

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION OF THE ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 1st December 2016

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

Volume 5, No. 35

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)

People's Deputies

St Peter Port South

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

St Peter Port North

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

St Sampson

Deputies L. S. Trott, P. R. Le Pelley, J. S. Merrett, G. A. St Pier, T. J. Stephens, C. P. Meerveld

The Vale

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, N. R. Inder, M. M. Lowe, L. B. Queripel, J. C. S. F. Smithies, S. T. Hansmann Rouxel

The Castel

Deputies R. H. Graham, L.V.O, M. B. E, C. J. Green, B. J. E. Paint, M. H. Dorey, J. P. Le Tocq

The West

Deputies A. H. Brouard, A. C. Dudley-Owen, E. A. Yerby, D. de G. De Lisle, S. L. Langlois

The South-East

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, H. L. de Sausmarez, P. J. Roffey, R. G. Prow, V. S. Oliver

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

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

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

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

Absent at the Evocation

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

Business transacted

Evocation	
Billet d'État XXIX	2477
VII. Future Structure of Secondary Education in the Bailiwick – Debate continued	2477
The Assembly adjourned at 12.37 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m	2516
Future Structure of Secondary Education in the Bailiwick – Debate continued	2517
The Assembly adjourned at 5.30 p.m.	2553

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m. in the presence of
His Excellency Vice-Admiral Sir Ian Corder, K.B.E., C.B.
Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Bailiwick of Guernsey

[THE BAILIFF in the Chair]

PRAYERS

The Senior Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État XXIX

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

VII. Future Structure of Secondary Education in the Bailiwick – Debate continued

The Senior Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État XXIX – Article VII – the continuation of the debate.

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Stephens.

Deputy Stephens: Thank you, sir.

10

15

20

I want to make a few comments on issues raised in debate yesterday and, first, I want to return to Deputy Fallaize's challenge to Members to outline a case for selection.

Yesterday, Members touched on more than a few justifications for selection and last night I tried to make them work for me.

The first justification, I think, could be that subjective personal experience is of value in making the decision before us. I would like to say that Members are involved today in planning for the future, so what I did at school and what school did to me, I think, is irrelevant.

We need to focus on the future and on planning for the middle and end decades of this century. What was good for Members and bad for Members in terms of school experience, whether as pupils or parents, really is not the point.

Now, I am a teacher and I am not even slightly embarrassed by that fact. I would like to say I have never accepted orthodoxy without challenging it. I would never claim to have an orthodox opinion and I would only say, with the utmost humility, that education is something that I know quite a lot about.

So, I want to unpack the justification that teachers have vested interests that make their opinions suspect in some way and that this, somehow, is a justification to continue selection. Yes, of course, teachers have vested interests. They have invested many years of work and much emotion and aspiration in doing endless permutations of taking students from where they are in

their learning at the beginning of the school day to a place somewhere in advance of that at the end of the day. It is the incremental progress of individual students that is the essence of their vested interest.

25

30

35

40

45

50

55

60

65

70

75

Then we have the justification, perhaps, that parental choice is enshrined in the current selective system. But, I want to say to Members that I am of the opinion that choice between which physical building students go to for education is not as important as the choice in subjects and in the combination of courses available. The current system is too rigid to allow for optimum variation in this more important area of choice.

Then we have the justification that selection at 11 is essential because there are a limited number of centres of excellence here in Guernsey. I really worry when that term is used to favour one school and exclude others. All our local sites, serving the needs of students out of the current transition at 11 years, are centres of excellence and the measure of that excellence is the distance a student has travelled in their learning from the day they entered school till the day they leave. The baseline from which that progress is measured is the standard they demonstrate in their learning when they join the school.

Excellence occurs when the measurement shows that the student has progressed more than predicted by the end of their school career and there are many examples, across all our schools, of that happening consistently. It does not just happen on one site.

Then there is the justification that selection at 11 is essential because high schools do not teach the same curriculum as the Grammar School. Well, yes, there may be a broader curriculum in the high schools but, in the essential core subjects, they take the same exams. It is true that some schools teach a more varied curriculum, but the core diet of learning is the same from whichever school the student is selected from.

Then there is the justification that selection is working because entrants into the Sixth Form Centre are most ex-Grammar School pupils. Well, this is not true. I agree with Deputy Fallaize's figures that he quoted yesterday that a low 40% to a high 30% split exists in the schools of origin, between those coming into the Sixth Form Centre from the high schools and St Anne's and those coming into the Sixth Form Centre from the Grammar School.

Sometimes, the entrants from the high schools and St Anne's are more numerous than those from the Grammar School.

Then we have the justification that selection is necessary because high school teachers do not teach to the same high standard as those at the Grammar School. But all schools produce students achieving A and A* at GCSE. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) In the same way, it is said that only the Grammar School meets the needs of pupils with high ability, but this is not true because all the high schools have programmes for gifted and talented students and the existence of those programmes, once again, demonstrates the ineffectiveness of the selection system.

Then there is the justification that selection is necessary because all-ability means that all pupils are taught the same things in the same way as in large classes. But, at the moment, all our schools arrange pupils in ability sets in core subjects within weeks of admittance. Then, I do want to point out, any growth in numbers in a school means more classes and more teachers, not bigger classes. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.)

Then there is the justification that selection is accurate, flexible, supportive and that the 11-plus exam is easily replaced by something else that nobody else has thought of.

I am very willing to give way to any Member who wants to correct me, but I think we are all agreed that the current 11-plus exam is not a good method of selection. What really upsets me is the fact that we do not support this exam and we know it is not an accurate predictor for ability and that it damages some and, yet, we are going to do it again in 2017. Regardless of the outcome of this debate, I want to know, very soon, what alternatives can be applied.

I do not want to way for an Education Committee meeting sometime next year to make a decision. I want to know from the President of Education, perhaps when he sums up in this debate, what the alternative to the 11-plus examination is going to be and why we are going to do an 11-plus exam next year.

By March 2017, the Education Department will have known for at least 12 months that the exam is not fulfilling any useful function.

Now, I do agree with Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Graham that this matter is becoming a distraction for those working in education and that the focus, post-debate, must be to get behind whatever the outcome is. I will be as fierce as Deputy Graham in scrutiny of the next developments and of standards in our schools. I would add to that thought that it is imperative that powers are very soon delegated out to schools and that the Education Law is revisited, revised, updated and made fit for purpose. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

But where our views, I think, differ, is on the need for selection at 11 years, because I really cannot find a justification for it. In the last three weeks, I visited the Grammar School and the three high schools and I have talked with the head teachers and many other teachers and some of the students.

On the basis of what I have seen and heard and from the answers to my questions posed to education officers, I have come to the view that the selective system that we have, to separate children at the age of 11 years and then reunite them at 16 at the College of Further Education or the Sixth Form Centre, is limited in usefulness. It prevents the development of an education service that is responsive to our needs as an Island and, really, it does a great disservice to our young people.

I say this not because one of our schools gets education more right or more wrong than any other, but because the system is already shifting to something different, even while we and the community continue and agonising over what is the best way to the future. There is change in this situation and it has a life and an impetus all of its own and I think Members need to know that this matter is moving on regardless.

For Members today, the choice is not between change and no change, it is about what changes do we need to make to deliver an appropriate education to our 11-16-year-olds and then to our 17 and 18-year-old students.

The Grammar School is changing. As Members heard yesterday, impacts on the Grammar School include the dipping demographic, which means a lower number of students are entering the school. The current system requires that 52 special places at the colleges, plus intake from the Grammar School, should be 25% of the Year 6 cohort, whatever the population number of that Year 6 cohort might be. The Grammar School has a falling roll of pupils. The capacity of the Grammar School at Years 7-11 is 600. Currently, I am told, it has 422 students in this age range. Members were also advised yesterday that the Grammar School is increasingly populated by girls, giving a gender imbalance to the pupil profile and, anecdotally, this imbalance is ascribed to the inadequacies in the current selection system.

So, remedies to better use the Grammar School by filling the empty seats might include reducing the number of special places offered at the colleges. But, of course, that would impact on those schools. Alternatively, adjustments might be made to the threshold to admittance to the Grammar School. But, very quickly, that would shift into a more all-ability system in one school, while reducing the spread of ability in the others.

All our schools, including the Grammar School, have single teacher departments, which are a higher than necessary risk to good educational practice. As numbers in any school drop, so does the flexibility in the type of courses and the opportunities to respond to individual student need.

In the Island's selective configuration of schools, staff are not used to best effect and neither can they achieve optimum flexibility in courses and in pupil groupings to match ability. There is also, of course, a financial implication in the falling number of students. The estimate for cost per pupil in Year 11 in 2016-17, and these are figures supplied by the Education Department, with allowance for central costs, is £7,777 per pupil per annum at the Grammar School and, averaged across the high schools, the figure is £7,545 per pupil per annum. As numbers of pupils attending the Grammar School have fallen, so the costs have increased.

I will point out that capital costs are not included in these figures.

125

80

85

90

100

105

110

115

While of course I celebrate that the Grammar School had success at Progress 8, there is no reason to suppose that the scores recently attained by the Grammar School would not be replicated by individual students if those pupils were distributed across all the schools. The notion that educational standards would be dumbed down in an all-ability school is erased by the already quoted statistics on the percentage of entrants from the different schools into the Sixth Form Centre that currently happens.

Like Deputy Yerby, sir, I do not dislike the Grammar School, but I do dislike selection at 11, because it just does not work. Deputy Fallaize yesterday read from a list of head teachers who were in favour of non-selection in 2001. I think my signature was on that list.

Members also heard yesterday of the quite dramatic changes that have happened in the high schools. In 2011-12, I would have been very much more cautious about what I am going to say next but, having visited the high schools, reviewed the validation reports, been given access to progress data relating to cohorts of students, then I am really confident to take up the argument for non-selection.

As I have said, I am not really drawn to any argument unless I can make a decision based on evidence.

I asked the Education Department why the high schools had not opted for inclusion in the Progress 8 assessments this year and I have been told that it is because England uses Key Stage 2 SATs tests to establish the starting point, the baseline for students, and we use teacher assessment. Because students here had already begun working towards exams in a wider spread of subjects in the high schools than Progress 8 includes, it was unfair to apply this assessment retrospectively.

Interestingly, the *Guernsey Evening Press* reported recently that at least one of the colleges commented that they did not think Progress 8 was a good way to measure achievement.

I am assured by the Education Department that rigorous benchmarking and setting of KPIs is well-established to drive school improvement and, where possible, in the future, comparison will be made with other jurisdictions across all the schools.

So, let me sum up by outlining why I think Members ought not to vote to rescind the decision of March 2016.

Change has arrived and we have been too busy debating to notice. There are not enough students identified by selection to make the current arrangements viable for much longer at the Grammar School.

Worse than that, by trying to prop up an inflexible system, we are disadvantaging all of the students.

Our system at present is rather ridiculous and contradictory. Students are taught in all-ability schools during the primary years and all the young people who want to come together to be educated at 16. If they go to their catchment high school at 11 and are grouped or put in sets according to ability, what is the problem?

Picking up on Deputy Roffey's theme yesterday, is it travelling together on buses, playing sport or taking part in the arts together, using the same cloakrooms or canteens? Members in favour of continuing selection need to be very much clearer on what is dangerous in that.

Members have today an opportunity to endorse something better than what we have now and it can happen very quickly. We have an opportunity to reduce the rigidity of the current system and introduce increased flexibility into what is taught, how it is taught and where it is taught and give individuals a personalised package of learning. Why do this? Because the Island needs, probably more so than larger jurisdictions, to cultivate a diversely skilled workforce of well-rounded people and, for every future vacancy in the labour market, we have first to try and grab our own.

I ask the Members to think back to the population management discussions, the longer working lives discussions, the insertion into the P&R Plan or specifics related to the direction of educational input, not just at 11-16, but lifelong. We have already recognised that we need to do these things.

175

130

135

140

145

150

155

160

165

That is why I am really pleased to know that some young people choose the College of FE route, post-16, and they go there as an entry into nursing, teaching, engineering, digital industries and arts and media careers.

There is a potential in a non-selective environment to further develop combinations of courses post-14 to support earlier the talents of our young people. Many Members here followed a narrow academic route and there is really nothing to regret in that. But the Island now needs something different. It needs well-prepared people equipped through varied and diverse education to support the future of the Island.

Young people will be better equipped by a flexible education to function in this challenging and changing world.

We also have an opportunity now to lead, rather than trail behind. I will share on further thought with Members. There is a growing stated intention of some parents who favour non-selection to remove their children from the selection process. If politicians are to learn anything from recent elections to other jurisdictions, or even closer to home, then we should know that groundswells of public opinion from the middle of our community can push back against what is regarded as an elitist agenda can upturn what has been considered the normal life of a community.

In comparison with the 2012 figure, the 2015 figure shows that the percentage of the Year 6 group whose parents opted them out of the selection process has risen across eight out of 11 primary schools.

I am not in any way promoting this action, I am reporting on fact. But I do hear parents discussing the matter when I collect grandchildren from school. This, too, is a live matter. If sufficient parents – and, probably, the tipping point is not a huge number – take this way of sidestepping selection, then selection will go and we will have all-ability schools almost by default.

How much better would it be to plan for change rather than deal with the retrospective impact of community action? (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

If all-ability groups moved in with the community high schools, would the sky fall down? No. The sun would still shine on a community where I think education would be much-improved from the selective system that we have now.

So, the Education Committee are faced with a changing situation and I do hope they are recognising that. I have, as a Member of this Assembly, the responsibility of supporting our colleagues on the Education Committee to address that change and I think it is best done by giving them a clear steer to offer students the chance to experience secondary education before their school and their guardians support them to make decisions about their futures.

What they want to study and in what combination of courses and how soon to begin to work towards a vocation does not depend on selection at 11. It falters because of selection at 11.

We are progressively being boxed into a corner, so rather than be fearful of change, I think we should embrace non-selection and move towards a better deal for all.

Thank you, sir. (Applause)

The Bailiff: Yes. Alderney Representative Jean.

220

225

180

185

190

195

200

205

210

215

Alderney Representative Jean: Thank you, sir.

Members of the States, the battle goes on. I could not equal, if I tried, yesterday's excellent speech by Deputy Richard Graham. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

In fact, that speech for me was truly a landmark speech and one of the finest I have heard in this Assembly. I congratulate him on that speech. It clearly was a passionate and well-researched piece of work.

I still rally to the call to keep selection. I note the statistics and the fact that several Members in the election last April lost their seats. This was to me a clear indication that the public view may be much stronger than any survey may indicate.

230

235

To me, the public and parents are the customer for the service. I have recently survived an election in Alderney, out of half of our States. I am the only one to do so. My views on education are well-known here and in Alderney. I have now clocked up 13 years' experience at St Anne's School as the States' rep on the management committee.

I fought on the first debate to keep the 11-plus back in the mid-90s. It was an issue even then. I do not wish to go against what I believe is the wish of the majority of the people, albeit it may be 60-40, but all the indications lead me to believe that more people want selection kept than want it removed. There are enough bodies lying around to prove it.

I give my support to Deputy Le Pelley. I was delighted when he was elected President of the Education, Sport and & Leisure.

240

245

250

255

I have explained the Alderney situation, which is different to Guernsey. In some places education's vision and federation does not fit in Alderney as well as it might. At St Anne's School, out students cannot hop on a bus to widen their curriculum. At the time when I spoke back in March, we were not doing well with our broadband, either, and could not link in to the teleconference facilities. I am delighted to say that, through Education's efforts, we are now able to link up on our broadband and it is much-improved.

Thank you very much for that. Sorting broadband out for us all. The students and the teachers and gaining from that enormously and I am very grateful.

Why have my views on the selection process changed despite all the pressure being applied? Well I tell you at times it has been most unpleasant and, apart from what I have said previously about the situation here in Guernsey, in Alderney if selection at 11 were removed, we would not be able to enter the education system until much later on in Guernsey. Until post-16. This does take away choice and opportunity and these both play an important part in life.

I remember saying to my mother once that I had been chosen to announce all the acts in the school play. My dear mother replied, 'Many are called, my boy, but few are chosen.' I was so proud. (*Laughter*)

I was no great scholar and I failed the 11-plus. You are going to love this. My head master caned me until I could leave school. Maybe you think I deserved it and I probably did.

At the 11-plus, he handed us each a sharpened pencil and told us, 'Woe betide you if you break that pencil.'

The pen to me

The pen to me is like a cudgel. I am heavy handed. Three questions in, yes, you have guessed it, I broke the pencil and no, before you ask, I was not about to ask for another. I do not blame the 11-plus, I blame my head master. (*Laughter*)

Back to being sensible. I am not against adjustment, realignment or change. Change the name, if you wish. If more girls pass at 11, then let the girls take the exam at 11 and the boys at 12. (*Laughter*) I thought you would laugh, especially with a dull scholar like me! Give them a better chance.

Deputy Tooley talked of conservations with students at St Anne's School. I have talked to the council there at St Anne's School and at the Bute Centre very recently, at our youth club. I explained what I was trying to achieve. They do not raise points with me. The opportunities were there and recent during the election process just a week or so ago.

270

275

265

Two more points I must raise. During the debate in March, the dictates contained in the Billet, the item on the proposals, was do not listen to any person who has not been through the education system, or been through the education system in the last six years. I resented that, I really did. My daughter went through the system here. Nine, 10 years have passed since my daughter left the system, she came to Guernsey post-16. My daughter Marie-Claire took the 11-plus and passed. We talked about whether she wanted to come to Guernsey. She chose to remain at St Anne's School, which is truly an excellent school and whatever happened in St Anne's School, I know that Education Council are supporting a lot of change there and things will improve again. St Anne's School, in the past has had a terrific record.

She passed out in the end with the second highest pass rate in the Bailiwick. In reply to my questions and all of the friends that she made in Guernsey, her answer was to keep the Grammar School and keep selection. But that is not the only reason.

It is sometimes not easy for students who are placed with host families and I accept that observation which has been made today, but the people who make the arrangements here in Guernsey try to iron out the problems and here is an opportunity for me to thank those host families and all those people from Education who make all the arrangements on Alderney's behalf. My grateful thanks to you all.

In conclusion, the Grammar School is recognised as a centre of excellence and should be kept and most of the public that I speak to in the street want it kept. Keep selection. Fine tune it. Change its name, if you wish. Call it something else.

But, remember, we are all subject to selection all of our working lives. Many are called but few are chosen and there are those who rise through the ranks, like my good friends, and all of you, yourselves, were selected and elected to come here and represent your parishes and your public.

I was selected and elected in Alderney and selected and elected as the Alderney Representative. One of them. This process is healthy. It is normal and so is spending time with your children and helping them with their homework. Even coaching is good. It shows you care.

If the 11-plus is not working, then adjust it and move it around and get it right.

One last point I want to make. As regards the Grammar School it has been clearly, throughout these debates, under threat. Let us be clear about this. People see this. People are listening to this and, of course, the roll of that school will fall. I am told that people are making other choices. Those of independent means are making other choices and going elsewhere because of this threat.

Those are my final remarks and that is truly how I feel.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Langlois.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you, sir.

I agree with Deputy Stephens in that very little has been said by the pro-selection Deputies about the rationale behind our selective education system that is very convincing. I do not think personal anecdotes and doorstep chats fill that void.

Despite entreaties by several speakers arguing selection, none of the pro-selection speakers has really explained the rationale behind a secondary education system based on attaching one of just two labels to 11-year-olds and then using those labels to stream them into separate schools.

A few years ago, I spent some time researching the genesis of separation. The report from the 1920s which first promulgated selection at 11 had social class etched in almost every line. That is not to condemn it. The authors self-evidently were genuinely concerned to accommodate the growing demand for education and to rationalise the systems current then. That they proposed selection at 11 into modern schools and grammar schools came as no great surprise. It reflected the class structure of the time.

What did come as a surprise were the remarkably progressive passages in the follow-up report, published just before the Second World War. I had no idea that the selection at 11 for streaming into separate schools was already being questioned at such an early date.

Those who read the extracts I circulated will have seen the five reasons the authors gave for reluctantly pulling back from recommending all-ability schools. Not one of those reasons really holds today. The exponential growth and the demand for post-16 academic education and the failure to develop a technical education stream has seen to that.

Yet, in Guernsey, until March this year, we still clung to a streamed system based on one devised for a very different socio-economic landscape in the inter-war years. The way we adapted the system for Guernsey's different social hierarchy and then amended it in rather desperate attempts to keep up with changing times is interesting. But now is not the time to go into that.

305

310

315

320

325

280

285

290

295

300

Suffice to say our streamed secondary education system should have been classified as archaic decades ago. If pro-selection Members want to revert to that old system, they should be responding to the entreaties and perhaps giving us five good reasons which hold today why an all-ability secondary school system is not the way forward for Guernsey in the 21st century.

Claims that the old system allows choice or any longer encourages social mobility are spurious. Choice is often cited as something Year 6 pupils will be losing if we move to a non-selective system. That belief does not stand close scrutiny. The only real choice the 11-plus gives a typical parent or child is that in their preference, should they pass, the Grammar School or one of our independent all-ability colleges. Once that choice has been made, the matter would be out of the parents' hands, if the 11-plus was as objective as originally claimed.

Whether to sit the 11-plus or not, is of course a choice of sorts. But not much of one. Other so-called choices related to secondary education have one thing in common. A degree of parental wealth. Parents can choose to pay for their child to be coached to improve their performance in our objective test. Then, should their child fail to make to their preferred secondary school, they can choose to pay the subsidised fees at one of our independent schools.

Yes, those are choices, but they are not universal choices available to all. Short of sending children to our all-ability colleges, there is no way to opt-out of our selective system. Therefore, there must be many Guernsey parents being put in an impossible situation every year.

Those parents who oppose the principle of selection at 11, yet know they are disadvantaging their children if they do not pay for coaching. That is not a choice anybody should have to make.

In countries such as Germany or the Netherlands, which unlike the UK or Guernsey fully embraced the tripartite system of selective education after the war, it could be argued that there are alternatives. However, it should be noted that in Germany, often held as an exemplar of selective education, the majority of pupils, not just 25%, attend gymnasiums, the nearest equivalent to grammar schools. Much more importantly, selection has survived in such countries because, in the large majority of states, it is evolving – my pages are stuck together! – and it is parents and pupils who make the final selection of school, not test results or teachers' judgements.

