considering the financial aspects when arriving at decisions?" The facilitator categorically stated no. Hence the majority went for four schools, not four campus one school, as it was not an option. No-one considered the significant extra cost of their preferred choice, nobody considered the spare capacity in existing schools. Had the group been properly briefed, the collective opinion may have arrived at a very different conclusion.'

3920 Sir, I am afraid the consultation on that particular point was poor, because it failed to mention, apparently, cost or capacity.

3925 We talked about the need for spare capacity, and I think Deputy Gillson picked that up in his speech about, actually, another issue is where do the colleges fit into the secondary education policy for the States? That is not addressed, but clearly there could well be a role for the colleges in addressing some of our future spare capacity, and again, I would expect that to be a consequence of this amendment, that Education Department go away and consider that, and properly advise us on whether that is part of their model, or not, in the future.

Deputy Sillars did concede that a three-school option is possible. He said the unions did not like the three-school model. With respect sir, they wouldn't, would they?

3930 Deputy James referred to the primary school closures and the inconsistency there, and Deputy Soulsby picked that up, as well.

Deputy Adam very wisely reminded us of the Barnett Report and the three schools which was Education's own policy in 2001, and also referred to the option, possibly of the tertiary college, again that could well be one of the consequences that come out of this, that that is what is looked at.

3935 Deputy Dorey reminded us of Chris Nicholls' comments about the need for vibrancy and buzz by having schools that are full, not half empty, because there are not enough pupils for the capacity of the school. He also described the problems of federation.

3940 Deputy Bebb, again, I think made the same point about the colleges and their role in helping to accommodate the peak, and whether there was a role there. That setting would be better with three schools. That is a very important point that Deputy Bebb made: with bigger schools, setting will be better. That absolutely is critical to the case I made yesterday of better educational outcomes, which is exactly what the teachers have been telling us as to why they think it is a better model.

3945 The one-school, multiple-campus model – and that is a phrase which I think Deputy Conder used – with respect, sir, I think it does work rather better for the age groups that Deputy Conder has been more familiar with in his professional career than the age group that we are talking about in younger to mid-teens. Deputy Le Lièvre absolutely picked up on this point, as this was the major flaw in the whole scheme for him – this idea of the one-school, multiple-campus model.

3950 Deputy Paint spoke about the smoke and mirrors, picking up on a comment from Deputy Dave Jones, and I understand Deputy Paint's chronic dilemma that he is in, but I think this point was picked up, particularly, by Deputy Gillson – it has all changed. The position has changed from 2001. What we thought had been promised is no longer the same, because we have agreed to a non-selective system, and the numbers of pupils in the system have changed, and that is why Deputy Paint, sir, I would suggest needs to change his position, because of the changed circumstances.

3955 Deputy Dave Jones referred to the passion of Deputy Le Lièvre, and I think he was inadvertently making the point as to exactly why we should listen to Deputy Le Lièvre because he is a man who is passionate and who does not adopt his positions easily, and therefore to have changed on this one is critical.

3960 Deputy Lester Queripel produced a quote from the newspaper and asked me to, in essence, comment on it. The correspondent, I think, is absolutely right, Deputy Lester Queripel, through you, sir, in that this debate is incredibly important to get the education right for the future of our economy. That is precisely the point. What will produce better educational outcomes, three slightly larger schools, or one monolithic school through four sites, broken up?

3965 As for the point that is made about the pupil-teacher ratio here, sir, this is simply a reference to the fact that we are currently operating at a high number of teachers per pupils than is the current education policy. Education's policy is currently one pupil to every 15 teachers, and currently we have more than that. We have one pupil for every 12.6 teachers, so in fact we are not suggesting –

3970 **Deputy Sillars:** It is the other way round, I suspect – it is the numbers of children to one teacher.

Deputy St Pier: It is the number of teachers, one teacher for each 12.6 children.

3975 The point, sir, for Deputy Lester Queripel, is there is nothing in here which seeks to change that policy at all. Again he asked the same question, what is the long-term vision for this site, picking up on particularly if it was in relation to La Mare? Again, as with all our sites, clearly, if their use changes, then we have to work out what to do with them. That is exactly the process we are going through with the Castel Hospital site and the King Edward VII right now.