It would be pointless to attempt shoehorning such Germanic systems into an Island with a population of 62,000. It is too late anyway. Education and society have moved on. There are much more plausible models to inform the development of a secondary education system suitable for a small island.

An un-streamed system that will give pupils genuine educational choices at the age of 14, a mix of academic, technical and vocational subjects, tailored to each individual pupil, chosen by them and their parents with guidance from teachers. Those would be real choices, not ones simply dependent on the size of parental wallets.

Social mobility is still cited by some as an advantage of selective systems, despite the figures revealed at the debate last March, which showed conclusively that our system was no longer delivering social mobility on any substantive scale.

Amongst my parents' generation, even access to post-14 education was extremely limited. Other than those attending the colleges, post-14 education was available only to the few who could pay the fees for the two intermediate schools which catered for education after 16. Post-16 education remained a closely guarded monopoly of the colleges.

From that low base, it was inevitable the education system introduced post-war would lead to higher levels of social mobility for my generation. However, it was the increasing availability of post-14, post-16 education, not necessarily the particular vehicle delivering it, which was responsible. There is no evidence that a non-selective, un-streamed system would have been any less efficient than the grammar schools and our secondary modern schools in promoting such a progressive development.

I cannot understand how anybody who benefited from the expansion of educational provision 60 years ago would, today, wish to see entitlement to an academic education capped; never mind, by the use of a discredited test. Allowing pupils in our secondary modern schools to take GCSE

380

375

335

340

345

350

355

360

365

exams with the possibility of entering the Sixth Form Centre, was a welcome though long-delayed measure to raise the cap a little. However, it is both inadequate and calls into question why we persist with streaming from 11-16 in the first place. Quotation:

'There is overwhelming evidence academic selection entrenches advantage. It does not spread it.'

Those words, delivered by a Tory shadow education minister some years ago, might be music to the ears of anyone who seeks to entrench advantage, but they undermine the case of those Deputies who claim their pro-selection stance stems from a desire for social mobility.

I would ask all States' Members to vote against this Proposition, otherwise they are condemning us to years of pointless, fruitless debate on chasing the idea of an alternative to the 11-plus when it is the rationale behind selection itself which is the huge fault line in our current education system.

Thank you.

395

400

405

410

415

420

425

390

385

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you.

First of all, I would like to thank the President of Education, Sport & Culture, Deputy Paul Le Pelley and his Members for bringing this report.

Deputy Le Pelley was right yesterday, I tried to sursis the March debate on selection, as I saw it as an election issue and here we are today, back debating selection or non-selection and I welcome that opportunity.

Life is all about selection. Parents select which pre-school for their child, with many being separated from their pre-school friends when starting big school. Going in to reception classes, how daunting that must be for a four-year-old, yet they settle in quite quickly and get on with school life.

In other areas in life as a child, selection takes place for sport, the arts, numerous other activities. The Eisteddfod and other. Are the children damaged if they are not selected into a team or to represent Guernsey? No, they are disappointed. Does that encourage them to try harder for the next year's competition? More than likely.

A question I was asked and one I cannot answer, why do the many supporters who wish to remove selection still put their children through the 11-plus? Why? If they support the high schools, why not opt out of the 11-plus? Could it be that they actually wish their child to go to the Grammar School or one of the colleges? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Nobody has been able to produce for me numbers of how many children are coached. Anecdotally we are told a vast amount of children are coached. I have asked head teachers. Nobody has been able to give me that data.

It has been suggested a way forward could be that the schools include the 11-plus types of tests as part of the curriculum, giving every child a chance. That is one way of removing coaching. Parents have told me coaching takes place with some of the teachers who admit coaching is wrong, yet they offer to help a child or they charge and earn extra money.

Deputy Tooley said yesterday when out canvassing on the doorstep how many people reacted or not as the case may be about the previous education debate. Many of the Vale electorate made their views known and, in some cases, said unlike other elections, education was such a major issue they would only vote for those wishing to keep the Grammar School. A one-issue vote. The Vale results reflected this, with Deputies Fallaize and Queripel losing votes as supporters of non-selection and the late Deputy Dave Jones and myself, our vote increased considerably as supporters of selection.

The results in nearly all cases of those in the previous States reflected a similar voting pattern, as we were informed yesterday. All bar Deputy Lester Queripel, who supported removing selection last term. So, the remainder of the Deputies re-elected lost many votes against their previous election, whereas the majority re-elected who supported maintaining selection, their votes

STATES OF DELIBERATION, THURSDAY, 1st DECEMBER 2016

increased considerably, well into the hundreds. Over 600 for Deputy Trott. A reflection of how the electorate felt about the outcome last term to remove selection and the Grammar School.

We also know how many Deputies lost their seat.

Deputy Parkinson: Sir, on a point of correction.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson stood on a point of correction.

Deputy Parkinson: Point of correction, Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: I know what you are going to say.

Deputy Parkinson: Yes. My vote substantially increased and I supported all-ability schools.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

Deputy Lowe: I appreciate Deputy Parkinson, but you stood in a by-election, so it would be very unusual for somebody who gets in on a by-election with a few hundred not to increase. (*Laughter*)

Deputy Brehaut said yesterday it was to be expected why his vote dropped, as did others. That happens. The longer you are in the States; there is no doubt about that. I have not looked up other colleagues' voting pattern, but what I can say is my vote has increased at each election. Seven elections in total, with 2,507 votes being the last election. I am extremely grateful to the Vale electorate for having such faith in me.

I took the opportunity to list four questions on my manifesto. I asked the following:

'I would welcome the opportunity, when canvassing, to hear your views: 1. Do you want some form of selection? 2. Do you want the 11-plus? 3. Do you want the Grammar School to remain? 4. Do you want the three high schools instead of four?'

Out of all the elections I have stood as a candidate, there were more people home this time than ever before. Half-term may have had something to do with it so, unlike previous elections, Deputy Roffey was right, to a certain extent. Usually, many young families are out at work during the day. This was not the case at this time, which was really beneficial as it meant so many were home and I could hear from many of the families involved.

By asking the electorate for feedback, many had their answers ready when I visited their homes and I made notes alongside their names on the walking order. Only 12 households of those who were home wanted me to support the previous decision to remove selection. Only 12 households. I say households, of two of those asked, I counted all the family living there, although they were out at the time. So, that is why I counted it as households.

An overwhelming amount of the electorate wanted to keep some form of selection in the Grammar School. Not one felt the current 11-plus was fit for purpose and I agree with that, as it lacks maths and English.

The feedback on the doorstep, or by email, or by phone or indeed by post, was overwhelming. A clear message was given. Answers to question one, yes, keep some form of selection. I had been out canvassing for a week before I heard the first parishioner say they supported non-selection.

Answer to question two, yes to the 11-plus providing it is an improved version that includes maths and English. Many said they would like to see a 13-plus or an option to transfer to the Grammar at 13 if the 11-plus remains, in the same way it used to happen many years ago.

Answer to question three, yes, keep the Grammar School. Answer to question four, yes keep four schools and build La Mare as soon as possible as it is going on too long.

475

470

435

440

445

455

460

At no time, did I hear 'keep the Grammar School building but remove selection and gain entry by sitting together with parents, pupils and the teaching staff, giving them the opportunity to choose if they want to attend this new academic school'.

No, I am not giving way.

That was not even on the radar at election time. Education is not the same way as having two lanes of traffic, down to one and revert to two. This States cannot, after today, if selection is rejected, come back. The Grammar will be gone, the special places at colleges will be gone and, if some Members succeed in their wish, it will not be too long before the grants will be completely removed from the colleges, making them so elite unless in a highly paid employment ordinary families will no longer have a choice of education for their children.

The huge cost needed to implement non-selection will be eye-watering next year, when the reports come back. Over £100 million. Our money is tight and we have to find 3% 5% and 5% savings in the meantime.

Supporting non-selection remains a leap of faith in the dark. The education system designed and circulated by Deputy Meerveld, all well-intentioned, is in my opinion a dangerous route when this was not even part of the consultation survey or has been thoroughly researched and costed.

We heard yesterday Education last term did carry out a survey and the results came back from parents wanting to keep selection and the Grammar School. This survey was dismissed as the wrong kind of parents responded, apparently. What a waste of money. If the Education Department of the day carried out a survey with intentions of only taking notice of responses that suited their comprehensive route, why bother in the first place?

What happened to the survey results from the students? Again, responses did not suit the comprehensive route.

As an aside, during my second term in the States, from 1997-2000, it was being mooted the 11-plus would be debated the following term. When canvassing for the 2000 election I asked, when knocking on doors, would you support removing the 11-plus. The outcome surprised me greatly. It was a very clear 'no'. So, not much has changed in the next 16 years.

Yes, we must listen to the professionals. But we must also listen to the parents and others who have a right to speak out, taking me back to the survey results.

Earlier this year the Youth Forum had a full day called At the States, held in this Chamber. Representatives were elected amongst their peers from all the high schools, Ladies' College, Elizabeth College, Blanchelande College and the Grammar School. The Bailiff sat in his normal place and presided over the proceedings where the delegates from the schools debated and voted on various issues.

I sat in the public gallery all day and listened to the students' debates. They were a credit to their schools. One of the topics debated included selection and the 11-plus. The Bailiff, as we know, cannot speak in our debates but, if he could, I am sure he would confirm the outcome of the 11-plus debate concluded the current system is not fit for purpose (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) but they were not against some form of selection, just not the current 11-plus.

That was from the youth earlier in the year, debating that in this Chamber. They were not against some form of selection, just not the current 11-plus.

Selection works. Could it be improved? Most definitely. Nothing stands still, but it is a fact children learn at a different pace. Removing selection would see an ability to pay for those attending the colleges and Blanchelande, rather than an ability by selection. The chequebook will rule, causing another divide between the haves and the have-nots.

On BBC Guernsey on Monday, I heard a guest suggesting there may be a bit of hypocrisy by some States' Members who support non-selection, yet are paying for their children at the colleges or Blanchelande. My answer to that, not on the radio, sir, but to myself: we all make choices how we spend our income. Some sacrifice luxuries to education their children. Some are wealthy enough anyway so they can afford to send their children to the colleges. But that does leave those who cannot cut back their finances any further, as they live on the breadline, yet they would love

500

495

480

485

490

505

510

515

525

530

to see their child at one of the colleges. Sadly, the would be denied that opportunity if non-selection is approved today.

I am sure the person who raised this on the radio would be pleased to hear the Deputies that declared their interests yesterday, and their children, although not necessarily needed, as explained by the Bailiff.

I have heard some Members say yesterday that they would like the Grammar to remain, but do not like selection at 11, as it is too young. A 13 or a 14-plus would better, but the amended Propositions do not allow. That is not the way I have read it.

The amendment reads very clearly:

'To rescind Resolution 1 on Billet d'État VII of 2016; to agree that all ability states' secondary schools should not be introduced and that, instead, selection by ability at 11 years should continue to determine the admission of students to state secondary schools; and to direct that, by no later than June 2017, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture shall submit a Policy Letter or Policy Letters containing proposals for the future use of the education estate, including consideration of La Mare de Carteret School site and the College of Further Education ...'

And this is where some people have perhaps misunderstood the amendment.

'... and any other proposal or proposals for variations to the previous States' Resolution ...'

That is the Resolution you will be making today.

"... which the Committee considers necessary for the delivery of selective admission to secondary schools."

So what that is saying, in my opinion, is once you have approved this today, if Education want to come back with a new 11-plus, with an 11-plus and a 13-plus or a 13-plus or a 14-plus, this amendment allows them to do it. (*Laughter*)

Clearly, there is some disagreement with that. I wonder if HM Procureur could help me out on that, please? Is my interpretation right, that Education can come back, because this would be a States' Resolution, with an alternative or a variation, the word is 'variation' on the amendment, with something else to do with selection.

The Bailiff: HM Procureur.

The Procureur: Well, this is very much a matter of interpretation.

Clearly, the way this amendment was drafted, there is a semi-colon after the word 'schools' in the fourth line, which would indicate that there are three aspects to this amendment, in my view.

The first is rescinding Resolution 1; the second is to agree that all-ability state secondary schools shall not be introduced and selection at ability at 11 shall continue; thirdly, to direct by no later than June 2017, there will be a Policy Letter coming back to the States with proposals for the future use of the education estate and any other proposals for variations considered necessary for delivery of selective admissions.

There are three semi-colons there, not wishing to be too pedantic about it, there are three different aspects to that Resolution, in my view.

It is theoretically possible, matter of policy, that those other proposals might look at selective admission in a bit more detail, but arguably that would be predicated on the agreement that that is looking at selection by ability at 11.

That is the first part of the amendment.

It is not a legal issue, it is very much a matter of interpretation. There is an argument that it might be a bit nonsensical to have an agreement for ability at 11 and then come back with different proposals. But it may be, and this will be a matter for the Committee, if they consider that, actually, having agreed selection by ability at 11 but then looked at further details of selective admission, it does not work or they need to amend that, it is open to the Committee to come back to this Assembly.

570

535

540

545

550

555

560

But, I do think the way it is drafted, with the three separate semi-colons, means that the first part of this, if agreed by the States, it is predicated on agreeing selection on ability at 11. But it would be up to the Committee to come back to this Assembly.

I hope that has assisted.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

Deputy Lowe: I would like to thank HM Procureur for confirming that selection at any age could be achievable. (*Laughter*)

The interpretation is there. The words are there. You had it read to you, by HM Procureur, they can come back with a variation. They have to keep 11-plus until June 2017, but they can come back with a variation.

So, if Members really do want to keep the Grammar and have a selection system, that enables the Grammar to remain as a Grammar School and the need to vote for.

Will removing the Grammar see a change of those wanting to come here, to offer their experience and expertise in our business or finance industry? I know it is one of the things that they ask if they are coming with their family, what is the education system here? I have concerns that will have a setback on perhaps somebody coming here to work.

Also, sir, I do not think it helps at times when you hear States' Members talking about the selection system and you hear that they want the best for all our children. Of course, we want the best for all our children, but that does insinuate the high schools do not offer the best.

Can I remind Members, the high schools are also academic, because we are hearing about the Grammar School being so academic? Of course, the high schools are, too.

Listening to the debate, you would think it is only the Grammar School that offers academic tutoring, whereas many, as you have seen in the media daily as leaders in high positions, the result of the high schools.

Members were canvassed by a successful property developer, recently. That successful developer went to La Mare.

You see in the newspaper quite frequently, the head of Guernsey Post. That gentleman went to La Mare. Both very proud of their school and both have certainly told me they are not damaged or traumatised and they accept it was the right school for them at this time.

It is the same as this awful, unnecessary terminology of 'creaming off' the top 25%. It is a bit like a cup of coffee, without the cream. It leaves a bitter taste in my mouth.

You might as well say the remaining 75% are just not up to it. It is far better to say all pupils have been selected to the school of their ability. No wonder there is a certain amount of snobbery still around amongst some parents, implying their children are better than others. The same people who say children are damaged if they do not pass.

Those who use these expressions fuel youngsters who may feel disappointed. But damaged or failures? Certainly not.

My father said to me when I failed the 11-plus – or did not pass, used more commonly these days; I will stick with fail – just because some of my friends passed for the Grammar School or colleges, that did not make them a better person. We are all different and you can succeed. He said, 'It is down to you, not which school you attend.'

If he was alive today he would not only be very proud, but I could thank him for that advice, which has stayed with me always.

So, sir, I conclude by saying that this Government belongs to the people, not the other way around. Forget that at your peril.

I was delighted with Deputy Dudley-Owen's speech yesterday where she reflected on the doorstep and what people told her and changed her mind and how she is now going to vote.

The survey was, for me, was very clear when that came back as well and the States, if they really want to, can find a solution with selection and I therefore ask the President, when he stands

590

575

580

585

600

595

605

610

620

up, will he be looking at that. If selection remains, he can come back with a choice for this States before June 2017.

Thank you, sir. (Applause)

625

630

635

640

645

650

655

660

665

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

As someone who is not yet accustomed to speaking in this Assembly, I will be brief and to the point. I was elected to the States in April this year and then subsequently elected onto the Committee for Home Affairs and also the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture.

At the beginning of my political career, my opinion was that the 11-plus was flawed and it needed to either be improved or removed. I was also of the opinion that our education estate should include four secondary schools.

After the last seven months of working on the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, my initial thoughts have been compounded and I truly believe that academic selection at 11 is outdated and should be completely removed. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

And I and the entire Committee do not want to close any schools. Sir, the Committee has looked at many different models over the last seven months and many different methods of selection. No alternative method has been identified that cannot be manipulated by the more affluent or involved members of our society. Even if we had found one, I could not be coaxed. It is still selection at 11, which is where the problem lies.

My dad once said to me, after I was constantly repairing my broken scooter, that was tired and old, with a squeaky wheel – we fixed everything in the 1970's, because money was tight – he said, 'Mark, you cannot punish a ... [Inaudible]'. By that, he meant you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear and I should ditch my scooter because I needed a bike. I should be going places, cycling to school, having better social mobility. (Laughter and applause)

I did get my bike, as promised. Admittedly, it was second-hand and bright pink. (*Laughter*) But that is the benefit of having an older sister.

Sir, the pro-selection Members of the Assembly have consistently referred to the current 11-plus as flawed and suggest that the ESC Committee should be tasked with finding a better alternative. The fact is, it is not the method of selecting at 11 that is the main problem. It is selecting at 11 itself.

You cannot determine a young person's future academic ability at such a young age and it totally contradicts the principles of growth mind-set, our new inclusive big picture curriculum and our new inclusive Policy and Resource Plan, which this Assembly voted phase one through only two weeks ago. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Now, if this is voted through, the Committee will have to go away, get the cloths out and polish frantically for the next few years until surely, at some point, we begin to see that the shine is no longer there and we actually listen to the experts and by the experts I mean our young people, our youth workers, our teachers and, I believe, the majority of our population. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

I ask Members to finally put this issue to bed and vote Contre and vote for the last time for 'selexit'. Thank you. (*Laughter and applause*)

The Bailiff: Anyone else? Yes, Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, I was hoping before I spoke to hear all the Members of the Education Committee.

I am not giving it its title, because all we are concerned about here are education issues. When I say all, they are very important all issues and I commend the speeches made, with some degree of humour, by Deputy Leadbeater and I was pleased to hear it.

675

Although, for reasons that I hopefully will explain, the conclusion is the only thing I differ with him about. Deputy Fallaize referred yesterday, and I think he expected me to jump up after he made his speech. He told me afterwards, but he is shaking his head the other way, now. I think he expected me to jump up and deal with the issue of social mobility there and then.

680

Now, the principal reason that I have come to the conclusion that I have come to, is because of social mobility. Do I think that social mobility is working at the moment? Absolutely not. Or not to any reasonable degree of satisfaction.

685

We heard yesterday very many good speeches on both sides of the argument. Without in any way denigrating or criticising anybody else's speeches, and that implication should not be made, the two best speeches on each side were Deputy Tooley and Deputy Brehaut. I commend both of their speeches, albeit I warmly approve the other speeches made by the other speakers.

I would just say this about Deputy Tooley's speech, that when they look at Hansard in due course, when they look at the great parliamentary speeches of the future, they will look at it in the same vein as they did when another able colleague, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, made her maiden speech a few months ago.

690

Now, the Ferbrache toilet does not exist anymore. (Laughter) It existed for many years, but the only people that now remember it are me, my mother and sadly my mother is starting to not remember things, and my elder sister, because my younger sister was too young to remember what kind of toilet we had and my middle sister and my father are no longer with us.

695

But, what is so delightful is that that will be in parliamentary records of this Assembly forever. (*Laughter*) So I am very grateful to those two able colleagues.

Now, of course, what the States did, it does actually physically exist because my parents rented the house for many years and then bought it and then the States were going to build all Cour du Parc's at Charroterie, that was their intent in the mid-1960's. They were going to build all these multi-storey estates or social housing as we now call it.

700

So, the States acted with their usual promptness. They knocked down the house and the toilet and then nothing happened for 30 years. Now, whether that was a deliberate States policy to let the land lie and see what would happen, or whether it was just the States doing what it often does do, and not get on with things, only time can tell. It was probably wise to leave where the toilet was alone and not get any human being to go within 50 yards of it for a period of time anyway.

705

But, moving on from that, the issue was made, again ably, by Deputy Fallaize, when he said yesterday, and he quoted from the Education Act and the commentary of the Education Act of 1944, and that language spoke of those times. They wanted a working class/lower middle class to do certain things but they knew their place. They could only go that far in society. That is all they could go to.

710

They did not want them having the privileges and the rights of other people. He was correct when he says that that equivalent legislation was brought in in Guernsey a few years later.

715

What we also should remember, of course, of 1944 is that there would not have been any democracy in this Island in 1944, because there were lots of Germans here. We were very thankful in Guernsey that young men of any social description, of any social class, were dying on the beaches of Normandy in 1944, so that we got the right to say what we have got to say today. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

720

Now, in connection with that, I am disappointed, I have got to say. I have heard able speeches, Deputy Leadbeater, Deputy de Lisle, Deputy Dudley-Owen, from the Education Committee. It would have been very nice indeed to have heard, in early course, from the vice-president of the Committee, Deputy Meerveld. I have read his pamphlet. I did ask him for another copy, because I originally misplaced it and then, when I found it, it was under a book I was reading about Donald Trump. So, I do not know if there is any correlation between the two! (*Laughter*) Anyway, perhaps both men of great aspirations.

725

What I am here about, I am here like we all are because we all are genuine, principled people in relation to this, whatever attitude we take, whatever way we are going to vote today, tomorrow. Whatever. I assume later today, but that does not really matter. We will vote on it.

There is no moral high ground. There is no triumphalism. Once we determine this issue, and the vote might be a little narrower than the vote we took when Deputy Lester Queripel made his Proposition yesterday. When we take that vote, I do not think it is going to be more than a few votes either way.

But, whatever happens, we have got to work with that system. We have got to make sure that that system is the best that it could be for the children of the Bailiwick.

Deputy, sorry, Alderney Representative Jean, I am sure he would be Deputy Jean if he lived here, but Alderney Representative Jean made the point about St Anne's and it is the only point of introduction at 11 into the wider academic system in the Bailiwick that Alderney children have had. Actually, that was not a point I appreciated before, but I now do.

I would like just to deal with something else. Voluntarily, Deputy Dudley-Owen, Deputy Fallaize, Deputy Brehaut and, earlier, Deputy Tooley, mentioned their own family situation and where their children go to school, etc. So, let me just mention that, because I think it should be mentioned, I fully accept, he is not the learned Bailiff today because it is a different forum, the Bailiff's ruling in relation to matters – he is always learned, he has always been learned to me, even when he had the temerity to disagree with me when he was in private practice, and he did so generally unsuccessfully, but never mind, that was the fate of most advocates! (Laughter) - in relation to that the situation is this. I have got four children. On went to St Sampson's Secondary School, because that befitted his ability. My eldest daughter was I think the second intake at the new Grammar School. She was born in 1975. I had better remember, because she will phone me up afterwards. So, she would have been 11 in 1986. So, September 1986, she would have gone to the Grammar School. My number two daughter, in age only, went to Ladies' College, because we paid for it. My youngest son, he came along some years after the others. I was a veteran parent by that, of 31, when he was born. I felt really old. He went to the Boys' College. Children two, three and four had their primary education, if I have to say it, at La Hougette School, which was a first class school.

We probably would not have been allowed now, because we had moved out of the catchment area, before our youngest boy went to school, to send him to La Hougette. My wife liked La Hougette, the girls had got on well there. It was a good school. I note, and I think it is page 1513, paragraph 6.14, if I remember correctly, that that would not be permissible now, because you would have to go to a particular catchment area before you could go to a particular school. So, this 21st Century vibrant revolution is perhaps not as vibrant and as revolutionary as it could be.

But I am also, because I am a generation older, despite what I said yesterday, than Deputy Fallaize, and a generation older than my able colleague Deputy Dudley-Owen and half a generation older than Deputy Brehaut. I have got grandchildren. I have got six of them. We still have got symmetry. We had two boys and two girls. We have got three granddaughters and three grandsons.

The youngest one has not started to bat yet, if you understand what I mean.

In connection with that, the two elder granddaughters were educated through the Guernsey state system. My eldest granddaughter, when she got to that age, went to the Sixth Form College and then went to the College of FE. My younger older granddaughter, if that makes sense, went to the College of FE.

My daughters did not get married until they were 30, so we had a gap between the eldest grandchildren and the youngest grandchildren. We have now got four who are younger.

My eight-year-old grandson goes to Beechwood, my six, soon to be seven-year-old granddaughter is at Acorn House and my two youngest grandsons are at Castel Primary. I just would perhaps take the opportunity now, because I get forgetful as I get older, that the six-year-old grandson phoned me up last night to say, 'Don't forget Grandpa, it is my play.' He meant his Nativity Play, on 8th December, at lunchtime. We have got a committee meeting then. I will not be with you during that committee meeting. Please accept my apologies.'

So, I think I have got a fair mix of where the school systems are and how they operate in this Bailiwick and I also did something, and I only did two days ago, that I have not done since July

775

730

735

740

745

750

755

760

765

1962. I went back to Amherst School, where I spent the ages seven to 11, and I met several of the teachers. I went there Tuesday, at the invitation of the head teacher. The granite school looked exactly the same. I walked in and I saw a picture of the teachers that were teaching when I was there and let me say now, one of the finest teachers of my life, that had a great influence on my life, was Mr Whitwell and I saw a picture of him.

I also saw a picture of the girls' netball team from 1961-1962, who were my era. But, never mind, we move on from that!

I was a bit early, so I sat outside the assembly while the head teacher was finishing off the assembly. The assembly finished about 9.30-ish. Loads of the kids walked one way, some walked the other way.

Every single child smiled at me. Every single child said, 'hello', 'good morning', 'how are you?' You know, waved a hand, etc. I thought what a pleasure it is to be here.

Then I was shown around to lots of classes of different ages. I spoke to several teachers and I spoke to four in particular, including the head teacher. And I agree with the point, I think it was made by Deputy Fallaize yesterday, about locals and non-locals. There is no difference. The three non-head teachers, if I could use that phrase, the three ordinary teachers, were all locals. They were all fantastically committed, they were all splendid teachers and they were all very much against selection at 11. I asked one of them and they explained why. Two of them were Year 6 teachers, one was a Year 4 or 5, I cannot remember.

I went in the classrooms, which obviously are smaller now, because I am older and they always seemed bigger when you were younger. But the point in relation to that is that those schools are doing a great job in very difficult circumstances. I was told, I think, there is 20-odd teachers at the Amherst School and either all, or nearly all, or maybe all, are against selection. The excellent head teacher, that was her view too.

I had also gone, remember we all had an invite, there were two opportunities, either lunch somewhere around here or we could go to La Roundel School, and I went to La Roundel School where I was met by four head teachers who, between them, had 100 years'-plus experience. They were all of the same view. They did not favour selection.

Now, not one of them, had a creed of dogma in their body. Their views were all intelligently, and with a lot of humour, and with a lot of fact, expressed to me. And I took those views on board.

So, therefore, I do not believe, that, when I have heard it from those teachers, and no doubt also the views that we have had expressed – we have had emails, we have had letters, we have had communications from other teachers – that there is any kind of political interference, that 'we want the communist system of comprehensives'. I do not believe that. I believe that those are their genuine, genuine views. I do not need any convincing at all about that.

They are all sincere, good people and I would like to thank them for what they have done and are doing for the kids of Guernsey. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.)

In connection with that, I have got to have my own views. I represent, as we all do, every single child in the Bailiwick of Guernsey and the decision we are going to make 'today' is a decision that is going to have effect in the Bailiwick of Guernsey for the next 40, 50 years or whatever. For a heck of a long time. Of course, whether the child has got the parent with all the money, as rich as Croesus, all the attributes, all the benefits, all the tutoring, all the private education or the child has got nothing, we put in 100%

But, Deputy Brehaut used, in a sensible way, the word communist yesterday in connection with things and I know what he meant. I am a Leftie, I have always been a Leftie, I always will be a Leftie, in my view anyway. Because I could not vote Conservative if it was compulsory, because I cannot ignore, whether this is the 1950's or 1960's, I will say it to my good colleague Deputy Brehaut, I do not care. I cannot ignore my own upbringing and the class that I came from. In relation to the people of Guernsey, post-war we had to bring in and it is still our Eviction Law, a basic Eviction Law to ensure that people were not evicted or had a home to go when they came back because, remember, 20,000-odd went away at the time of the Occupation.

800

780

785

790

795

805

810

820

815

830

We did not have, for very, very many years, in fact it came in in my time when I was vice-president or President of the Board of Industry, any real employment protection laws. So, the average working man, and it was the working man in those days, had very little protection. He had to doff his cap to the landowners who paid him £2 a week, or whatever it may be, to work in the greenhouses and he worked long hours.

We had the statements that Deputy Fallaize said yesterday, because generally remember we used to see the Pathé clips, you can still see them now, where the husband, who was the clerk, or the under-manager in the factory in England, went home, sat down. We all smoked a pipe in those days. We were a bit more tolerant. He smoked a pipe and the wife always had one of those skirts that was out here. She brought him a cup of tea and her hair was properly coiffed. That was the way society was structured.

Now, when Deputy Langlois and I first went to Elizabeth College in September 1962 – we are the same age, we may not look it, but we are (*Laughter*) – when we went to that school in September 1962, it was widely different and there was a degree of social mobility. Because the school I went to for my seven-11 education was Amherst School. There were over 40 kids in a class. Thankfully, I think there is only about 20-22 children in a class now. So, again, education has moved on and in so, so, so many ways, it is better. I want it in so, so many ways to be better in two years, in five years, in 10 years, in 20 years. What is true is that it will not be the same in two years, five years, 10 years and 20 years.

We did have a College of Further Education, what, 40 years ago? I think it has just had its 40th anniversary. That may seem a long time, but it is not really, in the history of education in these Islands.

I went and I am only saying it because that was the case. Seven boys went to Elizabeth College from the 'top class' because you had a 'top class' in those days, in the bigger schools. Ten or 11 girls went to Ladies' College and just about everybody else in that 'top class' of over 40 went to one of the other grammar schools. Remember, until 1984, 1985, we had two separate grammar schools.

So, it was a degree of social mobility.

But, where I agree a lot, Deputy Roffey said yesterday, he gave the example of his friend's daughter and 'why do we want these social housing children coming in our schools?'. That is true, there was a lot of that. There was a lot of it then. I will mention another example of how things have moved on. My elder sister is five and a half years younger than me, because I do not know whether my parents thought they had something perfect when I was born or they thought, 'That is such an abomination we are going to wait for a few years before we have another child!' But there is a five and a half year between me and my elder sister and she had her family, she has only got one daughter, a bit later, so there is quite a gap.

Her daughter Jessica was the only one from her year, and Jessica is now 25, to pass, because they still use that terminology, the 11-plus from Amherst to Ladies' College that year. My sister was living in the wrong social housing, wrong States' houses at the time. My sister by that time was divorced, was a single mother.

Jessica went to the college, went on to Durham University, which is one of the leading universities in England and Wales, and got at 2.1 in modern languages. But her time at Ladies' College was awful. It was absolutely awful. She found the kind of response that Deputy Roffey has highlighted and I do not look back at my period of time at the college with any degree of warmth. I enjoyed my time at Amherst School, the four years I spent there, and the two years before at Vauvert Infants, much more. I hold different memories, because I felt more comfortable with my own people. Undoubtedly that was the case.

I can remember, and if you come out of Deputy Brehaut's house, bottom of Le Foulon, you turn right, you go up about 40 yards, on the opposite there is a house. Quite a big house, open market house. It really is good.

I can remember the young lad who I was at school with, he invited me there, I think the first or second term that I was at the college. I went there and it felt like Buckingham Palace and I felt

880

875

835

840

845

850

855

860

865

immensely out of place. I never felt comfortable. It was not for me. We did not have that. I did not feel I could invite him back. My mum and dad would have welcomed him back, but I did not feel I could invite him back, because I did not feel comfortable.

I am not exactly a person that has ever lacked self-confidence. That is because I have asked so many girls to dance in my young days and most of them said no, that was why. Never affected my self-confidence. That was their loss, not mine!

One of the speeches I was disappointed with, I have got to say, not Deputy Lester Queripel's. It was amusing, He said two things, one of which is right, that whatever we say in this debate it is unlikely to influence any of us. I think most of us, the overwhelming number of us have made up our minds as to how we are going to vote and we made them up before the debate started. But, secondly, he talked about bullying. I did not really understand what he meant there. Certainly, I do not feel bullied by any of the representations I have had. I feel informed and people, whether they are teachers, not teachers, whether educationalists, whether young people, whether they are 60, 70, 80-years-old, are entitled to speak to me, are entitled to come to me.

With just one exception, and that was not a teacher, that was not a member of the teaching staff, they have all done so civilly and I am grateful to them and I have taken on board what they say.

I go to the analogy, because although I often do not agree with the conclusions, or sometimes do not agree with the conclusions, I always like the panache and the verve and the energy that Deputy Roffey puts into his speeches. They are always entertaining. You cannot fall asleep during that time.

One analogy he gave about, you are in a boat, it is in trouble, you would not burst into the cabin and tell the captain to move to port when he should go to starboard. I agree with that. Whether you deal with Captain Pugwash or Captain Hardy, you probably would not do that, I accept that.

But, when you become a parent – you do not have to be a parent to make that view, I accept that fully – your life changes dramatically and forever. From the minute you become a parent until the minute that you die, you are responsible for that child. It does not matter how old he or she may be, how obstreperous he or she may be, how argumentative or ungrateful he or she may be, he is your child. They are your children. You are the volunteer and they are the conscripts. You have to do your best for them.

Despite the fact, and I was really saddened to hear the detail of it earlier this week, of the level of children who do not go home to a loving parent who puts their arms around them, asks them what they have done in the day, who does not have a proper meal, who does not go home to any kind of ordered existence, I am shocked by that. That this supposedly affluent Island has got so many kids in that kind of position.

That is our fault. We have only been in this States seven months. It is the fault of the previous Education Departments, I am not just talking about the last four years, going back years and years. I am talking the departments, I am talking about senior officers, I am talking about politicians, I am talking about people that have not addressed that problem and dealt with it as it should have been dealt with.

You are never going to have a perfect society. You are never going to have 100% perfect parents. You are never going to have parents that can always look after their children as they should. But we should be much better than we have been. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

That is why I am not giving up on social mobility. I sincerely wanted to hear Deputy Meerveld speak before I spoke, because I have read his pamphlet and it is a research pamphlet. I do not mean any criticism of it and I will be referring in due course, if I can remember the pages correctly, to pages five, nine, 22 and 23.

Page five, if I recall – I am not going to instantly go to it, I have just relied on my memory, which is not as good as it used to be – he talks about a vision, not a blueprint. Today, when we make the decision we cannot just have a vision. We have got to have a blueprint that is workable and this is where I have a degree of disappointment with Deputy St Pier, because he was the

930

925

885

890

895

900

905

910

915

Treasury Minister until 30th April 2016 and, effectively, whatever the title, he is the finance minister, or finance president now.

The previous States has been criticised, I do not know if fairly or not, but it has been criticised for making decisions and policies without thinking through whether they are achievable or not. So, what I did read from the Policy Letter that was published, I must get my terminology right, the Policy Letter that was dated 8th January 2016, that was published a month or two later, was that what Treasury were saying then was that we cannot afford the system that was being put forward then, the four schools, *etc.*, because the annual extra cost would be £3.5 million per annum.

I do not know, we do not know, what is eventually going to come through in June or July next year when the Education Committee returns with their document. That is what worries me, because I considered with others, including Deputy Graham and including Deputy Lowe, whether we should have brought the requête earlier, but we were counselled and advised that we should wait to see what the Education Committee were going to do.

When they came back recently, and after a degree of pressure, it was only on this one issue. I do not mean only in any pejorative sense, but I find it difficult to make a decision for change without knowing if that change can be properly implemented.

I do not engage in social media but I do read some of it and I saw various missives, because he is an active participant, of Deputy Fallaize, who said, 'whatever, we have two schools, three schools, four schools, I will be against selection'. He knows that I respect his intellect and his integrity, but I think that is a bit irresponsible, because we need to know whether the system that we are going to vote on today is going to be able to be implemented in a practical way. If it is not, then all we are doing is puffing out our chests, big peacocks, and not making sensible and determined decisions.

Deputy Stephens, in her usual understated, able and efficient way, made a very good speech first thing this morning. And she is entitled to the answers to the questions that she and others have posed and I will seek to do that in due course.

In fact, I will address it a bit now. Let me just say this. Do I think the 11-plus is satisfactory as it presently is? Of course, I do not. Nobody can.

Do I think it achieves its purpose that it should achieve? No I do not.

So, let me just deal with the social mobility point in a little bit more detail now. At page nine, I think it is, of the Deputy Meerveld pamphlet, he makes reference to statistics he has gained quite properly, graphs that show that only 2.3% of children in social housing going to Grammar School, of the intake. Less than one in 40 if my arithmetic is right. Less than one in 40. But those people in social housing – it should be higher, it should be much higher – that does not mean that you can simply look at that statistic, because we have got our good old friend the *Guernsey Facts and Figures 2016*.

I have always liked figures, of every kind. *Guernsey Facts and Figures 2016* tells me that we have got a working population of 32.300 out of a population of 63,000. So, just over 50% of our population are actually in gainful employment. Alderney has a further 2,000-ish people. Never quite sure of the figures from Alderney. Sark, 400; Herm, 100.

So, altogether, we have probably got 64,000, 65,000, 66,000 people living in the Bailiwick and median earnings at the end of 2015, I appreciate the figure may have gone up a little bit since then, was £30,953.

Now, that is significantly less than all of us, whether they may be presidents, whether we are ordinary, and I mean that respectfully, Members earn significantly more than them.

So, that is less than £600 per week and, from that, the average person with the average earnings, have to pay direct and indirect taxes, social insurances and all the other things. When you look at page 29 of *Guernsey Facts and Figures 2016*, it categorises people into groups as to how they are employed.

Twelve of those 19 categories earn less than that £30,000/£31,000 per annum on average. The average is boosted, particularly, as you would expect, by the finance sector, by information and technology, by professional and business and, fifthly, by people in public administration.

985

980

935

940

945

950

955

960

965

970

None of those sectors are the earnings, on average, above £43,355 or £833.75 per week. So, the percentage of people who earn more than £60,000-£65,000 per annum is small. So overwhelmingly most people are not wealthy and many of their children go to Grammar School. Some go as placeholders, as it is called nowadays, to the three colleges.

Again, I checked the fees for Elizabeth and Ladies' College and, depending which school you go to, whether it is junior school, senior school etc., they are somewhere between £9,500 to £11,000 per annum per child.

Now, if the average earning is £31,000, even if you go up to £35,000, that is out of taxed income, for one child you are paying approximately a third, possibly more, of your income.

We are not an Island where there are very many people who can afford to pay. But some do.

I checked some of the grammar schools in England, what their fees may be. Some of you may know more about that than me. At Winchester I see boarding fees as somewhere in the region of £36,678 per annum. Cheltenham Ladies' College – I went out with a girl from Cheltenham Ladies' College, not for very long, a long time ago – boarding fees were between £34,000 and £38,000 per annum; day fees £23,000 to £26,000 per annum.

Those are massive sums. I fully accept, absolutely accept, what Deputy Tooley said yesterday, What we faced in April was an election not a referendum. It was not a single-issue thing. She is absolutely correct.

But I remember, when this Billet was discussed, the March Billet, I was due to go on the Sunday phone-in and then I was told. 'You cannot go on the Sunday phone-in because we have now had this Billet published and Deputy Peter Sherbourne is coming to speak about anti-selection, and Deputy Lyndon Trott is coming on to speak about pro-selection.'

All of a sudden, Deputy Lyndon Trott was not available, so I put on my number 12 costume shirt –

Deputy Trott: Sir, on a point of correction, that is utter rubbish!

Deputy Ferbrache: Okay, all I can say is that is what I was told.

Deputy Fallaize: Is Deputy Trott talking about the whole speech, or just ...? (*Laughter and applause*)

Deputy Ferbrache: We have got Ant and Dec. Now we have got Fallaize!

Deputy Brehaut: He was not selected!

Deputy Ferbrache: That was what I was told. All I can say is what I was told.

Deputy Trott: You must not believe everything you were told.

Deputy Ferbrache: No, no. Certainly not if it is from Deputy Trott! No, no...

Anyway, I was on that debate and it was a two-hour programme and, although people could phone up and ask how it would work and what could we do about a yellow line being painted at the bottom of the road, as you would expect because that Billet was out, 99% of the questions were on that topic.

So, it was very clear indeed what my views.

I did not say anything in my manifesto, because I said I am not making any promises because I do not know what is going on and I am not going to promise anything. I need to do my best. I think you could summarise my manifesto, which was a lot briefer than many of the others, in those words.

I also said, as Deputy Tooley correctly said, I am not in favour of flip-flop Government.

1005

990

995

1000

1015

1020

1010

1030

Deputy Roffey was right when he said the issue should have been decided a year or so before it was decided. It would then have been put to bed. We would know where it was. It was the worst possible timing, but it would be counter to reality to say it was not appreciated it would be an election topic.

It was an election topic on the doorstep. It was an election topic in the voting booth. People have talked about it ever since we have been States' Members, since May of this year.

So, that is the position in relation to that, that it has been a topic. It was raised at St Peter Port hustings. But Deputy Tooley is also, my goodness I keep saying she was also right, she was also right.

Deputy Tooley: I'm right about everything!

Deputy Ferbrache: Now she has started speaking we will not be able to stop her!

She was also right when she said people did not necessarily vote for you because you were in favour of selection or against selection. That is true.

I remember one gentleman, who was most courteous, and we exchanged several emails and he asked me what my views were on various topics and I gave them, because I had not really disclosed them in my manifesto, and he said, 'I really would like to vote for you but there is one real, real stumbling block. Your views on selection. Will you change them?'

He did not mean it in a threat, he just meant could he persuade me. I said, 'No.' We went to the hustings. He obviously was at the hustings and he emailed me very soon afterwards, saying, 'Now see what you say, although you and I will radically disagree with each other in relation to education, I am going to vote for you.'

And I assume he did.

So, she is right in that regard. But what I do not like, and I do not mean this as any criticism, I am not pointing, figuratively or any way, at Deputy Tooley, but it is the fact that some times when people do not like statistics, they seek to discredit them. I spent a professional lifetime where you had to deal with evidence. Sometimes, you could counter it, whether it was a criminal case, civil case, matrimonial case, whatever it was, because you had other evidence. Sometimes, you thought oh blooming heck, all I can do is discredit it, because that is the only weapon left in my armoury.

Sometimes, it actually works. But, here, that is what I do not like. We have had three major election shocks, or votes, or whatever you call it, over the last 18 months or so. The first isn't really a matter of issue, but I do not think many people would have predicted that the Tory Party would have won a majority in the English election in May 2015. The second was Brexit and, if I could have voted in Brexit, I would have voted to, not by a big margin, remain. Nevertheless, I think 16 something million people, 48.1% of people who voted, voted to remain and 51.9%, some 17 something million, voted to leave. That decision should have been respected, but what did we get? We got the Islington Intelligentsia and others saying, 'They are thick northerners. They are racists. They do not know what they are doing. We cannot accept their vote. We know better.'

I have never, in my life, accepted that people know better than me. They might be better informed in some matters. They will be better educated. They will know more on something. But I do not know my place, I never have known my place, I never will know my place.

So, from immediately feeling sympathetic to the Remainers, I thought, 'How dare you, you arrogant so-and-sos.'

Then we had the election of President-elect Trump and I know he did not win the popular vote. First time since Al Gore and Bush in 2000 and before that Grover Cleveland, back in the 1890s, if I remember correctly. I look at Deputy Trott and Deputy Gollop and I could have that conversation before in relation to American elections. But he still got over 62 million people that voted for him. He actually won the electoral college vote by 306 to 232, so it is a pretty significant majority, because of the way the American structure their elections.

1060

1040

1045

1050

1055

1065

1075

1070

1080

But what is said there? 'They are all blue-necks. They are racists. They are intolerant. They are terrible people.' No doubt, some of them are. But, again, it is the arrogance of the intelligentsia, which thankfully I have never been party to, that say you ignore the public will.

When I looked at this Billet back in February, or whenever it came out, it had some statistics. Now, again, like my good and able colleague Deputy Gollop, I am interested in statistics. Facts and figures have always interested me.