3980 Deputy Laurie Queripel said there has been no analysis and it should have been done. Absolutely, I agree, that is the next stage. His principal concern was around whether we could guarantee that the bulk of the money would stay on Island, depending on which route we went down, given that we know there will be capital requirements, either way. I cannot, of course, give him that guarantee, because I do not know what the final solution will be. But what I would say is I would say it is far more likely that a smaller number of smaller projects are going to help the local economy, local contractors, than a big scheme. It is far more likely that that will be the outcome.

The Bailiff: Deputy Hadley. Your microphone.

Deputy Hadley: Thank you for giving way.

3990 It is worth saying at this point that the view of the Department – and these are the professionals' views, it is not my personal view – is that having five projects running together, which would be entailed if you were not to build La Mare and start altering all the other estates that we have, five projects running together would overwhelm the staff of the Department – this is their view, not mine – and also overwhelm the construction industry.

3995 I come back again, that the figures I gave for the extra expenditure of £12 million at each site to enlarge the other schools are not my figures. These are the view of the Department. You talk as though the Department has not looked at the financial case. They have looked at the financial case. The point is that we just do not happen to agree with it.

4000 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, Deputy Hadley also talked about poor governance, and so, I would say that the reason that we have been put in the position that we have been put in is because we have not made the decisions in the right order up to this point.

4005 Deputy Fallaize spoke about the one-school, four-site model having been rejected by the community, and I would agree with that, and he also said it is not for Deputy St Pier to direct that La Mare be closed. That is absolutely right, that is not part of this Proposition at all.

Deputy Parkinson, sir, the only comment I would make in relation to Deputy Parkinson's comments is that Deputy Fallaize's preferred option is, I would say, irrelevant because it is not on the table.

4010 Deputy Sherbourne said that there had been penny pinching in relation to Beaucamps High School. That, sir, is incorrect. I did not want to interrupt him at the time, but the Billet back in 2010 made it very clear:

'The Education Department has now taken the decision not to proceed with the establishment of a new primary school at St Sampson's and to reduce capacity requirements at Les Mare and Les Beaucamps High School because the school population has fallen markedly and this has led to a revision in the requirement for pupil numbers in the future.'

4015 That is what drove the size of Beaucamps High School, it was not penny pinching. He also said – and this was very telling, Deputy Sherbourne's speech was absolutely critical, sir – this was not about data, it was about process. I understand exactly what he was saying. He was saying, in essence, we have got to where we have got to because of how we have got here, but that does not mean that it is the right place to be. We are at a juncture where we can make the right decisions, and that is exactly what we should be doing.

4020 St Peter Port School, he said the closure there was managed badly, but that, of course, is no reason to avoid school closures again, and his Department have brought school closures to this Assembly, and had this Assembly's support, and they have been much better managed. That is no reason to avoid school closures if it is the right thing to do educationally.

Educationally, he said, a three school model is the best answer – coming from Deputy Sherbourne. He said he understood there were other issues, and they needed to be managed.

4025 **Deputy Sherbourne:** Can I have a point of correction, there, sir.

I am sure that I will need *Hansard* to check that, but I would not have actually said that it was the best solution. I said that it was a logical ... not a logical, an appropriate solution. But so is a four-school.

4030 **Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

I will stand corrected on the record, having written down 'best', if that was not in fact what Deputy Sherbourne said, I do apologise, but I am grateful for him conceding that he certainly accepts that it is a model.

4035 I understand too that there are these other issues that need to be managed. He said now is not the right time – which was a point that was again made by Deputy Conder, and Deputy Conder said that in the long term is the time that we need to make this. Well as we all know in the long term, sir, we are all dead.

4040 Deputy Harwood made the point that there is no time frame attached to this amendment. That is critical, there is no time frame attached to this amendment. This is a decision about adopting a three-school policy. It is up to Education to work out whether to adopt it in the short, medium, or long term, and tell us how they are going to do it. Surely, sir, I simply cannot accept that now is not the right time, given that as part of this policy letter we are being asked to commit a substantial sum of money as part of the model that has been proposed to us.