I saw this. I am now quoting directly from the Policy Letter, paragraph 2.6 on page 1499:

The Department sought the views of all those working within the profession, via a series of challenges, questions, that it posed on a crowdsourcing platform. It is important to note that the crowd was only open to current permanent members of staff. Retired teachers and supply staff were able to give their views via the public online questionnaire. In summary, the main things arising from this consultation of the profession, who responded, were a preference for a move to all-ability schools, admission to secondary schools based on catchment area, provision of post-16 education via a tertiary college, keeping four secondary schools, a reduction in college funding and ...'

... something I absolutely agree with ...

'... Introduction of means-testing for special places at the grant-aided schools.'

I absolutely agree with that. I also agree with the elimination of the Grammar School, because it should be for the ordinary boy and the ordinary girl whose parents cannot afford to pay for that ordinary boy and ordinary girl to go onto the kind of education that is best suited for them. In my view.

1100 Paragraph 2.7:

'The public consultation was designed to provide a chance for the population of Guernsey and interested parties to have their say, but was not designed to be an all-encompassing statistical survey and was not set up to ensure a representative sample of Islanders' views. For example, of the 3,971 responses that were received ... '

I will pause there: 3,971 responses. To me, in an Island of 62,000, 63,000 people, and Alderney and Sark and the others, that is a heck of a lot of people who have taken the trouble – it was quite a complicated form, as it should have been – to respond.

To ignore that or to try and then undermine the value of that consultation is as equally offensive to me as the Trump situation and the Brexit situation. How dare people say that some people's consultation, their votes, are not as important as others? How dare they say that? It is arrogance of the gold medal stream. That is what angers me. It provokes the emotion of anger that you could ignore something like that because you do not like the statistics.

Sorry, are you standing up? Are you interrupting me?

Deputy Inder: Hopefully to help you, sir.

Deputy Ferbrache: I am quite happy to sit down.

The Bailiff: You are giving way to Deputy Inder.

Deputy Ferbrache: I am not sure if he was standing up or going out.

The Bailiff: I think he is asking you to give way.

Deputy Inder: I am just trying to help Mr Ferbrache, here.

I have dealt with stats most of my life, sir: 3,900 is about 5% of the Guernsey population, maybe 6%, 7%, I cannot remember exactly.

YouGov, alone, works on only figures of around 10,000 and I cannot be bothered to work out what that is as proportion of the UK population, and the BBC only on 1,000. So, that 3,900, sir, is absolutely massive and should be commended.

1095

1090

1110

1105

1120

Thank you.

Deputy Ferbrache: I am grateful for that, because that makes much more eloquently than I did.

But just going on, then, what it said, bullet point:

"... 2,128 were from people with connections to either the Grammar School and the Sixth Form Centre, or grant-aided colleges, while 756 were from people with connections to the high school, 11-16 only. '2,561 were from people who own their own houses.'

My goodness, what a crime. You own your own house.

Whilst 82 were from people from social housing, 352 were from the private rented sector and 381 said they were living with friends and family,

In summary, the main themes arising from this consultation with the public were a preference for maintaining a selective system, but changing the way that selection is made; retaining a sixth form centre based at one school and a separate College of Further Education, keeping four secondary schools and a continuation of college funding and the introduction of means testing of special places at the colleges.'

Then, the statistics carried on. 2.9:

'As part of the young people's survey, Year 6 pupils ...'

So, that is 11-plus pupils.

'... were asked specific questions to gauge their views on the current system of selection, including 11-plus and their preferred site of schools. In summary, there was a preference for keeping the 11-plus as it is now; allowing parents to choose which school their children go to if the 11-plus is not in place; having smaller schools of between 500 and 600 pupils.'

I would have thought that is pretty good evidence for kids, particularly also from parents. As I understand it, the statistics also were they had some 300-odd teachers who contributed out of 1,200. I may have got the statistics slightly wrong. And that was thought to be, and in fact it was said to be in this report, a very good return. I accept that. It is really the point that Deputy Inder has just made. It is a good return.

We would be fools to ignore the views of the teachers and we are not ignoring the views of the teachers, because the reforms in education are much greater than whether or not the 11-plus survives or goes. They have to be far wider than that.

I share Deputy Graham's comments yesterday. If the vote is taken today to get rid, or keep rid of the 11-plus, whatever the right terminology is, it is not going to bring Sodom and Gomorrah, the pillars are not going to come down from the temples, it will continue.

But, I want the kids to have opportunities and I do not believe, if we get rid of selection, they will have those opportunities.

What is the evidence of our success? I would like to quote a couple of things, because when we went to La Roundel, as I say, I spoke to the four teachers for 50-55 minutes. Deputy St Pier, it seemed they were surrounding you, in the nicest possible way. It seemed like that but it was not like that at all. I really enjoyed my conversation with them and I do not say that in a patronising way. It was very informative.

As we walked in or out, I cannot remember which, in addition to being given by Deputy Meerveld his pamphlet of quality, we were also given a folder with material in. I have read it all, of course, and there were certain links on the internet, which as a result of the training that Deputy Dudley-Owen has given me in earlier times, I can now work.

Something from the Sutton Trust, published on 23rd September, 2016, so pretty relevant. It says this:

'The Sutton Trust has produced a series of surveys documenting the education backgrounds of leading people across a range of professions from medicine to politics, to acting and even Nobel Prize winners. These show that the products

1155

1135

1140

1145

STATES OF DELIBERATION, THURSDAY, 1st DECEMBER 2016

of secondary schools, now in their 50s and 60s, make up around a quarter to a third of the country's most successful people.

'We have also published an analysis by Durham University, investigating GCSE results at the 163 existing grammar schools in England. It found that pupils from poorer backgrounds did marginally better than similar pupils in comprehensives.'

It also went on to say, 'Shaping the Impact' was the heading:

'We have worked with grammar schools to enable them to benefit more children from disadvantaged backgrounds. For this approach to work for any new grammars requires a series of measures:

'Tests to allow children to enter at different ages, to avoid crude, cliff-edge decisions.

'Grants for poorer pupils to prepare for tests with private tutoring.

'Almost certainly lowering academic grades needed for those from less privileged homes.'

Why cannot we do that here? Why cannot we do that as part of our reform of our current selective system? We did not have tutoring back in the days when Deputy Langlois and I took the 11-plus in 1962. We did not have that when former Deputy Le Lièvre took it in 1961. We just turned up, we were given the exams, none of our peers, we did not know what homework was. We never did any. We were not expected to do any. And we went away.

But the system has changed and people will try and get around, take advantage of, and I do not mean that in any critical way, of any system. What you hear constantly, and I heard it on Tuesday and I have heard it previously, is that the more affluent parents will pay for their child to be tutored and, therefore, they get advantage over children who have not got that opportunity. I accept that, but that is wrong.

But we live in a democratic society. You cannot ask a child, when he comes into school at 8 a.m. or 8.30 a.m. 'Have you been tutored? Did you have a lesson on maths last night?' 'No.' You cannot do that, because that must happen in a democratic society, but you address those balances. That is what you will do.

These are suggestions made by something called the Sutton Trust. It goes on to say:

Even then, there is the wider challenge of ensuring that high academic achievers in the majority of non-selective schools are appropriately supported and stretched, as well as creating equally desirable schools for children with other creative and vocational talents.

'Our researchers found that many highly performing comprehensives are just as socially exclusive as grammars.'

I was surprised to read that, but now I have reflected on that, it does not surprise me.

Probably a few months ago, I cannot remember exactly when, I was sent a document from a person whom I respect, fully, has been a friend of mine, we have known each other for over 50 years. He used to raise his eyes at my ability to ride a motorcycle. He sent me a document about social mobility, or the lack of social mobility. He used to be a Deputy until the end of April.

His point was there is not any here. Basically, that is what he was saying. There certainly is a lot, lot less. But I have told you that has got to be looked at. The statistics that Deputy Meerveld quotes at page nine of his pamphlet, extrapolated from elsewhere, I am sure are completely accurate, I am not challenging them. But that is the narrow gauge of social housing. I, again, emphasise and I fully accept, I do not have any qualms or argument with it, that that figure is too low.

Is it not beyond the wit of educationalists? Because your intellect is not fixed at 10 or 11 years of age, and some people who are stars at 10 or 11 are pretty indifferent at 15 or 16. That is self-evident; more often than not, I think that is not the case, but certainly there are some that it will be.

In the days when I think a child's ability, especially in a small community like ours of 60-odd thousand people, can it not be monitored so that, I think we were told, I am at a little bit of a loss in relation to statistics, whether it is 180 places or 160 places, at the Grammar School, that were not filled?

We were told of research in the 1950's, which said that grammar schools effectively are not very good, they should be changed. Our current Grammar School did not come together as an

1195

1160

1165

1170

1175

1180

1185

entity until about the mid-1980's. You had a boys' grammar school and a girls' grammar school before then and, although they provided decent education, they were not the quality of educational establishment that now exists at the Grammar School.

I would be the last person to say that you just look at the academics, you just look at the supposed top 25%. The people who are vocational, the people that are artistic, the people that have got logic, the people who have got abilities in whatever other field it may be and I am sure there are lots of others, are just as important to our society.

In his pamphlet, Deputy Meerveld refers to the fact we need continuing education until somebody is 99. The only objection I take to that is why should you be prejudiced against the hundreds? I will be there in 35 years' time, but I know what he means. We should be continuing to look at education on an ever-involving basis.

That is the point today. We are only, and I do not mean only in any unimportant, because it is a vastly important question, we are only look at one issue.

There was a quote. I like writing down quotes. It was something that Andrew Marr said when he was writing about Fidel Castro. He said:

'Evil can be debonair. Idiocy is well-dressed.'

What I wrote underneath that, was that 'uncertainty can be disastrous'. That is a Peter Ferbrache quote, not an Andrew Marr quote.

We cannot create uncertainty.

Deputy Stephens in her excellent speech, it really was an excellent speech, I thank her for giving it, even though she and I come to a different conclusion, I still respect it to the nth degree. She made a point that we did have, my era, Deputy Langlois' era, our academic path was pretty limited really. Off you went to law school or architectural school and then you went off to do your various things and that was it. That was how you spent your life.

I have been in the same profession all my working life. I worked for the same law firm for 36 years since I came back. There is now another law firm, but we will not talk about that! I was a barrister in England for several years before I came back. Again, it is just going back, because I have got that image with me of what I was told recently about the needy children in our society, and it took me back to my days because, in those days as a lawyer, I had a very direct style. I was asked in Nottingham to take on a succession of care cases for a local authority. The procedure was different to how it evolved later on, with separate representation. They were children who were living in circumstances, we are talking about the 70's, in a city like Nottingham, in a county like Nottinghamshire, and it literally, I used to go home, I had not been married long at that time and it literally brought tears to my eyes that we have had to deal with that.

We have allowed that to happen here and it cannot happen.

We have got to look at also, we cannot just ignore statistics, as I say, if we do not like them. Again, from the Sunday Times last week, there was something published. The 250 top state secondary schools, rankings based on 2016 examination results, with A*, B grades at A-level. There are 250. It is here, you can all read it if you want. Not very exciting really. The first 125, there are 110 purely selective schools that are most successful. There are nine comprehensives and there are six partially selective.

So, even if you pulled all the partially selective, non-selective, and that would be generous, 110 out of 125 of the top state schools are selective. And we are trying to get rid of a selection system, when this evidence is hot off the press.

There was also something, and it reminded me of somebody by the name of Queripel, but not Deputy Laurie, or Deputy Lester, but by a gentleman, who again been a friend of mine for a long time, called Lyndon Queripel. It says 'A Stone that Mick left unturned'.

'Students relished the challenges offered at Dartford Grammar, a selective but not elitist school that has Mick Jagger as its most famous pupil.'

I suppose we could have continued the debate last night, if the Bailiff had allowed us to spend the night together! (*Laughter*)

1245

1200

1205

1210

1215

1220

1225

1230

1235

STATES OF DELIBERATION, THURSDAY, 1st DECEMBER 2016

We might have even continued it until Ruby Tuesday and hopefully we will come up with a Rolled Gold decision. Enough of that.

Deputy Graham: No satisfaction!

1250

Deputy Ferbrache: Speak for yourself, Deputy Graham!

Sorry, I give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

1255

1260

1265

1270

1275

1280

Deputy Fallaize: I am grateful to Deputy Ferbrache, before he moves on to his second exhibit. No, not the second paragraph!

The league table he read out, while interesting, would he not agree with me that if you have one group of schools which contain children of the highest academic aptitude exclusively, and then another set of schools which are mixed abilities, so children of all aptitudes, is it not absolutely inevitable that the schools in the former group, which are made up exclusively of children of the highest aptitude, will end up with the better public exam results?

Does he not agree with me further that it is absolutely miraculous that that table includes any comprehensive schools at all when it obviously exclude several dozen schools which remain grammar schools?

Deputy Ferbrache: No, I do not agree with Deputy Fallaize absolutely.

Because this list includes lots of grammar schools, but it is headed 'state secondary schools'. These are state schools. It is not Winchester. It is not Eton. It is not those kind of schools. These are state schools. Temerity would take me, even if I would not object or disagree with Deputy Fallaize, I rarely do, then I would parade a grammar school girl who is now the Prime Minister of England. The second grammar school girl, there have only be two prime ministers of England who are females.

She said this recently. She went to Holton Park Girls' Grammar School.

'Currently we have a situation, whereby if your parents have got the money they can buy a selective education –

Deputy Tooley: Could I raise a point of correction, sir?

The Bailiff: Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: As somebody who has spent their lifetime growing up in Wales, this is the second time during his speech that Deputy Ferbrache has forgotten that we do not have a Prime Minister of England, or a General Election for England. It is, in fact, the United Kingdom.

Deputy Ferbrache: Absolutely. I accept that. Absolutely. I was just using shorthand. I completely accept it.

1285

1290

Deputy Tooley: I would further like to object, sir, to England being shorthand for the United Kingdom. Perhaps we could also use it as shorthand for the Channel Islands?

Deputy Ferbrache: Well, the only reason I did it was E comes before W and comes before S and it comes before N. I know it includes England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. I know that

I did not mean any offence but, anyway, obviously, I did offend and for that I most sincerely apologise.

Anyway, Theresa May, the Prime Minister of all those great countries, said this:

STATES OF DELIBERATION, THURSDAY, 1st DECEMBER 2016

'Currently we have a situation whereby if your parents have got the money, they can buy a selective education or move into the house next to the good school. The ban on grammar schools means these kinds of opportunities are being restricted. I want a system where all schools are providing a quality education ...'

So do I, so do you.

'... where everyone's skills are recognised and developed, not just the people who have wealthy parents.'

Hear, hear, Theresa May, Prime Minister of England, Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland.

She got her team to do some analysis, her team reveals that a dozen key towns and cities in Britain have no grammar school within 30 miles and five have none less than 50 miles away.

If I can go back to my Mick Jagger Dartford School, which I think was number 17 in the list, it was a point I think that Deputy Tindall made yesterday about the International Baccalaureate and the details about the International Baccalaureate and the head master of that school talks about International Baccalaureate and he talks about how exams have improved and he said something and then afterwards, it said this:

'Unusually, every one of the school's sixth formers takes the IB, the International Baccalaureate, often wrongly, in Oakes' view, thought of as an elite programme for only the best and the brightest. The curriculum is demanding. Pupils take six subjects, including maths, a science and a language, and spend 93% of their time in classes, compared with around 65% for A-levels.'

And he then gives other statistics. I think this a point that perhaps might, and I do not want to encourage him to jump to his feet again, but if he wants to and no doubt he will and I will sit down, that Deputy Fallaize was referring to.

The head teacher says this:

'Dartford as a town is quite inward-looking. The thinking was to move the school forward. We are looking out, not just to Europe but to the wider world and, of course, it is more important now than ever before we should all be outward-facing and respect the differences in cultures.'

He makes other points about the education system and the benefits, as he sees them, of selection.

I have diverted myself from Deputy Jane Stephens' point about having to create an educated – in the widest sense, not just people with lots of O-levels, or GCSEs or A-levels, whatever it may be, academic qualifications – a diverse community with a diverse range of skills.

I think that the top-ranking schools system in the world is either South Korea or Singapore, something like that. Finland is about fifth or sixth, I think. People can correct me. They will be able to correct me when they speak if I have got it wrong. I am speaking to the best of my recollection.

I do not quite want a system where they have got for South Korea, where the kids go to school for 14 hours a day, or study for 14 hours a day. You have got to have a childhood. You have got to remember going out with your mates. You have got to remember playing football in the streets, you have got to remember doing all the things that you want to do when you are a youngster, because those memories will be with you forever. Equally, if you do not create those memories you cannot have them.

But they put some South Korean children of whatever age it was into the GCSE, they took a mock science GCSE. They completed it within 15 minutes and they got top grades.

Now, we are going to have to compete, with our young people and the services we want to provide, if we want to keep this community affluent, with that kind of education system. I am not saying we follow it, I am not advocating that at all. I am just saying those are the challenges that we face.

When I was a young lad, when Deputy Langlois was a young man. When we were young boys of 11, 12, 13, holidays in England were not for people like us. Guernsey was where we spent our holidays. The first time I ever left Guernsey was when I was nine or 10, because my father had broken his back in an industrial accident and my mother took me to go and visit him in a hospital

1305

1300

1310

1315

1320

1325

just outside Southampton. That was the first time I ever left Guernsey and I do not think one can say that was for a purpose of a holiday.

So, the world was different then and, in lots of ways, it is much better now. But it is much more competitive. We used to get our papers, we had very little contact, really, with the outside when we were in Guernsey all those years ago. Now it is instant.

We had the two or three cables that were ripped up by a thing earlier this week. My goodness, Sodom and Gomorrah, the world was coming to an end. It did not, because there were other cables at Shoreham, but never mind, it was thought to be the end of the world and, of course, it was not.

Again, I make the point, and as I say, I was disappointed and I have to emphasise that, that Deputy St Pier, who in the Billet that I referred to, or the Policy Letter, the commentary on the Billet, that was written in the earlier part of this year, commented on the financial difficulties and said that the Education Department, as it then was, had not come up with something for value that the Treasury & Resources Committee, as I think it was then called, could support.

So I turn now, again, probably almost finally, I am sure everybody will be relieved, to Deputy Meerveld's pamphlet. Again, I sincerely do not mean any criticism of it. It is an intelligent piece of work and it is something that is worth considering. But you would not make a permanent decision for the education of the children of Guernsey, Alderney, Sark and Herm on the basis of this document.

Deputy Graham's point is, if we make a decision today, that we are going to uphold the March Resolution, the Grammar School will start dying from tomorrow. An analogy with that was, when I read that, I did not realise and perhaps I should have realised, again I apologise, that now the children know their 11-plus results by March, in other words a full term before they leave their primary education.

Apparently, that change was made some years ago. I cannot see the logic of it, because I was told by a number of teachers the kids switch off after that and it is very difficult to motivate them for that last term. I can understand that. I can understand that in relation to the Grammar School.

Deputy Roffey told us, and I sincerely know, he is an honest man, he is not going to tell us if he has not researched it, that he had spoken to some management at, I imagine, the Education Committee, about timetables and, I think, it is appendix four to the Policy Letter that was written earlier this year, and it talked about timetables.

Rather than try and memorise it, I will try and find the exact page and give you the exact quote, so that I make sure that I have not unintentionally misled you.

It is page 1737 of the Billet, Policy Letter of that time. It is appendix five.

Appendix five, 'Proposed Implementation Timeline, Outline Timeline by Academic Year.' It says:

'2017-18: Appointment of executive head for the Guernsey Federation of Secondary Schools. Final year of 11-plus testing for Year 6 primary schools.'

So, I imagine that is what Deputy Roffey was talking about yesterday. I am imagining that, if I have got that wrong, I invite him to correct me. He is going to correct me, so I will sit down.

Deputy Roffey: Yes, happy to correct him, sir.

As said that I had exchanged emails with the staff at Grange House and that the implementation of a non-selective intake for 2019 was still entirely do-able, but within the existing education estate. So, in this timetable, where it mentions the completion of the La Mare rebuild, I was certainly not referring to that part of it.

Deputy Ferbrache: That is helpful.

But we have got here, and I accept it is subject to the comment that he has just made, but for example it talks about, and Deputy Roffey has just explained that, new La Mare site complete 2019-20, we know that is not likely to happen now so it is up to that region.

1350

1335

1340

1345

1355

1365

1360

1370

1375

But, what it is talking about, within a very, very few years, the Grammar School will cease to operate. Whether it is three years' time, five years' time, it will cease to operate. But it will start dying tomorrow, because they will know that, as a Grammar School, it will be changing from almost immediately.

In fact, if I have remembered correctly what Deputy Roffey said yesterday, there is no reason, they do not have to wait for the new school to be built. That is an issue for another day. We can start up this system almost immediately. We can start doing this almost immediately.

Even if La Mare is rebuilt and that debate will take place, presumably, next summer, then we have got to operate with the Grammar School, St Sampson's High and Beaucamps. They would have to start operating this system almost immediately.

This is where I then again parade Deputy Meerveld's pamphlet. Page 22, he copies the costing of La Mare de Carteret School and its stage three plus cost plan 6th January 1916. So, that is only, what, less than a year ago.

That shows, if it is a school for 600 pupils, I am talking about the main school, the end cost, total project cost, including inflation, £69.2 million. If it is decided it is going to be a 960-pupil main school, £77.15 million. It then goes on. After accurately setting out the table, Deputy Meerveld says this:

'As can be seen from this table, extracted from the Policy Letter, the total cost of rebuilding La Mare de Carteret School of 600 students and all other facilities is estimated to be £69.2 million.'

He then goes on, the College of F.E. and he then refers to the relevant page of the document:

'The project to consolidate the College of Further Education down from three campuses to one, at Les Ozouets site, would cost an estimate £67 million, but vacating the Coutanchez campus would enable the site to be sold for an estimated £2 million. However, no estimate has yet been made for the cost of remedial works that will be needed to extend the useful life of the existing Grammar School buildings at Les Varendes site.'

Even netting off the potential sale of Coutanchez, the total cost of La Mare de Carteret and College of FE rebuilds is an eye-watering £134.21 million and he says it does not include the cost of remedial works at Les Varendes.

Now, fine, I am sure that arithmetic is right. It does not take into account inflation over a period of time and building inflation, despite the fact that real inflation is less than 1%, building inflation always seems to be more than that. I do not know why. Also, I have got to say, although it is a secondary issue to what we are talking about today, but a very important secondary issue, the external works and drainage costs at building La Mare is, if it is a 600-pupil main school, is £11.8 million. If it goes up to 960, it is £12.9 million.

Could we not have found another place to build the school, to save that £11 million, £12 million, £13 million? I find it amazing.

When I saw the designs, I went to the Amherst School as I say, pitched roofs. Castel School, pitched roofs. I do not know much about building, but we are going to build another school with flat roofs. Where on earth is the logic of that?

But that is for another day. All these wise experts, we are told to follow the will of experts, cannot realise the basic rule of geometry, water goes like that and it runs away then. If it has got nowhere to run, it will pull and it will erode the substance that it sits upon. My goodness me, you can tell I did not do building studies as part of my education. But, perhaps, I did common sense as part of my education of life.

That takes me to the point about realism. We all want, all 40 of us, whatever view we may take in relation to this, the best education that we possibly can have. So, the remedy for success, I am sure you will disagree with me, but nevertheless I will give you examples of success and evidence. The system for education should be along the lines that the Sutton Trust, I am not advocating them because they are of greater brains, more intellect, you cannot make a snapshot of that, should look at that. We should address the social problems, we should encourage social mobility.

1400

1385

1390

1395

1405

1415

1410

I am here primarily for the ordinary children of Guernsey and Alderney and Sark and Herm. Not those whose parents can afford it.

I also do not know the logic, I have to say, because there is talk about Elizabeth College and the colleges and keeping them on. But, if you think about it logically, if we are going to say that we are going to go to all-ability schools, how can we justify the logic of financing schools that are not all-ability, not in a sense that we have been talking about over the last day and a half? The only logical way and I think all three colleges are good schools, would be in whatever transitional period runs out, we would not be able to finance them again. There would be no logic, there would be no ethos, there would be no sustainable moral code that could say that we could support those schools.

In that Billet that I have referred to, there is another passage that says we could not manage if those schools did not exist. We could not house them elsewhere. We do not have enough room to put them.

So, I looked up what that meant. How many children are we talking about? I found the figures. In relation to Elizabeth College, from when they first start school as little ones, there are 786 boys and there are 73 girls because, if you remember, girls can go to the junior schools and at 11 they go off to the Ladies' College or wherever. So, that is 859 pupils, when I looked up the figures just a night or two ago.

Ladies' College, from three to 18, is 555. Blanchelande, which we know does not go to 18, is 252.

Now, the arithmetic is 1,666 children. If you take out the special placeholders' children, say you take out 350, I do not know if that is the right number, I just did 52 by 7, which is 364, took that away roughly from 1,666, you have got 1,300 children, if you did not have any placeholders, if those 360 went directly into the all-ability schools, whichever catchment they were. Where would you fit those 1,300 children?

So, you – when I say you, again, I do not mean it pejoratively – who are voting to say to ordinary people we are going to get rid of the selective system but we must use, as a prop, for our education system, 1,300, 1,400, 1,500, 1600 kids are going to go to the colleges, I cannot see how that is logical. I cannot how, morally, that is justifiable. I just do not understand it. I have no difficulty with it, because I want everybody to have every opportunity. If a parent can pay for his or her child to go to a school, good luck to them. They will be looked after. As a good friend of mine, who is not in this Assembly, said to me once, the rich can look after themselves. And I accept that fully. The rich will look after themselves.

Again, Deputy Roffey said, well, look at the demographics when you go around. You are not sure you are going get a thing. I do not pretend. Deputy Graham went to great things, went home every night and put 'I have seen 56 people and 23 have talked about education and 18 have said yes, five have said no', or whatever the sums may be. I did not do that, I just stored up information and made a judgement in my head.

I went around at weekends. I went around early nights. I have never, in any of the time I have been a States' Member, gone around late-ish nights, because that is time people want to spend with their family or do other things and I have gone around during the day. Have I got around a statistical cross-section that I can say that is the case? No, I cannot say that. I can only form my judgement and the judgement that I form is that a clear majority of the people that spoke to me about the issue – it was not the only issue, it was Condor and everything else that people wanted to speak about – were in favour of keeping a selection system.

That was the clear view that was expressed to me. Now, that weighs significantly with me. There is also, in this same Billet, I keep thinking of other things, but I will sit down in a minute, the point it made reference in the Policy Letter of January that inflation of fees at the colleges was running at 7% per annum over a number of years. Now, inflation has not been running at 7% per annum for a number of years. Do you not think, States' Members, that there will be a rush to seek places at the colleges if the Grammar School is to go? If you think other than that, I am afraid you do not live in the real and practical world.

1475

1425

1430

1435

1440

1445

1450

1455

1460

1465

1470

STATES OF DELIBERATION, THURSDAY, 1st DECEMBER 2016

We, even in Guernsey, have people trying to move to catchment areas so that their kids can go to a particular school, because they think that school A is better than school B. In England, people pay £200,000, £300,000 to live in street A, because it is within that catchment area for this school, than street B, which is right next door, because it is in a different catchment area.

As a very distinguished former magistrate, Mr Tony Gillett told me once, because he had been a magistrate in ... [Inaudible], whether you are judging people in Abu Dhabi, in Guernsey, Mr Langlois or Mr Ferbrache, or whoever it may be, people are the same, by and large. So, do you not think it would happen here?

The Committee for Economic Development, I do not pretend it was raised in any particular way, we were considering in our Committee meeting just last week, a review of the insurance sector. By the way, that is a good news story. That is another day. A great news story. One of the people said one of the things that drags people here, one of the other speakers has already mentioned it, is our education system.

Now, by that, we did not go into any more detail other than that, I would be misleading if I said otherwise, I believe they mean our current education system. Our current education system needs to improve, it needs to get better. But please do not jump from a system where the Grammar School is in the top 2% or 3%, whatever it is – again you have got the statistics, those of you that do not like it might seek to disparage them, you should not, because they are good statistics – in the top 2% or 3%, for GCSEs, *etc.* Do not try to throw that away. Do not get rid of a very good school, because that is what you will be doing. That is the effect of this decision.

Deputy Fallaize, I forgot his name for a moment, said yesterday, look at Hampshire, that is a better analogy than some of these other places, and there are 26 comprehensives that have a better record than if you joined ours altogether. I do not know and I do not know the answer, where our Grammar School would fit in that top 26, whether it would be 25th or fifth, or third, I do not know. I would have thought that is a better test to apply but, again, I do not know. What I do know is from the publicly disseminated information is that it ranks very highly.

If you make a decision today, and you may well might and that is the democratic process, let me say this unequivocally and unreservedly, I will support that decision fully and I will try and make the best of it. I apologise to Deputy Yerby –

The Bailiff: Giving way to Deputy Yerby.

Deputy Yerby: I wanted to ask Deputy Ferbrache, as the President of Economic Development, how it is possible to reconcile the importance of Grammar School as a site of social mobility with the importance of Grammar School as being attractive to wealthy professionals migrating to the Island? I cannot make those two items fit. They are separate items for retaining the Grammar School, but they do not sit well together to me.

Deputy Ferbrache: I do not see any conflict. People want to come in, they want the best of every opportunity, so I do not see a conflict.

I do not have any prejudice against people with money. I quite like people with money. I would quite like a bit more of it myself. But I do not have a prejudice against people with money, but I have a preference for people that do not have it, but want their kids and their grandchildren to have the best opportunity.

I have been stopped on the street many times, probably because they know the views that I hold, because they are not secret, and say, 'Please put this forward. Please do your best.'

I have tried to do my best. I ask you to reflect.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

1525

1480

1485

1490

1495

1500

1505

1510

1515

1520

First of all, can I just say I told you so, sir, in the last term of the Assembly – I just had to get that off my chest – that we would be back here with this particular debate?

I am also nervous whether or not education will be improved with a comprehensive system and whether or not our education system will be improved with the loss of Grammar and the loss of the highs.

The big issue, and those who argue for the end of selection, hang on as much to the past, to argue that the 11-plus predicts students' academic achievement. That may well have been part of the ethos for the creation of the 11-plus in the first place but, I agree, the 11-plus does not predict academic achievement.

What has happened is the system has evolved over time and it is now used to stream children to the environment that suits them best. So, people who argue about non-selection, are arguing against a premise that has already changed.

Deputy Smithies gave the analogy that I was looking for. I want schools to match the 10mph child. I want schools to match the 5mph child. Those speeds, I appreciate will change over time, some up sometimes down, but that is really important. It is not necessarily the speed of travel, but the distance travelled. It is achieving the potential. It is where you get to.

Selection to me is not a poorer path. Nor does it have to be. I want opportunities and resources in teaching matched to children to maximise their potential and I think that the way that selection is used does help with that.

An excellent speech from Deputy Tooley and I agree with her on part of what she was saying, although we are on different sides of the argument. She said we all need a pace to suit and is not that what we have? A child gets what it needs. More time, more nurturing, perhaps, in the highs, more stretched, more pushed academically at the Grammar.

I can remember in my school days, I will just do one of these because it is always terrible to go through the family history, you would have children who would be able to do their French homework on the bus going into school, get a better mark than me and I have probably spent two hours at home doing the homework. There will always be these children. On something else, on woodwork class, I may have well made a chair with four legs and they might have struggled to get two of them. We are all different.

The speech of the day, for me, undoubtedly, was Deputy Graham's. I was so grateful to him, because I knew I was right to support selection, or at least to continue with it for the time being, but I was grateful for him to articulate and explain why I know it is right to continue with selection and keep the Grammar.

I would just like to back up one of his comments, and I know Deputy Tooley had some issues on this, but it was about seven out of 10 of those who expressed a preference were very much, certainly in the western parishes, very keen on keeping the Grammar School. I know that is not a scientific survey, but it certainly was the feeling that I had from the electorate.

Deputy Oliver gives me another thread that I was looking for. She mentioned pieces of a jigsaw and she is absolutely right. Where do we get better outcomes? Because that is what we are after, better outcomes. We all want the same thing. Do we get it from the selective system or a non-selective?

Now, when you unpick and start this journey on non-selection schooling, the schools on the Island will look very different. We do not know what we will get. Will La Mare be rebuilt? Will the Sixth Form be merged with the College of FE? We have seen some statistics that say that sixth form colleges perform better than sixth forms in school, which perform better than tertiary colleges and so on. So, what will the landscape look like?

We are starting today. We are pushing a very important button, but we have got no idea of the colour or the shape or the destination where we are heading.

The other big problem that I have and I know it is one that Deputy Kuttelwascher uses every now and then, if you do not have a good argument try and stir it up by putting in some doubt, but I think on this occasion with good reason. What is the capacity, going forward, with all the pressures on Education and all our departments? We all know about the 3-5-5 that people are

1545

1530

1535

1540

1550

1555

1560

1570

1565

looking for across the whole of the States to deliver savings. What is the capacity going forward to deliver enormous change that this revolution move will cause? Can we do it?

What is the history like of Education to deliver major change? What was it like when they closed St Peter Port School and the children moved to La Mare? What was that disaster like? Have we learned that lesson? Will we be able to back it up?

I will touch on it later about the results, but even now, Alderney's last cohort going through, although Education knew that they had difficulties, we still ended up with some results that were not as satisfactory as Education would be pleased with.

I am not sure we have got the skills yet in place to do this major change. One of the difficulties, I think, when talking to the teachers at Alderney school, I said why did it happen. The best they could come up with was it was coasting. Sometime Education coasts and we need to make sure that Education does not. We need this Assembly to be on their back night and day to make sure that they push the teachers, they push the schools, and nurture and help the children to get those best possible results.

So, when will the proponents who want us to move to a non-selection system, when will those improved results be seen? It cannot just be about ideology. It must be about attainment. The people who are arguing non-selection are not giving me hard figures of what they are going to do with it. When will it be improved? By how much and what risk are you taking in the journey you want us to go on?

Which brings me on to skills and past results. Probably, and I think in the main nothing to do with selection, but about the ambition and drive of Education to inspire their schools – and it is not their schools, they are our skills. It was the skills audit of C&E, many, many years ago that brought into focus the poor results that were being masked. We lost a board over it, apart from one Member. We had the Mulkerrin Report and there is one stat that I do remember and I keep it with me, I have had it all this time, and I have it here. I just want to share it with you.

Mulkerrin Report said that 50% of children entering the highs had a reading age below the required standard and this is what he says about it:

'A child's reading age is critical on how they will progress at school. If, for example, an 11-year-old pupil has a reading age of eight, this means that his or her reading age is three years behind their chronological age. Such a child is likely to encounter serious difficulties with subjects involving reading, i.e. most subjects on the school curriculum,'

Now, we have improved since then. I believe the stat is getting up to about into the 80 per cents, but it took an outside agency to look at Education and I think that process is still continuing. It is quite a Leviathan, to move Education, and I do not think by having the massive change that will happen by having non-selection on top of them, bringing the highs up to an acceptable standard, I do not think anybody would be happy with the results that La Mare has put out, sometimes, in the past, but we see they are improving and I want that to continue. I want that to continue with all our highs.

I think Deputy Conder summed it up at St James', when he was on Education. He said, in January 2016, 'Education has not always been as good as we thought.'

I would just like to touch on this. One part of disruption, and this is 1C on the back of the amendment, it talks about disruption, and that was part of an amendment brought by myself and Deputy Ogier. Disruption is one of the big concerns that parents have and especially in the highs.

The reason for it can be many fold and Deputy Brehaut, I think, touched on it. Some families, he said, are always the ones that are, over time, needing of extra support. I think it is something also that Deputy Ferbrache touched on. That is something, I hope, that we are pushing through with the Children and Young People's Plan, about strengthening families, which is a slight mirror of the UK system of troubled families. I hope that comes into play, where we actually put real resources in and break the generational cycle, because one child in a class of 24 or 25, can make a major difference as to how that class works and functions and the satisfaction of the parents and the satisfaction of the children.

1605

1610

1615

1580

1585

1590

1595

1600

1625

If Scrutiny wants something they can really get their teeth into, this would be it. This is an ideal opportunity for Scrutiny to look at something like disruptive children. How are they looked after? How can it be improved? What is the standard now? What best practice can we follow? Because we need to address that. We are too small an Island to have people not living up to their potential. We need everybody into the economy and if we can spot these children at the early age that need that extra help, that need that extra nurturing, and that is what they get ...

I will give way to Deputy Green.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

1635

1630

Deputy Green: I thank Deputy Brouard for giving way.

I will raise that at our next Scrutiny Management Committee meeting.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you very much indeed.

1640

1645

1650

We have moved much further on in education and we now have some of the triggers so that we do not see the car crashes happening on our watch but, just as we are grappling with this, we are going for a revolutionary change.

I hope, if you do decide on having non-selection, it will be done well. But history dictates otherwise and Deputy de Lisle, his comments are absolutely right. Let us evolve the system, evolve what we have, make it better, small increments, more small increments, making it better. Do not take the risk by doing something quite major.

Deputy Yerby, I was quite interested in what she said. I will never believe stats off her again ever, because it was quite interesting how stats can be used whichever way. It is just like the one that someone mentioned about 7,000 students not being matched in the UK system, with regard to the 11-plus.

But, of course, 11,000 you think, 'wow, that is a big figure'. Hang on, in Guernsey context, that would be seven. So, I would not be so worried if seven children were not selected for the Grammar and went to the high or whether or not some children were selected –

1655 **Deputy Yerby:** Correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Yerby has stood on a point of correction.

Deputy Yerby: The stats that Deputy Brouard has attributed to me are nothing like anything I said.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Absolutely, I said another speaker.

The stats of the 7,000 came from another speaker, absolutely. You are right, thank you.

The point I am making is that we have lines drawn by society on society everywhere. It is a 35mph speed limit, it is not a 34.5mph, it is a line.

We will always have lines and there will be cut-off points. There will be a class size that is too big. There will be lines. I do not think, taking that particular stat into account, there is a particular problem if a child happens to be, they will either go to the Grammar School and it is inappropriate for them or they may be stretched a little bit too far, or if they end up at one of the highs, then the margin may well be that they are going to be top of their particular year group in a particular subject. I do not particularly have a problem with that.

The pro-non-selection camp proponents put much weight on selection as being bad. 'It is bad about choosing your school. That is bad.' Yet, they are warm and friendly and cuddly about settings in school. Yet, we do not live miles apart. We are all squashed into 24 square miles, whether we like it or not, plus Alderney. We are not like vast stages of Dartmoor, where children

1675

1665

go to one school and their parents live 30 or 40 miles away from another set of parents and their children. Our children have the opportunities to mix all the time, in sport, in the street, everywhere. I do not think the difference between setting in school and selection has been quite as divisive as some of the proponents of the non-selection camp.

I just want to read a little passage from a letter from one of the teachers who talks about this particular point. I would if I could find the letter.

This is a teacher, I have not checked back on the emails, whether they really are, but I am sure they are.

I would like to make it clear that my opinion over selection in the Island comes entirely from the viewpoint of a teacher who is solely looking out for the young people of Guernsey. When we have been discussing selection here, we are only talking about what schools students will attend, not the setting of pupils within schools.

'However, I would like to make it very clear, the schools here are not large enough to set adequately. That is a logistical fact. To set students for a subject, there often needs to be blocking, so students will be setting for one subject, but that grouping will then dictate what they are set for in other subjects.

'This is not effective for students' learning.'

I think Deputy Fallaize made the football analogy, he was saying you may not be picked for the A team, you could be in B team, and you can move up and down. I do not follow football particularly closely, but I notice referees get really upset when one of the teams has 13 members on the pitch and the other team has only 11. You cannot always get into the top set unless there is space in the top set, or the Z set, or whatever it is. So, I do not think that particularly works.

The move between sets can also be just as difficult as the move between schools.

I just want to say a few words about tutoring. I am having difficulty dividing the line between tutoring and helpful parents. We emphasise so much that we want parents to be involved in the schools. We want parents to come into the schools, we want parents to read school books to them, we want parents to learn with our children, we want parents to help with maths. Where is the line where it comes to be tutoring? That is suddenly, 'that is verboten'.

As our very nature, we want to do the very best for our particular children. That is what we do and I am sure, even in a non-selective, new ideological world, there will be some parents, heaven bless, actually may get another teacher to help their child with a particular subject whether they may be struggling, or not. Is that bad? Is it going to be an offence in the new world? How absolutely ridiculous is that?

We have almost an in-built mechanism in our bodies that we want to do our very best for our children and we do that however we can. If that means we sit down with them or some of us, who may not have the time or even the ability, will employ someone else to do it, you cannot stop it. Proponents of non-selection are saying it is bad and it will not happen in the new world. It will happen in the new world.

Talking about another analogy, I love Deputy Roffey's one about the captain of the ship and three degrees to port. I was actually laughing and then, of course, it was against what I am standing for! (*Laughter*)

Overnight, I thought about it, and I thought actually we do. There are not many shipping companies that sail to places we do not want to go to. They do not last very long in the commercial market. (*Laughter*) Who is to say?

We do tell captains where to say. You are not going off on Deputy Roffey's cruise and you go down to Marseilles and you pick up your beautiful cruise ship there and you are all there with your family and you are all off and you are going on a cruise to the Bay of Naples, visit Pompeii, Vesuvius and all that, and just 10 minutes out of port, the captain says, 'Well, actually, we are off to Algiers.' It is not going to happen.

You, as the passengers, you decide where the cruise ship is going. You choose the cruise ships you want to and we want, in effect, the teachers to do a fantastic job in the classroom. We want the captain of a ship to do a fantastic job to steer us to our destination. But we all need teachers, parents, businessmen, grandfathers, whatever, to agree about where the destination should be.

1690

1680

1685

1695

1700

1705

1710

1715

What standards we want. How best it should be delivered. We all have a say in that, including teachers.

Deputy Roffey also mentioned about pointless separation. It is not pointless. It puts our children with a team of professionals who match their needs. The children who are selected for the Grammar School have a particular set of needs which is matched by their teachers. The children who go to one of the highs, may need a little bit of nurturing, may need an extra arm around the shoulder. That does not necessarily happen at the Grammar School.

I was not going to do it, damn! My daughter went to the Grammar School for a few days and she said, 'It is great there. It is lovely. But you have to actually want to work.' I said, 'Yes, that is probably part of the idea of going to school, dear.' And she said, 'Actually, there, they almost expect you to be self-motivated and, Dad, you know me, I am not really quite as self-motivated as you might like to think that I would like to be. Can I go to Ladies' please, where they will put an arm around and say "Yes, Rebecca, get a move on"?'

So, it is horses for courses and it is the same with the highs. I know it, because I went around the parish and my parishioners, one of the catchment areas is for La Mare, were telling me, they are really pleased at the change at La Mare and that they are really pleased that the teachers there understand their needs. They match the children. They get the extra tutoring for someone who needs a bit of extra help in maths. They will bring that resource in to make it happen. That is what we want to foster. We want to make sure that the 5mph child has the help to run at 5mph and match with the teachers and we want the 10mph also to be stretched and pushed and matched with their teachers.

I do not think it is pointless separation.

I will also say well done to Deputy Dudley-Owen. We always expect everybody else to change their views except us, because we are right. We always like to hang onto our position. It is not always an easy thing to do to change your mind, so well done.

My electorate, by a vast majority, I think, at least 70%, said keep the Grammar, rebuild La Mare. I say keep the Grammar and rebuild La Mare and I ask you to keep the Grammar and rebuild La Mare.

Let us move our precious cargo of children with care. This is not a cargo I want to experiment with. I do not want to take big steps, I want steady progress. It is too big and it is too important to play ideological theory.

We need to match schools and what they offer with the children. We need to inspire our children and do what I think we can and be world class.

Thank you, sir.

1725

1730

1735

1740

1745

1750

1755

The Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak? Deputy Dorey.

1760 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I would first just like to speak about the teacher surveys. Many Members have referred to them, particularly yesterday, saying there was over 90% support for ending selection. Well, let us look at the three surveys. What I call the Connie Armstrong survey ...

1765 **Deputy Tooley:** Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: I did not say that over 96% were supporting the removal of selection, I said that fewer than one in 30, which constitutes 96%, said they were against retention of the 11-plus.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: I did not actually refer to your name.

Deputy Tooley

Deputy Tooley: Nobody else used that stat at all.