Soft or hard federation – suddenly that seemed to lose its importance a little bit.

4045 There was a challenge over whether four sites would attract teachers. Deputy Sherbourne said that it will attract teachers. Sir, I was contacted last night again by a very experienced educationalist who said that three schools would be more cost-effective, and that larger schools would produce better outcomes – a repetition of exactly what I was saying in my arguments yesterday. That was exactly the argument Deputy James referred to that was used for consolidation of the primary sector. 'A one-school, four-site model is nonsense', was the phrase that was used. But more importantly he went on to address this question of recruitment. Schools are all about people, and the analysis that was given to me is that the heads of the schools will effectively become the campus leader, in other words they will become glorified deputy heads. That will be a post which is much less attractive to people in the future, was the advice that I was given, so I am not sure that I accept that this model will attract teachers as was suggested.

4055 Deputy Sherbourne did say it could work over three. It could work over three. I think others have made the point, Deputy Gillson in particular, that surely, if it can work over three it would be better to work over three because it will be easier to operate over three.

4060 **Deputy Brouard:** Thank you for giving way Deputy St Pier.

I made a mistake yesterday, I tried to get the States some information about the proposals that Deputy St Pier was putting forward with regard to La Mare and get some figures and paper work that I could actually see in my hand. Unfortunately I had to blow my speech to get that, and, of course, unfortunately we have not actually got that information.

4065 But just on that, just looking at the economy of the Island, and teaching in particular, which Deputy St Pier was just talking about, if a stable economy is attracting business into the Island, I am not too sure that having La Mare up in arms, not knowing whether it is going to be open or closed, a Grammar School going to be closed, is going to be a stable position to attract teachers. I just cannot see that. Maybe in 10 years' time when the dust has settled, but at the moment it is going to be absolute pandemonium.

4070 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, Deputy Gillson spoke about the federation of the three-site model operating better, operationally, and talked about the total capacity in the Island. I would agree with that analysis.

4075 In relation to Deputy Green's comments, again, picking up on Deputy Gillson's comments, how much flexibility do we need in the system? To have an additional 10% over the additional 5% capacity built into the numbers really is, I would suggest, too much.

4080 I would thank Deputy Soulsby, sir, for her excellent analysis of what value for money means. I think I will definitely need to refer back to *Hansard* for that because it absolutely hit the nail on the head.

Deputy Brehaut's point about us being the supporting tailors for the Emperor's new clothes project, is absolutely right. We as the States are responsible, as are our predecessors, for allowing us to have got ourselves into this position.

4085 Deputy Duquemin asked me to comment on whether more resourcing could end up on the front line. My views on that, absolutely. I will repeat what I said in yesterday's speech, educational outcomes are being compromised and constrained by obtaining such poor value for money. What I mean by this is we could be ploughing more into front-line teaching, where it will be most effective, if we were not wasting it on an inefficient one-school, four-site model. So, that would be my comment in relation to Deputy Duquemin's comments, sir.

4090 Sir, I want to wrap up with just picking up on final couple of comments that have come in. We have, of course, all had our inboxes inundated with messages, mainly on behalf of members of the La Mare community, on behalf of that school and that area, and I absolutely understand the passion and commitment of all of those involved in the La Mare community. I would expect and hope for no less, and Deputy Sherbourne referred to that in contrast to the experience at the St Peter Port School.

4095 I just want to give you a couple in a little more detail. One correspondent said:

'I feel very sorry for both parties to the current debate on the three-school structure. You have both been left in an unenviable position. Also we must not forget the impact the uncertainty is having on the staff and students of the school, who this morning had to face a barrage of reporters and cameras. The real serious mistake leading to the current problem was the decision to rebuild Les Beaucamps on its cramped site.'

That has been mentioned, I think we all can see that is true.

'At first I was tempted by the one school on four sites proposal',

and this is coming from another former senior educationalist –

'as a reasonable compromise',

'as a reasonable compromise' – I used that language in my speech yesterday, sir –

'but deeper reflection causes me to support the three schools of around 750 students as you propose. It makes sense from a curriculum point of view, staff recruitment, and yet avoiding a vast comprehensive. I base my view on what I hope is the best for the strategic development of the service.'

4100 And so on.

Then I have just two other little anecdotes. I had one message from somebody in the last couple of days in relation to the decisions that have been made so far, and it was three words that I have not heard before: 'best States ever'. (*Laughter*)

4105 As I was walking down the High Street today a lady came up to me and she grabbed me –

Several Members: Ooh!

Deputy Trott: By the throat? (*Laughter and interjections*)

4110 **Deputy St Pier:** I was fearing, Deputy Trott – through you, sir – that it was going to be by the throat, but she said to me, 'You won't want me to talk to you, but I just want to thank you.' I said, 'Oh really?' She said, 'I just want to thank you. I worked at Les Beaucamps High School for 37 years, and I just want to thank you.'

4115 My personal opinion is that it makes no sense to rebuild La Mare, but that is not in this Proposition. The decision today is about our education policy, and it is up to Education to work

out how to implement that, and that very much, I suspect, is the theme of any consequential amendments.

Sir, the States should not in good conscience support a one-school, four-site model which locks us into an inefficient and educationally flawed model for the next generation or two.

4120 Please support B2. *(Applause)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Sir, just a point of correction. I did not want to interrupt Deputy St Pier before.

4125 He mentioned where I said 500 was too many. I was talking about the current La Mare de Carteret School. I am fully aware it is 600 for the new development – only for *Hansard*, I think it needs to be corrected.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

4130

Deputy De Lisle: Sir, the Minister did not give us the numbers that he promised earlier on with regard to the costs and benefits of his three-part model.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I did not promise any numbers. I said that that would be addressed through the consequences of this amendment, and what needed to be done next.

4135

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

4140

Sir, I did not want to interrupt the Minister when he was speaking. Am I too late to ask for clarification (**Several Members:** Yes.) on a point that he responded to?

The Bailiff: Yes, he has sat down now.

4145

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: There is a request for a recorded vote on, first of all, amendment B1, which for the benefit of anyone listening is:

'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.".'

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, before we vote can I just check. On B2 when we come to the vote on that, are you going to accept that Proposition 1c had changed to 1a?

4150

The Bailiff: Well, it has not, because at the moment it has not changed.

Deputy Fallaize: No. But I am saying if B1 gets through, are you going to permit B2 ... ?

4155

The Bailiff: We will deal with that when we ...

Deputy Fallaize: Well I want to know before I vote on it please, sir, because I do not want – it makes a difference to the way I vote ... Because the top of B2 says to delete Proposition 1c.

4160

The Bailiff: Well, that is the amendment before us, Deputy Fallaize. If there is a request from the proposer to amend it, I will consider that, but it is not for me to alter an amendment that has already been under debate for 25½ hours and nobody has yet raised that point.

Deputy Trott.

4165

Deputy Trott: May I just check, I know this is most unusual, but I am going to ask you nonetheless, this is a vote that has enormous public interest and we are, due to the lateness of the hour, absent our two Alderney Representatives. Is there any precedent for a vote of this type being delayed until all 47 Members of the Assembly are – *(Interjections)* let me finish – until all 47 Members of the Assembly are in this Assembly, bearing in mind that we will be reconvening and debating this States' report for several more hours after the vote on this amendment is taken.

4170

My fear, is, sir, that there will be cries from within our community, because it is going to be very close, that we are not all present.

4175

The Bailiff: The Procureur is going to answer that.

The Procureur: Just to say that I am not aware of any such precedent, and always we get situations and if we did delay it you could not guarantee that everybody would be here.

4180

The Bailiff: Exactly. I was going to make that point. I have been told that if we sit tomorrow there are Members who are not able to be present tomorrow. If we sit next Tuesday there are Members not able to be present next Tuesday, so I do not know when you would be delaying it to, Deputy Trott. There is no certainty there would be any time when 47 Members would be present.