Deputy Dorey: I will just go to the survey. It was of professional educators in state, primary and secondary schools and the College of Further Education.

Of the 445 replied, 71% were against selection. It did not include teachers from the colleges and in emails we have subsequently received, it seems like the Grammar School as well.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, on a point of correction.

That is incorrect. It did include the teachers at the Grammar School. There were Grammar School teachers who responded to that survey.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: As I said, it was in the email, but I will accept. It definitely did not include teachers from the colleges, so it was not of all the teachers in the Island.

The Education Committee survey, which was of education professionals working in state schools, and it said that these included teachers, lecturers and learning support assistants of all primary, secondary and special schools, as well as the College of Further Education and the Education Support Services. But staff working at Grange Road House were not included in the survey.

The tech came up with very similar results of 72% were in favour of selection but only 46% of all educational professionals took part in the survey, again, just only of those working state schools. It did not include those at the colleges.

The only survey that was done of all teachers was in the Your Schools, Your Choice survey and that was included in the March Billet, which was included in this current States' Report, and it said that 48% were in favour of moving to an all-ability system, while 42% disagreed. Those were the quotes from the Report.

So, the figures are not quite as convincing as perhaps it might have seemed yesterday.

Looking at performance. In the lead-up to the Report that was considered in March this year, Island Global Research did an Island education benchmarking assessment for the Education Department, September 2015. They gave the performance of Guernsey, Jersey, Isle of Man, Gibraltar, about five A-C, including maths and English, and Guernsey had 67%, Jersey had 59%, Isle of Man 51% and Gibraltar 55%.

I fully accept that is a snapshot of one year, but I am using there what they included in their report, which was done for the Education Department. The Isle of Man system of education, the school you go to for secondary education is based on catchment areas, Gibraltar has a system of two single-sex secondary schools with no selection in place and Jersey has a perhaps more complicated system of comprehensive secondary education in non-fee-paying schools, but there is a number of private schools, with their own application process and entry examinations and two fee-paying state schools that have entrance examinations in maths and English.

The key thing was that Guernsey out-performed all those locations. If you are going to compare our system to another location, similar jurisdictions of similar size, I think it makes better comparisons.

In the Billet, there was also the UCL Report. There has been a lot of evidence said about the different systems and I think we need to focus on this research report which was in appendix three of the Billet of March and it is in the back of this Billet.

It is the research report from the London Centre for Leadership in Learning, the UCL Institute of Education. To give you some of the details, it says that the Institute of Education has been ranked number one for education in the QS world university rankings for the last two years and

1795

1790

1775

1780

1785

1800

1805

1815

1810

was top-rated UK performer for research, strength and education in 2014, scoring more than four times higher than the next best performer.

So, they really went to the right place for getting the best research. It states that the project involved a rapid review of leadership.

I will read their conclusions:

'The impact of selective versus non-selective systems on equity, social mobility and overall attainment.'

1830 There are three bullet points.

'Evidence on the benefits of otherwise of selective as compared to comprehensives systems is inconclusive.

'Despite the lack of convincing evidence for either selective or a non-selective system for organising secondary education, the arguments continue in England.

'Social economic factors result in social and academic segregation among schools in both selective and non-selective systems.'

I think that clearly shows that we can argue either way, but from their research, one is not particularly better than the other. But it goes on to say, further down, under 'equity'.

'There is strong evidence that pupils attending a selective school tend to achieve better academic outcomes than pupils of a similar background and prior attainment who attend secondary modern or comprehensive schools.'

So, there is evidence that there is better performance from selective schools. But, obviously, there is not sufficient to be conclusive.

I think that is the reason why, when the Education Department consulted, and it is what it is in the title, Your Schools, Your Choice, 61% were against all-ability schools. Because, I believe that the public believe that there is better performance from selective schools than non-selective schools.

I go on from this report. Many people have spoken about the 11-plus. It goes on to say, further into the report:

'Strand's work tested the predictive ability of cognitive ability tests, reasoning tests, as compared to Key Stage 2 tests by looking at data from a national representative cohort of over 80,000 pupils in England who completed both Key Stage 2 tests and CAT ...'

...cognitive ability tests, which is effectively 11-plus tests. They concluded that the CAT tests, schools at age 11, were the best single predictor of all GCSE outcomes.

So, people are very critical of the 11-plus, but it is shown, again, by the evidence, that it is the best predictor of the outcomes.

I can relate to my own family where two of my children were selected to go to the colleges. Again, no paid coaching, but they were at the time when they did the larger number of tests, which is where I think we should be. The only thing that we did as a family was that, you could buy them those days, you can get them online now, some papers and they just went through them so that they were familiarised with the type of questions that they were asked.

I think part of the problem is that some schools do not do that. Schools should be making sure that pupils are familiarised with the type of questions, so they do not freeze when they see a particular question. That is all we did and they were the right schools for them.

People say why do you need different schools? If you want to, say, take Latin GCSE, to have a school of the size that we are talking about in Guernsey, you will not have the number of pupils to achieve such GCSEs, without having schools which are streamed, and take the best performing pupils.

On the other hand, my elder son had dyslexia and we spoke with him and his teacher. He did not even sit the 11-plus. He had a mixture of academic and practical education at Beaucamps and that was the right education for him and it has enabled him to go on and he has eventually got a foundation degree.

1835

1840

1845

1855

1850

STATES OF DELIBERATION, THURSDAY, 1st DECEMBER 2016

The argument I am trying to make is by having these different schools, we have the right school for the right pupil, which has the right curriculum and the right amount of care and teaching, as Deputy Brouard said, arm around a shoulder and helps them to get through the system. I think the system actually works very well.

It is interesting, when you look again from the UCL Report, and it tries to understand why, perhaps, we do get better performance from grammar schools, and it says:

'High quality teaching, by more motivated or better qualified teachers has been suggested as a reason for better attainment outcomes in selective schools. Higher qualified teachers are more likely to apply for posts in higher performing schools, such as grammar schools.'

That is what their research has shown. So, I think we do create a system which enables us to have the right teachers for the right schools and, therefore, we get the best outcomes, and that is why our performance is higher than perhaps Jersey, Isle of Man and Gibraltar.

But, it is always easy to criticise existing systems, but I think we need to look at the problems with a non-selective system. Because there are problems with them.

Education proposed a hard federation in the March Report. That was very heavily criticised as being unworkable. It also included one 11-18 school and, just as has been said by others, that 11-18 school will attract teachers who want to teach to A-level. The Nicholls Review was very clear that 11-18 schools are more attractive to teachers, because many of them want to be able to teach up to A-level.

So, you will just get, as we have in the UK, people moving to catchment areas for that school.

Another method has been to have three 11-16 schools and a combined College of FE and Sixth Form Centre, but as has been said, that is the worst performing institution in terms of A-level results. Sixth form colleges, which are not practical in Guernsey because they have to be of such a large size, are the best performing. Next is 11-18 schools. So, we would be moving to a system where we have the worst performing of the three types of sixth form. Why change that when we have a system which is performing better?

Another method has been said about two 11-16 year school and one 11-18 school but, again, that would have the same problems of people moving into that area.

The Report did not cover in March what would happen to the colleges in terms of the scholarships and that is being left unresolved.

So, I urge Members to vote against the Proposition. (**Several Members:** For!) For, sorry, I apologise. The public have clearly shown that they are in favour of our existing system. The UCL Report concluded the evidence of the benefits of selection are inconclusive, so why change when we have a current system that the public want, but the evidence is inconclusive whether one system is better than the other. But there are indicators that we are better performing than the other similar jurisdictions in terms of GCSE results. If we moved to a non-selective system, there are serious flaws in those systems, particularly in relation to A-levels.

I urge you to follow what the public demanded and vote against this Proposition.

Several Members: For! (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: We will rise now and resume at 2.30 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 12.37 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.

1900

1895

1865

1870

1875

1880

1885

Future Structure of Secondary Education in the Bailiwick – Debate continued

The Bailiff: Members, we continue with the debate on the future structure of secondary education in the Bailiwick.

Are there any more speeches? Yes, Deputy de Sausmarez.

1905

1910

Deputy de Sausmarez: I will just try to get the technology to work. I should have listened to Deputy Tooley's wise words.

I would just like to pick up on a few points that have been raised in the debate over the last day and a half. We seem to get this question of a mandate from the public coming up time and again and I would just like to spend a little bit of time on that and remind my colleagues that we are, of course, representatives, not delegates.

It is not simply a case of doing a straw poll of public opinion, however you might decide how that is, and deciding on key issues along those lines. We are representatives. It is our job to make informed decisions, based on sound evidence, and vote in the way that we think is in the best interests of the Island.

1915

So, I do find it extraordinary, there is a wide variety of what we construe as public opinion. I thought Deputy Tooley, yesterday, did a very convincing job, actually, of making the case that the election was not a referendum on education and the survey that the previous Education Department carried out could neither be interpreted as a majority view. I would just like to quickly pick up on a point that Deputy Dorey made when he might have implied that all teachers responded to that survey and, of course, they did not.

1920

Deputy Lowe talked about election results, too. I respect her very respectable vote, but I always see it in the context that, of course, regardless of what Deputy Fallaize's vote did, he still polled higher, so I find that a strange interpretation and I think the 2000 election was also mentioned and Deputy Roffey assures me that he came top then, too.

1925

I love psychology and I would just like to add a little psychological analysis to what is going on. As human beings, we are all susceptible to various biases and one of these is called the false consensus bias. This is the tendency for people to project their way of thinking onto other people. In other words, the tendency to assume that other people think the same way as they do. It leads to a logical fallacy that certain beliefs and impressions are more prevalent amongst the public than they actually are.

1930

This probably explains why two representatives in the same district can interpret the public opinion so differently. I think we have seen examples of that going on, on all sides of the debate. I do think it is quite true.

1935

The same can be said, Alderney Representative Jean talked about Deputies who lost their seats and, again, I do not think it can be explained on a single issue. I know, certainly, in my district, there were very localised issues that had a big influence on Deputies not being returned and, if we think back to the 'Sarnia Spring' of 2012, (Interjections) then I think that could probably be interpreted as a widespread disaffection with the whole political process.

1940

I think it is disingenuous to try to reduce it to these terms, in order to support arguments in either way.

1945

Human beings, that is us. We are also subject to another highly influential bias, called loss aversion bias. This is the strong tendency to prefer avoiding losses, rather than the equivalent gains. In other words, would you take a 50-50 chance to win £5, if the flipside of the coin was to lose £5? The chances are you would not. How does this translate into this situation? Well, we are very scared of loss. We are more scared of loss than we are excited by the prospect of gain.

We are scared of change. We have heard this fear articulated by Deputy Prow, among many others, we do not want to lose the Grammar School. But, I think it is important to understand what people mean when we say that. We do not want to lose this Grammar School's good results. We

do not want to lose the ethos of aspiration and achievement and I agree. We do not have to lose those elements, just because we no longer divide children at 11.

As Deputy Fallaize and others have pointed out. No one has yet provided any reason to select into different schools at 11 in the first place. Selection adds no demonstrable value. But it does restrict flexibility.

As Deputy Roffey made crystal clear, a vote to support selection at 10 or 11, is a vote for the unknown. The 11-plus had been widely discredited and, it seems as of this morning, unanimously rejected, even by supporters of the selective system. We all agree it is not fit for purpose and we all agree it should go.

How many times yesterday and this morning have we heard speakers say they want selection, but just a different form of it? Something a bit better than the 11-plus. But when it comes to the slippery issue of what this special alternative method of selection might be, there is no such consensus. There are not even many specific suggestions, in fact.

The most appealing description of what this alternative form of selection should look like came from Deputy Prow. I genuinely liked his vision. He said he wanted a fair, transparent, non-judgemental selection. The only problem with it is that it contains what sounds to me like a contradiction in terms: non-judgemental selection.

Surely the act of selection is inherently judgemental? So, let us get past that problem by taking out the word selection and I think we could probably agree that we want a fair, transparent and non-judgemental education system. I think we would have consensus on that.

What I do not think we would have is a consensus on a specific, alternative form of selection that the majority agrees is better than the 11-plus, assuming such a thing exists. Deputy Graham, and may I congratulate him on his commitment to researching the issue, and also to commiserate with him on the size of his next phone bill, has suggested that we might look to models such as Germany's. Of course, Deputy Langlois, this morning, responded to that in some detail. I would like to add two further problems in following the German model. The first is that, of course, it does not fare much better than the UK and the PISA rankings, as I think Deputy Fallaize pointed out, and the second is that children of poorer families are less likely to succeed in school than those from wealthier backgrounds.

In fact, the disadvantage for the financially challenged in Germany is greater than in any other industrialised nation. Given that social equity and educational equity are the problems that we are trying to address here, I do not think we would find a majority in this Assembly prepared to entertain that one.

Deputy Lowe did come up with a suggestion, along the lines of improving the 11-plus, perhaps by including maths and English. Well, the OECD show that problem-solving is less affected by socio-economic factors, so including maths and English would, in fact, be a retrograde step that would reduce social mobility, not improve it.

There is this sort of idea that floating around somewhere in the ether, there must be, by sheer force of will, if nothing else, this better form of selection. It has been referred to as a Holy Grail and a panacea. It is not like no-one has looked for it. This Committee, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, went on that very pilgrimage and came back empty handed. So did, seemingly, countless education boards before them.

Today, the only conclusion we can draw is that there is no alternative. Voting in support of this Proposition is a vote for the unknown. If we vote to support this Proposition we will find ourselves back in this Chamber, trying to find consensus on some as-yet unknown method of selection at some indeterminate time.

This brings us back to the same old point. Why divide children at 11 in the first place? The 11-plus was originally designed to test a child's innate intelligence, when it was believed that a child's intelligence was innate and fixed. Advances in psychological and neurological testing clearly show that a child's intelligence, by whatever measure we choose to measure it, is neither innate nor fixed. Their minds can and do continue to grow in strength and ability.

1970

1955

1960

1965

1975

1980

1985

1990

1995

Many of the teachers who got in touch with us talked about selection being counter to a growth mind-set, so I just wanted to spend a little bit of time talking about what this means. One of the best examples and, I think, one of the formative examples, was back in 1968, following the assassination of Martin Luther King. There was a primary school teacher called Jane Elliott, I think she was, and she decided to teach her children about the dangers of judging people on the way they look.

She divided her class into two groups. Those with blue eyes and those with brown eyes.- She divided the class up in this way and then she explained to both groups that the blue-eyed group was superior, and she spent a little bit of time, throughout the day, explaining all these fatuous reasons why. I did not say it was an ethical thing to do! It did come up with some very interesting results, though.

By the end of the day, the brown-eyed children, their self-confidence had plummeted and their academic performance also fell. Now, just to be fair, she reversed it the following day, and she started telling the children all the reasons why the brown-eyed children were superior. The exact mirror image happened. The children with the brown eyes' confidence grew and their academic performance improved, whilst the blue-eyed children's self-confidence fell and their academic performance dropped.

It was quite a telling experiment. She did explain, by the way, just to set your minds at rest, at the end of the day that, of course, no group was superior and they were all friends again. They apparently were a very close class after that.

But it does illustrate the point that we are very susceptible to suggestion. Human beings, especially young human beings, are susceptible to the suggestion that they are bright, capable, talented and that they can succeed. They are also susceptible to the suggestion that they are not that bright, not particularly capable, not especially talented, and are not expected to succeed.

Our teachers, I am sure without exception, work incredibly hard to make sure that our children are not exposed to these negative suggestions. However, whether we like it or not, the 11-plus makes that suggestion explicit, simply by signalling to some that they are capable of a grammar school education and others, who are the majority, that they are better suited elsewhere.

We might not like it, but those children get the message. For some, it is like water off a duck's back. Some are very good at rising above it. Others are deeply affected. They require a good deal of building up again in order to restore the confidence and self-belief that is so influential in academic achievement.

I was at a 40th birthday celebration recently and, at one stage, I felt like I was gate-crashing on a reunion for one of our high schools. All these people seemed to have enjoyed their school experience, but these old friends all agreed on how they felt on being selected for a high school. They felt cast aside. They felt like they did not matter as much. They felt that they were effectively being told that their job prospects were necessarily more limited than their peers. It is still affecting them 20 years on.

How many times have we heard similar stories? I am deeply uncomfortable with this dividing line for all kinds of reasons. The assumption is somehow that the children in the 25% above the line are more academic, more gifted and talented, perhaps harder working than the 75% below it. As Deputy Stephens has already reminded us today, this is simply not the case.

If you think of the results of the 11-plus in graph form, it would be nice to imagine that there is a clearly defined hump of results in the top 25%, then a stretch of clear blue water, and then a clearly defined group of all the rest. The dividing line falling cleanly between the two. Of course, this could not be further from the truth.

The dividing line falls through a dense clump of results that are very hard to differentiate between. This is how it works in reality. The results are sorted by percentage ranking, relative to the rest of the cohort. Those that fall in the bracket, between 23% and 27%, are put into the sorting zone, the Sorting Hat maybe. Those children are scrutinised more closely to make a careful decision as to which type of school they should go to. However, there is a line, however arbitrary that line is. That means that the children in the Sorting Hat zone need to go in one direction or

2020

2005

2010

2015

2025

2030

2035

2040

2045

another. Some of the children at 27% might get into the Grammar School. Some of those at the 23% mark might not get in. I met one of those students recently. His score had been adjusted down because he was old for his year. I asked him how he felt about that, he told me he felt 'guilty'. Guilty that he had let his mother down.

We do not have any accurate statistics on coaching or tutoring, but we do know that it tends to be effective. How do we know this? I am sure Deputy Trott would confirm we know this because of its market price. That is what tells us it works. It has been suggested that we make coaching available to all children at primary school, most recently by Deputy Ferbrache. I find this suggestion a little bizarre. Coaching makes a mockery of what the exam is supposed to do in the first place and would not we rather our schools taught our children the curriculum rather than techniques to pass a one-off test? (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) (*Applause*)

As Deputy Ferbrache confirms, there is no way to stop parents tutoring their children and neither should we condemn for doing so while the system provides an incentive for those who can afford to pay to do it.

Deputy Ferbrache's suggestion was interesting that we should have a quota of children from poorer backgrounds in the Grammar School. Presumably, this would be broadening its range of ability? Well, would that not compromise the whole set of assumptions that the Grammar School is based on?

So, is the problem where we draw the line? We know it is arbitrary. We know it is based on an archaic model of society that is no longer relevant to 21st Century Guernsey. I ask my colleagues who support selection where they would be comfortable drawing that line. From an academic point of view, would they be happy drawing the line at 10% or even 5%, as some super-selective schools do in the UK? If not, why not?

Would they be happy to draw the line at 60%? If not, why not? How do they justify drawing the line at 25% when so many more of each cohort go on to a sixth-form education? For that matter, how do they justify drawing the line at all?

I spoke with someone with many years' teaching experience, spanning the Grammar School and our high schools, and in his judgement, the lowest achieving third of the Grammar School and the highest achieving third of our high schools are generally indistinguishable in terms of their academic ability.

In other words, many of the students achieving good results at the high schools, would cope with and indeed benefit from a Grammar School education. Deputy Fallaize's statistics from primary schools support this. There are full 40% of Year 6 children considered suitable for a college or Grammar School education who are selected for a high school education instead.

One of the arguments that we hear from proponents of selection tells us that the students benefit from being able to learn from and aspire to those of a slightly higher ability. We know there are plenty of students on both sides of that dividing line who would benefit from learning in a classroom with each other, as they are likely to be at a more similar ability than the children with whom they are currently studying.

By dividing the children into separate institutions, we create two separate, but over-lapping spectrums of ability. Is 'spectrums' the right word, should it be spectra or something? Maybe, if I had been to the Grammar School, I would know the answer to that! (*Laughter*)

This is borne out by the fact that some of our high school students achieve better grades than some of our Grammar School children. We are likely to have students in the high schools, metaphorically able to travel at 7mph, to use Deputy Smithies' analogy, whilst there may simultaneously be students able to travel at just 6mph at the Grammar. Why are we preventing those students at the Grammar School from benefiting from learning alongside their peers currently at the high schools? Surely, surely, surely a selective system of setting across a single spectrum ability would be more educationally effective, not to mention more socially inclusive?

Setting is flexible. That is the difference. It is easy for the school. It is easy for the teachers and, most importantly, it is easy for the students to move up and down between sets, whereas that is simply not the case with moving schools.

2070

2055

2060

2065

2080

2075

2085

2090

2100

2105

Deputy Brouard and his correspondents seem to be confusing setting with streaming. Setting is grouping by a student's ability per subject, streaming, which is what the 11-plus does, is the grouping by students' average ability. It discriminates against students who are very strong in, say, maths, but who might struggle with literacy.

2110

I agree with Deputy Ferbrache that we need to address the educational and social problems inherent in our system. To recap some of those key problems: a child in social housing has just a one in 50 chance of passing to the Grammar School, as compared with a one in 15 chance, I think it was, for a child from a more affluent background. Forty per cent of students assessed as being suitable for the colleges or Grammar School are selected instead for our high schools. The Bailiwick of Guernsey is outperformed by 26 comprehensive schools in socially comparable Hampshire. There are many more examples.

2115

The sticking point is that these problems will always be inherent in our system while we insist on dividing sheep from sheep, as Deputy Fallaize so eloquently put it.

We currently have an education system that is divided along socio-economic lines. We already have the postcode lottery that Deputy Brouard was warning us about. Why else would we see school catchment areas listed on brochures for houses for sale?

2120

As Deputy Tooley reminded us, our job is to provide a good education system for all our children, not just the children whose parents can be bothered. We also have a statutory duty of care for looked-after children and we are obliged to think of those children first, level with our own children, in our own considerations as Deputies. The Children Law 2008, which applies to Guernsey and Alderney, requires us to promote all children's proper welfare and development. These are our statutory obligations.

2125

The argument that students are either academic or vocational, or those who will work with their heads and those that will work with their hands, or gifted and talented and probably different and talented in other ways. All these fatuous distinctions have never been less relevant to 21st Century Guernsey society than they are today.

2130

We need more flexibility. We need more parity of educational opportunity. We need more social equity. We need better overall outcomes for our Bailiwick. Better academic outcomes. Better economic outcomes. Better health and social wellbeing outcomes.