4185

Deputy Trott: I accept your ruling, sir, but I am glad I mentioned it.

Deputy Burford: Excuse me, sir.

4190

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Just for clarity, if amendment B1 is passed, we then proceed to vote on B2, **(The Bailiff:** Exactly.) and if that is passed it overrides B1.

4195

The Bailiff: Yes.

Deputy Burford: Thank you.

4200

The Bailiff: But I am not going to alter the wording Deputy Fallaize. That is what you are asking me to do, and that is not for me to do.

Recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 19, Contre 26, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

POUR

Deputy Robert Jones
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Sherbourne
Deputy Conder
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Trott
Deputy Fallaize

CONTRE

Deputy Harwood
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Domaille
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Bebb
Deputy St Pier

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Alderney Rep. Jean
Alderney Rep. McKinley

Deputy Laurie Queripel	Deputy Stewart
Deputy Lowe	Deputy Gillson
Deputy Le Lièvre	Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Collins	Deputy Ogier
Deputy Green	Deputy David Jones
Deputy Wilkie	Deputy Spruce
Deputy De Lisle	Deputy Duquemin
Deputy Burford	Deputy Dorey
Deputy Sillars	Deputy Paint
Deputy O'Hara	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Hadley	Deputy James
	Deputy Adam
	Deputy Perrot
	Deputy Brouard
	Deputy Inglis
	Deputy Soulsby
	Deputy Luxon
	Deputy Quin

The Bailiff: Well, Members, the result of the voting on amendment B1 was 19 in favour, and 26 against. I declare it lost.

4205 So, now we vote on amendment B2, which reads:

'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.))".'

Voting on amendment B2.

There was a recorded vote.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stewart.

4210 **Deputy Stewart:** Sir, when you announced the previous vote, sir, you said it was 20 votes in favour and 26 against, did I mishear you sir,

The Bailiff: Nineteen in favour –

Deputy Stewart: Oh 19, sir.

4215

The Bailiff: Nineteen in favour and 26 against, making a total of 45.

Deputy Stewart: Sorry, sir, I misheard.

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 19, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

POUR

Deputy Harwood
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Domaille
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Robert Jones
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Bebb
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stewart
Deputy Gillson
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Ogier
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Le Lièvre
Deputy Spruce
Deputy Duquemin

CONTRE

Deputy Gollop
Deputy Sherbourne
Deputy Conder
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Trott
Deputy David Jones
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Collins
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Wilkie
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Burford
Deputy Sillars

NE VOTE PAS
None

ABSENT

Alderney Rep. Jean
Alderney Rep. McKinley

Deputy Dorey
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy James
Deputy Adam
Deputy Perrot
Deputy Inglis
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Luxon
Deputy Quin

Deputy O'Hara
Deputy Hadley

4220 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, the voting on amendment B2 was 26 in favour, with 19 against, I declare it carried.

**Procedural –
Sitting to resume next Tuesday, 15th March**

4225 **The Bailiff:** Now we have a decision as to when we resume. I know some Members have suggested that we come back tomorrow. So I am going to put to you first the Proposition that we resume tomorrow at 9.30 a.m. Those in favour; those against.

Members vote Contre.

The Bailiff: Well to my mind the *Contre* have it. So the alternative Proposition is that we resume on Tuesday at 9.30 a.m. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: We resume on Tuesday.

4230 I do remind everybody that this business has to be finished during the course of next week for these Billets, unless any Articles are going to be adjourned until later, because – sorry Deputy Luxon. I was just saying – well I have forgotten what I was saying – I was saying we do have to finish the business next week.

Deputy Sillars.

4235 **Deputy Sillars:** Can I just say that the Education Department will be laying an amendment, and hopefully it will be the first thing laid when we do meet on Tuesday.

The Bailiff: Well, yes, there may well be other amendments, who knows?

4240 Well, thank you everybody. I have to say I am exhausted, I am sure you are as well, so thank you, see you on Tuesday.

The Assembly adjourned at 6.30 p.m.