2135

Removing the 11-plus will allow us to achieve these outcomes. Voting to reintroduce the 11plus will reintroduce a mechanism that will make all these outcomes harder, if not impossible to

Let us be clear about what voting for this Proposition means. Voting to retain selection at 11 is a vote for some, as-yet undefined, let alone agreed, method. Voting to retain selection at 11 is a vote to drag out the uncertainty even longer.

2140

I will be voting against this Proposition; to remove the 11-plus and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. (Applause)

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

2145

Deputy Trott: Sir, I could deliver three speeches today.

I could deliver one that lasted for an hour and 23 minutes, in an attempt to snatch the record from my friend Deputy Ferbrache. I could deliver one, sir, that captured all of the good points in that speech and that would take

me a minute or so! (Laughter)

2150

Or, I could deliver the speech that I want to deliver, in the sure knowledge that it will not change a single mind in this Assembly, but it is important that a record of what I believe is recorded in the same way as all Members who have spoken would want their views recorded.

2155

Deputy Roffey and I, on occasions, disagree. In fact, on lots of occasions, to be accurate. We often see things differently. I look at the Grammar School and I see a centre of excellence with simply outstanding results, functioning in a unique educational environment. He might not.

STATES OF DELIBERATION, THURSDAY, 1st DECEMBER 2016

I look at one third-plus of our education system, our colleges, and I see fantastic value for money. He might not.

I look at failing educational systems elsewhere and I see risk. He might not.

But, sir, where we are certain to agree is how we look at the excellent facilities at Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's High and the hope that La Mare might be rebuilt. The hope.

Because I believe, and I want to put it on record, because at the very least we will see if my prediction comes true, should this Proposition be lost, I believe that if we abolish selection then the chances of rebuilding La Mare are materially reduced. But that will be a debate for another day, sir, and I shall leave that at rest for now.

Let us now turn, if we may, to the Education, Sport & Culture Committee, who experienced some hostility from some quarters of our community, including some Members of this Assembly, when they made the sensible decision to bring this matter back before the Assembly of 2016 and how that decision has been vindicated. It was quite obvious to all before we came in today how evenly split this Assembly was. It should be more apparent than ever, some day and a half of debate later.

But I say this to Members. If, after seven months of intensive briefings and information flows, after all of that information a majority of the Members of the Education, Sport & Culture Committee are not able to recommend to you the ending of selection, what does that tell us? It tells us that the case has simply not been made adequately. The risks have not been adequately addressed.

Or, there could be another reason.

In England, only 6%, we are told within the documentation that we are debating, of students are in private education, whereas in Guernsey it is over 30%. Now, this is about as significant a debating point as you can get. This is one of the key reasons why a comprehensive system working effectively in Guernsey is very high risk indeed.

Recently, this Assembly elected me onto the board of Elizabeth College, and I start a six-year term in that capacity next month. The ending of selection is bonanza time for the colleges. If we abolish selection, we will create a system where we move from selection by ability to selection by ability to pay. Not very many people have used that expression in this debate, but it is a fact. It is a fact. The colleges are already witnessing that.

I do not want this outcome and I believe fervently that neither does our community.

Some say a non-selective system is fairer for all children. To my mind, the suggestion that the current system is unfair implies that the quality of provision is not equal in all schools. In other words, it is worse at the high schools, or worse at the Grammar School. On what basis is such an assertion made? On what basis?

If it is made on the basis that the Grammar School is a centre of excellence, then that is certainly true. The Education board – which includes people like Deputy Leadbeater and Deputy Meerveld – recently announced that the Grammar School is placed in the top 10 selective schools when compared to those in the UK when measuring student progress up to GCSE. That is a phenomenal performance and yet there are some in this Assembly and in our community who seek to discredit that brilliant outcome. Long may it continue.

On page 1562 of the Billet, we find these words, and I think it goes to the heart of the arguments around social mobility:

'The existence of grammar schools creates greater social mixing than would be the case if they did not exist.'

Now, we have seen some differences, certainly, when compared to two or three decades ago, but those words are true. 'The existence of grammar schools creates social mixing than would be the case if they did not exist.'

On page 1562, we go on to read:

'Raw results indicate a high level of performance at any grammar school, compared to all-ability schools.'

2522

2160

2170

2165

2175

2180

2190

2185

2195

That is what we read, sir. Those are the facts. Those are the objective words that I read and understand.

So, to our Grammar School. Well ours, we are told by the same Education board, is in the top 1.3% of English schools. That is absolutely stellar. I believe it would be the politics of –

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Point of correction.

2210 **Deputy Trott:** I give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: It has been confirmed that, even if the Progress 8 results were comparable to the English systems, since they do SATs and not teacher assessments, I understand there is some methodology involved in the software that was purchased to create the Progress 8 results.

However, even if the results were comparable, they would be in the top 3%, not the top 1.5%, even if they were comparable. But they are not because it is subjective as opposed to objective.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Well you can see by the reaction of some Members, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, that not everyone agrees with that, but I will concede, because for me the top 3% is outstanding; 1.3% is absolutely brilliant, but the top 3%, well, all credit to them. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

I believe, sir, it would be the politics of the asylum if we were to throw this away. I have always believed that. I believe it as strongly today as I did 16 years ago.

Sir, on page 1510 of the Billet, and we have been subjected to a number of statistics, but I like to look at the facts and the facts are those that are contained within this report, not things that may have been conjured up at the last minute, but objective facts about the public consultation and others have mentioned it. But they are important enough and relevant enough to mention again.

The key issues are that 61% of respondents were against an all-ability system. I did not carry out this survey. This is not me knocking on doors, although we will come to that in a moment. This is the Education Department itself and, more importantly, the previous Education Department, who were unanimously opposed to selection, as opposed to the current one, which, by majority, is in favour of selection. They carried out that analysis, that survey and they got that overwhelming response: the community wants to keep selection.

But does it stop there? No, it does not, because 16% of students who responded to this consultation were in favour of an all-ability system, a staggering two thirds-plus were against. Amongst teachers who answered the online questionnaire, about half were in favour of moving to an all-ability system, while 42% were not.

Now, those were the facts then. There are some that are telling us there has been a quantum shift, since. So, let us move to the election, which happened after that consultation and we all have our own experiences of our general election a little over seven months ago. My experience, though I can attest, was slightly different for this reason. I had a specific election pledge and it was to ask every elector that I met whether they favoured the retention or scrapping of selection at 11 and I can tell you, sir, that no one escaped. If you were in, you were asked. I can tell you that in St Sampson's, and others may put down my particular election success last time to my charm, ability and good looks, others may view it differently, but what I do know is that absolutely everyone that was in was asked and I can tell you that by a ratio of three to one, God be my judge – I said God,

2220

2205

2230

2235

2240

2245

Deputy Ferbrache, not you! (*Laughter*) – those electors in St Sampson's favoured the retention of selection. That is a fact.

So, we come to the conclusion of why I believe what I believe. Moving to all-ability schools in my view does not pass five tests.

Firstly, it does not pass the risk test, and I will take little guidance on risk from most Members of this States, sir, because I was paid for more than a decade to take professional risks as a foreign exchange trader, I am well aware of what risk-reward is, but certainly moving to all-ability schools does not pass the risk test.

It absolutely 100% does not pass the people test. It is not, in my firm belief for the reasons I have given, what this community wants.

It does not pass the Guernsey test, because of the phenomenal success of the Grammar School and, dare I say it, the very high success rate of the colleges, particularly the Ladies' College, which is another centre of excellence.

It does not pass the departmental board test. The majority tell us to support this amendment and to stick with selection.

It absolutely does not, sir, it absolutely does not pass the evidence test as presented by those in favour of ending selection in this Assembly over the last day and a half.

And, for that reason, I shall support the amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

2275

2280

2285

2290

2295

2255

2260

2265

2270

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, sir.

For some of us, and me included, this is very much like Groundhog Day, because I was certainly elected, my first term in this Assembly, in 2000-2004, and the debate was raging over selection at that time and I found myself on the then Education Council.

I do believe, as Deputy Trott has just reiterated and Deputy Ferbrache mentioned this morning, that it is almost impossible to expect anyone to change their minds. However, I will not go on for over an hour, like Deputy Ferbrache, as a result of that. I will try and concentrate on things that we have not heard already. It is very difficult, because everybody has touched on many, many different things and, of course many of us were in this Assembly only a few months ago, sir, where the same arguments were rehearsed back then.

Like Deputy Ferbrache, if I may, I would like to tell a few stories and perhaps ramble a little. Just to begin with, my own experience is that I was a special place holder at Elizabeth College and I am married to someone who passed 11-plus and went to a grammar school in the UK, which, while she was there, became a comprehensive school. I have three daughters, they are all pretty much grown up now, but as a result of that we have experienced all that you possibly can experience in the system.

My eldest daughter went to Les Beaucamps School. She ended up then moving to the College of FE to do a diploma and then went on to study fine art and get a degree from the University of London.

Our second daughter went to Ladies' College, she too went to study in London and is now back working on the Island in accountancy.

Our third daughter is in her final year at university, having left the Grammar School Sixth Form Centre a few years ago.

So, I have experienced about all it is possible to experience and more recently. But it is not that experience that particularly struck me when I joined the Education Council back in the year 2000. Because at the time, in the hustings, in the campaign, I remember I was asked my views on selection and at the time I supported them because, well, it did not do any harm, did it? We have heard that argument before.

I think I said that the system should be tweaked and, at that time, one of the biggest complaints on both sides of the fence was the fact that there were something like six or seven

2305

different exams and things to go through in the process and all parents felt it was cumbersome and over the top for children, particularly in Year 6, to have to go through all of that time in that year, so they effectively did very little normal learning and were taking exams for the whole of that year. That was a big issue.

2310

The thing that particularly got me when I joined the Education Council and the thing which shifted my opinion the most was the evidence that was provided for me, once I could see it from the position of what we were doing all of our children.

2315

So, I sympathise with Deputy Dudley-Owen, particularly, because I can understand having said one thing, I was in that position, then I was faced with the evidence and being in Education and being involved, politically, in the education system, it does challenge your views and I can understand why she has, sort of, flipped back and forth in trying to work out where she wants to stand.

2320

I think being at the beginning of the term, which was the debate last time, 2001, it enabled me to make up my mind and I became convinced that selection at 11, to different schools, and by means of 11-plus, was no longer appropriate, and I am of the same opinion today.

There was one particular part of that experience, sir, that really did it for me and that was seeing the process and being involved in borderline appeals. The Borderline Panel, not a lot has been mentioned about that and I will come back to that a bit later on.

2325

Some of the arguments we have heard today seem to be to renege on the decision made earlier this year, in the previous Assembly, and go back and reinstate the 11-plus because it is a sort of status quo where there is less risk. It is the argument of better the devil we think we know.

I think, often, the good, is the enemy of the better. By that I mean I do not think our current system is bad, on average, but there is much better we can do. In fact, this is something that I find very often in Guernsey life, is that we settle for the status quo, because we think we understand the risks involved in the status quo when, in fact, the opportunities of the other possibilities, compared with the risks that we do not see in the status quo, outweigh them.

2330

That was the problem, I think, that came to my attention, particularly back in 2000-2004.

2335

Settling for the 'it ain't broke' argument for the system we currently have in place is, I believe, like settling for standards in tax transparency, for example, or financial accounting and regulatory environments, of several decades ago and saying, perhaps, they only need to be tweaked a bit. We know this is not the way to progress and not the way that we are progressing, or even to keep up with today's environment.

We live in a different world than decades ago. We would be doing our key businesses a huge disservice if we settled for that.

2340

Neither must we blindly copy the systems of larger jurisdictions around us. Rather we should, and we do in fact in other areas, focus on the best outcomes and decide what we want there and then seek to raise our standards by finding solutions which fit our unique size and shape.

We have an opportunity to do that at the moment, with the extant Resolutions as they stand.

2345

We have, before us, I do not believe, a choice between the impersonally massive urban British institutions of the comprehensives of the 1960's and 1970's or the equally British suburban, benign grammars and blue collar secondary moderns of the 1940's and 1950's.

2350

For example, the 1940's and 1950's were a totally different era. But that is the era in which the 11-plus came in. It was not our invention. It came from the UK. In fact, it came really in the 1930's but was not implemented until after the war. In those days, there was rationing, there was a workforce in the UK that was very, very different, engaged in manufacturing, industrial, the vast majority of people in that sort of work. There was very little expectation or desire amongst most children and working class families, particularly, to attend tertiary or university education.

2355

The social environment was totally different. Homosexuality was illegal. Most people did not own a TV. The internet had not been invented. I know that is the case, still, for some people, that is the way they think, anyway, in this Assembly, but that is the way it is!

Certainly, people did not travel as far as we do today. It was a very, very different environment, but that was the environment that the 11-plus and its grammars and secondary moderns were designed for.

It was an environment in terms of the logic, and some people asked for the logic and I can give it, because at the time the logic was if you did not pass to go to the Grammar School, then you were not expected to do the same exams, you were not expected to do the same curriculum. You were not expected to go to do A-levels. You did CSEs and you did vocational-type jobs and you left school at 14 or 15. That was the vast majority, that is what happened. If you went to Grammar School then of course you did GCEs and you went on, more than likely, to do A-levels and perhaps onto university.

But the expectations are very different. That is why selection, the division of young people into those categories, was considered logical. I do not necessarily agree with it now, but looking at it at that time, that perhaps made sense in the economic and social era of the 1940's and 1950's.

The 1960's and 70's, similarly, those were eras where perhaps comprehensives were beginning to take root in the UK, but it was an era of high levels of civil unrest and strikes, four-day working week, low levels of productivity, there was political instability, massive inflation and massive cultural shifts happening, so Guernsey today is culturally, socially and economically akin to neither of those types, those environments, those societies, if it ever was.

So, I do not believe that is the decision that is before us today. I believe, as with many other things, we need to find our own way forward. But, for me, the current system of the 11-plus, which the last Assembly resolved to remove, is not something that should be considered. In fact, if the argument is to tweak it, there is a big question about how to do that. We see in appendix two of the Policy Letter that there are four or so options of selecting in a different way which many, many of our electorate, as well as people in this Assembly, have suggested there could be a way. Well, we can see that there is not a way that is possible to do without it being abused in some way. It is not appropriate and the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, could not come up with a suitable alternative.

I do believe that selecting at 11, in itself, is not a good time to do it, if you are going to do it all. That is because of my experience with the Borderline Panel. Now, I know that the borderline process still exists and I do not believe it involves so many as it did back then. It was nearly 100 that could be considered borderline, 2% either way of the pass rate, which remember changed and still changes from one year to the next, because we are talking about averages and different size and different shapes of cohort.

So, it struck me, at that time, when we had, in addition to the verbal and non-verbal tests that were part of it at the time, we had maths and literacy exams as well, as I looked at the marks of those in the borderline, because we were selecting such a large percentage, effectively, on the bell curve of normal distribution of ability at that age, or indeed any age, I guess, as soon as you bring it back further and further into the middle, you bring in to the equation a much larger group of people. It becomes more and more difficult to work out what is fair and what should be counted as a pass mark, as the border, as the line to draw.

As a result, every year there were individuals, young people who had scored very highly in maths, say, but not so in English. Or the other way around. Who did not pass and were borderline, perhaps, but whose parents did not fight for them or appeal on that basis, because they did not have parents who support them. As a result, some of them went to, and no doubt perhaps still do go to high schools. We do not know any more because we do not take those tests and some people are suggesting we put them in again. They go to the high schools and they cannot be setted properly in the high schools. Our high schools are not big enough to do that.

My eldest daughter was one of those. She had a very high mark, 10 marks or so above those that were going to the Grammar School at the time, but being slightly dyslexic, her English let her down. Now, she went to Les Beaucamps, and it was a very good school, and they did the best they possibly could do, but to this day she still thinks she is no good at maths. The trouble was there were only two or three like her in school and they could not set her in a class. They could not have

2405

2360

2365

2370

2375

2380

2385

2390

2395

a set of three, so it was impossible for the teacher to effectively stretch and give challenge to those three and, very soon, they were effectively grouped in with the others.

You cannot do it. We need bigger schools in order to set properly. I am totally in favour of setting by subject and by ability and that can change from year on year. Because the other difficulty with the borderline issue is that it changes from year to year and so, by the lottery of whichever year you were in, you could either be chosen, selected to go to the Grammar as a special place holder, or end up at one of the high schools.

That is not social inclusion. That is not making the system as fair as possible for everyone who takes it. So, this Assembly, and its predecessor, have made some bold decisions with regards to the sort of society that we want to live in today, in terms of social inclusion. I include in that, in the justice of that, social mobility.

It is clear that the 11-plus does not provide social mobility any longer. Selection at 11 does not provide that, if it ever did. I am not going to go into that, because there is no point in going into that. By tweaking it we are not going to improve matters. If we tweak it, the issue will be we will perhaps select a different group of people to go to the Grammar School and there will be a different group of parents who will be upset. How are you going to deal with that, when we have added another five exams into the system to tweak it and make it more fair and we will get back to the situation that we were in 20 years ago, when people were saying, 'This is too many exams and my kid is not actually learning in Year 6 at all, because he or she is sitting exams all the time.'

It is not appropriate.

Perhaps we could do, as the late Deputy Dave Jones said once when speaking to me, I am sure I have heard him say it elsewhere. He said what we need is two grammar schools. Because actually we could select a lot more. Our kids in Guernsey are far more able than the average similar size society in the UK. There is an element of logic there.

I argued once, having looked at that initial evidence when I was Education, I said, you know this is not PC at all, but I am going to say it here anyway, I said if we have to have selection by any form, the way to select is the bottom 10% or so, because it is that bottom 10% that is the most difficult to deal with. But, you know, no one is going to want to suggest that, are they?

If we are going to have selection at 11, then we certainly should do two things. If we are going to keep the Grammar School like it is and have selection, the first thing is this. We should only select 8%-10% because those are the genuine all-rounders that you can probably guarantee, at 11, will continue further down the line. As soon as you draw the line back any further, you cannot be certain at all.

Secondly, let us make the Grammar School truly just academic, because the remarkable thing I have noticed about the Grammar School and I rejoice in this, but some others may have a different opinion, is that they are no longer doing just academic subjects there. My daughter did photography and media studies and 'soft' subjects like that there. A huge number choose that. Well, they should not be doing that, that is for high schools, surely? Those subjects are the ones for whom it is more appropriate because they learn in different ways and at different speeds.

Then let us make the high schools, similarly, just concentrate on those 'soft' subjects, because that will provide the sort of workforce that we want today.

I think not

I cannot support these amended Propositions. Firstly, because I do not believe that by doing so, we are mitigating our risk. We have no idea what the alternatives are. The only alternatives that can work are the 11-plus like it is and it is not satisfactory. We are almost unanimous on that, unless some people are being disingenuous.

We have to work differently. We have to have all-ability, all-inclusive schools. We have to deal, certainly, with perhaps some unruly pupils and how we deal with that. We have got an extant Resolution already on those issues and I believe that can be dealt with appropriately, that is how we deal with that 10% or so.

But it is not appropriate to go back to selecting at 11 to different schools. Let us move forward for the sake of our society.

2420

2410

2415

2430

2425

2435

2440

2445

2450

2460 **Several Members:** Hear, hear. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

Fellow States' Member, one of the many reasons that I stood for election, proved to be sitting in the public gallery on the March debate, often with the taste of blood in my mouth.

To clarify, no one had hit me. What hit me was the personal anecdotes. 'When I was a boy back in the 1950's ...' that is plus 40 years ago, '...I went to the college and I went to this school and I went to that school. It worked for me years ago'.

Has education moved on in the last 50 years, sir? It feels today that it has not even moved on in the last nine months, because here we are again. Back in March, I was literally biting my tongue to stop me from rising from my seat and speaking. Now the electorate has given me a voice.

With all due respect, sir, this is not about what may have worked 60 years ago. This is not about our personal educational experiences, or personal anecdotes. Yes, we can learn from the past. We can respect the past and some people may want to live in the past, but I believe we should be looking to the future.

This is clearly a divisive and emotive debate. At its very core is a simple question. Do we want to have an inclusive education system or a selective one? Are we teaching our children to be inclusive, or do we need to separate them, all to the benefit and detriment for a selective system versus an inclusive one. Why are catchment area schools alright for primary school children but, then, why do we need to then select some to go to different schools at the age of 10 years old? Just 10 years old.

I have listened with wry amusement regarding the Guernsey doorstep referendum. Canvassing for election is not a referendum. If you truly want to know what the electorate wants regarding selection, then logic dictates that we would have to hold a referendum. A referendum purely on this one question. We have not done this.

I believe the Guernsey doorstep has to be one of the greatest fallacies in the history of local politics.

I was new face, a new voice. Yes, education questions were asked, but so were waste questions, Island-wide voting questions, transport links, to name but a few.

So, I am a bit confused, sir, as I thought and indeed I am in the same electoral district as Deputy Trott. I should clarify that. I stood in my district and Deputy Trott stood also decided to stand in my district. (*Laughter*)

I came third. So, maybe when the confusion with one in three, I was one of the top three, which I thank the electorate for. I do hope that no-one in this Assembly was voted-in purely because of this one debate. Education.

What are they going to do for the rest of their term?! (*Laughter*)

Who has made this an election issue? I would suggest it was the defeated pro-selection candidates. A second bite at that cherry. I know what I said on those doorsteps. I know how I replied to the questions in the *Guernsey Press*, I know what I said at the hustings. I know what I said and I know what I heard and I can sleep well at night.

Let us move away from fallacies onto some facts. People have been asking for facts. Fact. If I need legal advice, I will go to a law practitioner. If I am ill, I will go to see a doctor. I agree with Deputy Graham, you can get a second opinion from a different doctor. But, sir, there is no second opinion on the 11-plus.

If I need some advice on education, I will go to see teachers and students. I will research educational experts. I visited all of our six secondary schools last week. I was working with all of our head teachers. It is a fact. I asked them all direct and pertinent questions and I respect their answers, their viewpoints, their concerns.

None of our head teachers want selection. None.

2480

2475

2465

2470

2485

2495

2490

2505

2500

We were led to believe this could be a conspiracy. Why are they only employed because of their start in selection? Really? Another conspiracy theory busted yesterday and I thank Deputy Le Pelley for busting yet another Guernsey fallacy.

Another conspiracy theory is still yet to be busted. Teachers have a vested interest. Let me try to bust that theory now. Do teachers have a vested interest in our children's education? Well, I hope so. Yes, I think we can safely say that teachers have a vested interest in our children's education. Just as my doctor has a vested interest in my health.

I have spoken with many students, observed lessons. I am not an expert regarding education, nor do I claim to be. So, to selection and, indeed, the 11-plus. Back in January, so many children 10 years old, not 11; 11-plus simply because it dictates where you should go to school when you are over 11 years of age. Which children succeed or fail? Who was coached, who was not? Who will be accepted and who will be rejected? Who will the winners be and who will the losers be?

Of course, some Deputies think this is pre-determined. That selection happens at birth. Selections are normal. Natural. So, have you been selected by birth into a family that can afford coaching or is it nature, or is it nurture? Have you been selected by birth into a family that, through nurture, can support and guide their children through a system that revolves around the ability to pass two 11-plus papers?

Were you born a boy or a girl? Girls, historically, get higher grades and therefore, for years, unknown to the general public, would not get into the Grammar, even with a higher pass mark, as it was deemed more important to have an equal boy versus girl split. So, even now, if you are born a girl, you are more likely to get a higher 11-plus score. This is literally selection at birth. So, being born a girl, literally means you are more likely to pass an 11-plus. Thank goodness I am a woman! (*Laughter*)

I thank Deputy de Sausmarez for touching on mind-set. Our and our children's growth mindset. Mindset is a simple idea discovered by Caroline Dweck, a worldwide known Stanford University social and developmental psychologist, after decades of research on achievement and success. Teaching a growth mindset creates motivation and productivity in education, business and sports. In a fixed mindset, people believe their basic qualities, their intelligence, their talent, are simply fixed traits. Are we telling our 10-year-old children that they have a fixed mindset? Do we, as an Assembly, have a fixed mindset? People with growth mindset believe that their most basic abilities can be developed through dedication, encouragement and hard work. This view creates a love of learning and a resilience essential for great accomplishment.

Deputy Smithies thinks that the child who cannot go faster than 5mph should accept that. Maybe, a bit faster. The 10mph child should carry on. What if the 10mph child slows down, the 5mph child speeds up? Hmm. Did you know that Darwin and Tolstoy were considered ordinary children? I have tried to find out, but I simply cannot find out, how fast that Darwin or Tolstoy could run! (*Laughter*) Unsurprisingly, they are remembered for different attributes.

But I have found out that Ben Hogan, one of the greatest golfers of our time, was completely uncoordinated and graceless as a child. His words, not mine.

Ability is not fixed and is certainly not fixed at the age of 10 years old. Therefore, how can we retain a selective system, sending our children down different educational paths? I believe that all our children should have the same opportunity. We should listen to our teaching profession and consider all of our Island's children.

We know all our children are different. They have different aptitudes, abilities and interests. Our education should be capable of allowing all of our children to achieve their full potential, allowing them all to flourish. All of them.

So, I am a bit concerned by Deputy Brouard's comments. I have checked with a few teachers and it appears that there is not a separate teacher training college for grammar school teachers, with teachers being taught to match the children's needs. I was always led to believe that secondary school teachers were all trained in the same way. Maybe Deputy Le Pelley could confirm this?

2560

2515

2520

2525

2530

2535

2540

2545

2550

STATES OF DELIBERATION, THURSDAY, 1st DECEMBER 2016

When the Butler Act was passed in 1944, the vast majority of the working population worked with their hands and utilised and developed practical skills on the job, in the process becoming highly skilled technicians. All that secondary or technical education could do was prepare them for the lifetime of doing pretty much the same job.

The world has moved on, at least those who are prepared to listen with an open mind have. This Island will live or die on the basis of the collective intellect of its workforce. Refusing to acknowledge the fact and condemning nearly 70% of our population's failures at 10 or 11 threatens to do irreparable damage to our future economic health and wellbeing and require us to continue to bring in from outside those key, knowledge-based professionals this Island is now dependent on.

Let us allow all of our children to develop, flourish to their full potential. Let us not restrict the subjects they can learn. Let us have an aspirational educational system that gives all of our children a growth mindset.

To finish, I would use a quote that we all were sent yesterday, from an Islander:

'Continuous effort, not strength or intelligence, is the key to unlocking potential.'

This quote was attributed to Winston Churchill. I thank you, sir. (Applause)

2580 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir.

I rise with hesitance, because, obviously, we have had nearly two days of debate now and I think, firstly, it is clear that no one is going to change their vote. Secondly, I think pretty well everything that needs to be said has been said, but a few comments have arisen in debate which I feel compelled to respond to and I also think that there is a central argument in favour of moving to all-ability schools which, perhaps, has not been properly aired yet.

We have heard much anecdotal evidence of what Deputy Merrett calls the doorstep referendum, which the supporters of selection seem to rely very heavily on. Of course, it is true that in the Your Schools consultation, those who responded to the consultation were by a majority in favour of retaining selection. But, with due respect to Deputy Inder, a vote by a self-selecting sample cannot be compared with surveys of statistically representative samples by YouGov or other polling organisations.

My own impression is that the public are actually pretty evenly divided on the subject and, indeed, that there are many people with no view at all.

I give way to Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Deputy Parkinson, with the greatest respect, sir, practically all surveys and all polls are self-selecting. No-one is forced to take a survey or a poll.

Deputy Parkinson: Well, Deputy Inder will be aware, of course, that not everyone gets invited to participate in a survey or a poll. The polling organisation scientifically selects what they consider to be a balanced and representative sample. That cannot be compared with a self-selected sample of 3,900 people or whatever it was.

Deputy Inder: Of which, not everyone takes most of these polls at 100%, so it is still self-selecting.

Deputy Parkinson: I think my point is made, for those who wish to understand it. (*Laughter*)

2605

2565

2570

2575

2585

2590

2595

2600

2610

2615

As it happens, as I say, I think the public are relatively evenly divided. Certainly, that was my impression in St Peter Port North and, indeed, which is not mentioned by anybody, a lot of people had no view on the subject at all.

There are, after all, a lot of people who have no real stake, if you like, in the Guernsey education system. People with no children. People whose children are long grown-up and so on and many people were relatively indifferent on the subject.

So, I reject Deputy Ferbrache's accusation that it is in some way arrogant or elitist if we try to form our own opinion on the basis of the evidence presented to us.

2620

Deputy Ferbrache: That is not what I said. I would be grateful, if I am being quoted, and it was a long speech, so I appreciate that some of the points were missed, I did not say that at all.

What I said was what I objected and what was wrong was that when evidence was put, if people did not like it, they sought to disparage it rather than analyse it.

I hope that is clear.

2625

Deputy Parkinson: What I am saying, regardless of whether 61% of the public thought that we should retain selection, and I do not happen to think that is an accurate figure, we are still obliged as representatives to form our own opinion on the evidence that is placed in front of us. I do not think it is arrogant or elitist to do so.

2630

As it happens, enough people in St Peter Port North who perfectly well knew my views on selection were willing to vote for me to place me near the top of the poll and, you know, I am happy to represent their views, because their views are just as worthy of representation as anyone else's.

2635

On the subject of statistics, we have had some strange ones bandied around, or some strange statistical notions bandied around. I have to refer again to Deputy Ferbrache's speech, because the only surprise in the information that the top-performing state schools in England are selective is that anyone is surprised by this. (*Laughter*)

If you measure performance by the number of A*s or the number of A*-Cs obtained by people at various schools, the schools that select their intake start with an insuperable advantage. Similarly, it is absurd to suggest that the performance of the 26 comprehensive schools in Hampshire should be compared only to the performance of the Guernsey Grammar School. We cannot compare apples with pears.

2640

The real question is whether the talented pupils at selective schools would have done as well in all-ability schools and I will come to that presently.

2645

I keep getting drawn back to statistics. Deputy Brouard misquoted the statistics for the number of children who were allegedly misplaced by the 11-plus system in England and Wales in the 1950's and he said it was 7,000 per annum. In fact, the figure estimated by Yates and Pidgeon in their seminal work *Admission to Grammar Schools* was about 10% or, in the numbers of those days, 60,000 to 78,000 every year. So, rather than an equivalent figure for Guernsey of seven, the equivalent figure for Guernsey would be 70.

2650

The comparison made by some supporters of selection that puzzles me the most, however, is the alleged contrast between a successful Guernsey education system and a supposedly failing UK comprehensive system.

The Bailiff: Give way to Deputy Brouard.

2655

Deputy Brouard: Thank you very much for giving way, Deputy Parkinson.

The figure I picked up was from one of the people who were arguing with regard to the debate, opposite from me; 7,000 was a figure that they quoted to me, so I just was quoting it back

2660

My apologies if the figure was wrong.

Deputy Parkinson: I think your hearing is at fault (*laughter*), because I have the same figures, they say 70,000 and if the speaker concerned wants to rise and correct, then please do so. I heard them say 70,000 and the source material says 70,000. So, that is why I felt the need to correct your statement.

Here we are, presented with this alleged argument in favour of retaining selection that Guernsey has a very successful system, the UK system is failing, the comprehensive system, and that we should not move towards something that resembles their system in any way. We heard this from several Deputies, but I will move on to the point.

The reality is that Guernsey's overall performance at GCSE is now slightly, but only slightly better than the UK average and that, despite the fact that we do not suffer from many of the problems faced by some regions of the UK, of extensive deprivation and large immigrant communities for whom English is a second language, we only just out-perform, as an Island, the UK average. Allowing for those differences, I think it fair to say that Guernsey's system really could do a lot better. If we had a school report on the Guernsey education system I think it would say, 'Must try harder.'

Guernsey may well, as Deputy Dorey tells us, perform better than Jersey, the Isle of Man or Gibraltar, but that does not make us successful by international standards. We need to understand that the UK itself is deeply unhappy with the standards that it is obtaining. The Conservative Government has launched, which are now being implemented, a series of reforms of the GCSE system which are designed to bring the UK back up the international PISA league tables.

Several speakers have already remarked that in the 2013 league table, the UK featured 23rd in reading and 26th in maths. This is not a bad performance, but for a country that used to be near the top of the table and which has been sliding down the table for decades, this has become a matter of serious concern to the UK Government and they are taking steps to change their system in the UK to try and get the UK performance back up the table and, bear in mind, we at the moment start at roughly the same level as they do.

They introduced this new Progress 8 and Attainment 8, which replace the old GCSE gold standards and which effectively move the GCSE syllabus towards the baccalaureate model. In fact, the core of the syllabus in the Progress 8 and Attainment 8 is called, now, the English Baccalaureate, or E-Bac and onto the E-Bac you can tack various optional subjects, many of them vocational, to widen the scope of the exam.

Incidentally, I must say that I do not understand why Guernsey has decided not to follow the UK on this because our children, in the end, compete for places at university and jobs with people, children coming out of the UK system and I think for us to simply try and turn our back on that and say we are going to develop our own curriculum is, frankly, crazy. It is now interesting that that attitude is being undermined by the Grammar School and others, who are producing their own Progress 8 scores, because they want to be compared with schools in the UK. But, anyway, I digress.

The central point here is, as I say, the UK is not satisfied with its performance. The same performance that we have, more or less, and is taking serious steps to improve it.

So, we need to consider what we should be doing to enable our schools to keep up. Merely staying where we are is not really a good option. Our teachers, who are the people best placed to advise us on this, tell us by a substantial majority, that splitting children at the age of 11 into two different types of schools, is not conducive to optimal performance. It is damaging to those who 'fail' the 11-plus and it does not significantly benefit those who pass.

I spent many hours looking into the evidence behind this, because it has always been a concern for me that any reform we undertake should not damage the interests of the highest ability groups, who do perform very well in the Guernsey system. While I think the evidence shows beyond doubt that the children of lower ability do better in all-ability schools than in secondary moderns, I think the evidence that children of high ability do just as well as they would have in selective schools is harder to come by. Possibly, because any difference in performance is so small that it is difficult to measure.

2680

2665

2670

2675

2685

2690

2695

2700

2705

The experience in Kent, like ours, suggests that the overall results of the comprehensive system are very similar to the overall results of selective systems, but it is clear to me that we do need to introduce special measures in any reform to take care of the highest ability groups and to see that they are stretched. But I think that can be achieved within an all-ability school system and I do not see that as an obstacle to reform.

As I say, if there is a detrimental effect for the high-ability groups, it seems to be small and the raising of standards at the lower end seems to be quite substantial.

Now, my thinking on this whole subject was largely influenced, I have to admit, by my oldest daughter, who qualified as a teacher at a comprehensive in Kettering and I asked her advice on the subject. She said to me, 'Look, it is very simple. If you have got good teachers, you will have great schools.' (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

This, of course, is what Denis Mulkerrin told us, which is that the ability to recruit and retain good teachers is key to raising standards and getting the best results. It follows that if teachers do not like teaching in selective schools or, probably more accurately, in secondary modern schools, we will impair our results by retaining that system.

It is generally the case that teachers like to teach a mixture of different sets. Some speakers have suggested that there are teachers whose specialist interest is in teaching students who are struggling, but I suggest they are few and far between. Most teachers enjoy teaching a variety of sets, from those who are keen to learn and who pick things up quickly, to those who are more challenging and where more time and effort has to be invested in explaining the topic.

What most teachers, I suggest, would like therefore, is a spread of different ability sets so that, in the course of a day, they get exposure to the full range of ability and I think the evidence is very clear in that the teacher surveys in Guernsey, people have been interpreting them in different ways, but if you include the teachers at the colleges and at the Grammar School, you get people are more in favour of selection than, basically, if you exclude them, the opinion is much less favourable towards selection. There is clear evidence that many teachers do not like being restricted in the scope of their work to teaching the lowest ability sets.

I think we need to understand their position on this. There are some, unfortunately, on the other side of the debate who take the attitude they will have to do what they are told and if Guernsey votes to reintroduce the 11-plus and selection, they will just have to get on and operate that system. That, frankly, risks demotivating the very people who we need to catalyse the change that we need to make to drive through the improvement in standards that we need to see.

In summary, therefore, for me, the argument for removing selection by the system at 11 is about preparing for a step change in performance which we are going to need to make to keep up with international standards. Now, in May, when I stood for President of ESC, I explained how I have quite different views on how secondary schooling in Guernsey could be restructured and I am not going to reiterate those now, but suffice to say I am all in favour of selection, as long as it is the students doing the selecting. I cannot see the necessity for geographic catchment areas when all of the secondary schools on the Island are located within about a mile and a half of each other.

That is a discussion for another day. All we are asked to decide today is whether the system should continue to select pupils on the basis of some sort of assessment at the age of 11 and then allocate them to different schools and, to that, my answer is resoundingly Contre.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: I will start just by declaring an interest.

As Members will know, because they appointed me a few months ago, I am a governor of Ladies' College. I am very proud to be so, given the latest ISI inspection report, that rated it excellent in all categories. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2533

2720

2715

2730

2725

2735

2740

2745

2750

2755

I am also pleased that the post-16 team not only beat Elizabeth College, but was the Guernsey winner of the De Putron Challenge last week. I have to declare a personal interest in the latter,

By the way, what I am about to say, they are my own views and not those of the college, whose stance on this issue is neutral.

Now, I was not looking forward to this debate. Not so much because I knew I would just hear all the same arguments as six months ago and, in some cases, the same speeches as six months ago! (*Laughter*)

The greatest reason I have not looked forward to it is more personal. Now, I rarely bring in family into my speeches, but I feel I need to today because it explains why, for me, the whole debate around selection is not an easy one. A month before the last education debate my mum was admitted to hospital and she died just over a week after. Her funeral was a day after the South-East hustings, so the election was quite bittersweet for me.

She was a teacher, a highly-respected teacher, I might add. Like many others, whether they are a majority or not, was against selection. Incidentally, she was the first year to take the 11-plus and it gave her the ticket to leave the family home, where she had been expected to stay, and look after her parents, and strike out as a professional woman. She was one of the first to start tapping on that glass ceiling and, 70 years later, the cracks are appearing, but it has not broken yet.

Now, when I went to visit my mum in the evening after the education debate, I told her the States had voted against selection, as I knew it would make her happy and, in one of the last times she was able to manage speech, she said, 'Oh, good.'

Of course, I could not tell her I voted against selection. In her prime, we would have had a robust exchange of views about it and she would probably have convinced me I was wrong. She was a woman of strong opinions. Feisty and independent, as Deputy Roffey would say. So, perhaps, Members will forgive me when I say I have not been looking forward to going through the same debate all over again. The associated memories are still quite raw.

I have pondered whether to say anything at all, as despite almost everyone making a speech, most, if not all of those of us sitting here now had already made up our minds before we entered the Chamber. In fact, I think everyone has had a script in front of them and I am no different, of course.

In the end, I succumbed, if only to vent my frustration that we are having the wrong debate at the wrong time. How, whatever we decide today will not make a jot of difference in sorting out the problems we really wish to solve. We should have had this debate six months ago, of course. This delay has not helped anyone. The debate should have been a dim and distant memory now and we should have the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture looking at the really important stuff, the stuff that goes far beyond the structure of secondary education. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

We should be debating the policy and level of teaching resources. I was surprised, during the Budget debate, that we heard very little from the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, around the impact of savings of 3% 5% and 5% over the next three years. There was a strong correlation between the resources put into education and the results achieved. You can see that from what happened at La Mare, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) which has made great strides and which Deputy St Pier highlighted in his speech yesterday.

We should be allowing head teachers more autonomy. One of the biggest frustrations for the school heads is the fact they cannot manage their own schools, particularly regarding recruitment. I have been told of numerous errors made by the centre during the recruitment process and the inordinate amount of time it takes to recruit. I want to hear from the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture about what they doing about that. We should be looking at how we reverse the growing mental health issues of our school children.

Members of the Committee for Health & Social Care visited the communities team on Friday and, during the visit, we met the school nurses. They spoke of the increases in mental health issues that they are experiencing now, spread between all schools, girls and boys. They expressed

2780

2765

2770

2775

2785

2790

2800

2795

2805

2810

their concerns over the increase and the role social media is playing. That is what needs to be looked at. How can we support our children? What should schools be doing about it?

We focus on secondary school as places to get GCSEs and A-levels. They are all judged on how many five GCSEs A*-C they get, but education is more than that. We need to support the whole child. I want to see schools bringing in the award-winning Decider Skills, created by two amazing Health & Social Care staff. If you have never heard of it, see me afterwards, as they say. That is what we should be looking at.

Changing the structure of schools will not change those issues and, if we decide to get rid of selection, timely resources will be diverted from where they are most needed. You really do not have to take my word for it and I will get onto that in just a minute.

There are two phrases used in this debate that have got me really worked up and they are equality of opportunity and social mobility. This obsession with ensuring everyone gets the same academic education is contributing to the problem. We should be debating what we are doing about technical education, why there are only around 25 apprentices registered at the College of Further Education this year. One size really does not fit all. I have some great friends who are the most skilled craftsmen that you will ever find. They can turn a piece of metal or wood into a thing of beauty. Does sticking them in a classroom, doing the same work as someone with an IQ of 120 make any sense? Of course, it does not and that is the point.

We are totally missing the point. The whole selection debate is completely missing the point. Selection is not about elitism. It means helping kids get an education that suits them. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Equality of opportunity is not about giving all kids the same academic opportunity. What is being missed is supporting and enabling our skilled young people. Those creative people. Those for whom learning *Of Mice and Men* is a complete waste of time. To be honest, I think *Of Mice and Men* is a complete waste of time to the children who are academic, but that is another matter and for another debate! (*Laughter*)

Those who get so worked up about selection are those that just do not get the fact that we are all different and should have an education that fits who we are. Let us not forget that those who are highest paid in our society include sportsmen, actors, musicians. Not being academic does not mean having the lowest paid jobs. It is a problem of our society if we do not value those jobs.

That leads me onto the issue of social mobility. I am sorry, but this is a complete red herring. It is nothing to do with the system of secondary education. We hear there are few children in the Grammar School who live in social housing and none in the colleges. Well, honestly, is not that a symptom of problems elsewhere, not the cause? The problems of social mobility are well-recognised in the UK. A Social Mobility Commission report published just two weeks ago said that those born in the 80's have less social mobility than their parents. That, despite the fact the vast number of children attend comprehensive schools.

They state that and I quote:

'Successive governments have focused on reforming school structures, with mixed results. The Commission hopes that the government will move on from over-reliance on structural reform to a new and relentless focus on improving teacher quality and fairly distributing teachers to the schools that most need them.'

Sir Michael Wilshaw said just that on the *Today* programme this morning. So, whilst the antiselection lobby, generally, have been quick to quote the sentence where the commission asks the government whether they should bring in grammars, it is not to do with their belief it will make social mobility worse, but the politicians should put their ideological viewpoints to one side and get on and focus on what really matters: the quality of teaching.

That is why, if I were in the UK, I would not support the introduction of grammar schools. Issues around social mobility start well before a child reaches 11. It is why the 1001 Days initiative, which the Committee for Health & Social Care is fully behind and wants to see traction on, is needed as part of a suite of measures to give children the best start, before they even start school.

2835

2820

2825

2830

2840

2845

2850

2855

At the other end of the education system, why is it that so few state-educated children go to the supposedly top universities, compared to those in private schooling? Five times as likely to get to Oxbridge if you went to a private school than a state school. Why should social mobility be set by what academic qualifications you have reached by 21? Surely that is what lifelong learning is about? How sad if we think we cannot strive for a better and more fulfilled life for as long as we are fit and able to do so.

Given today's schoolchildren are likely to live beyond 100, surely Government must help that happen? But we are not. We are obsessing, as we have been doing for years and years and years, on just one small period of time in a person's life. We currently have the Longer Working Lives initiative, but if we do not learn when we are older, what opportunities will there be for us? Jobs are no longer for life; lifelong learning will be essential.

Now, I went to a grammar school, but did not particularly enjoy it. But that was in the UK in the late 70's and the early 80's. It was not a great time to be at school, either as a student or a teacher, for that matter.

But, for years, I supported all-ability schools. I am still not ideologically opposed to them, but I have a real issue about bringing such a system here because I do not see that we have a broken system, quite the reverse. I have real concerns about what the alternative will mean.

Firstly, there can be no doubt that the Grammar School is a top performing school. I do not want to get rid of a school that is a top performer. In fact, why get rid of any of the schools as they currently operate if, as may well be the case, they are already outperforming?

Deputy Stephens said in her speech how great they all are. So, the alternative: Members will be aware of an email we received recently from someone in our community who attached a paper on how Hampshire comprehensive schools performed compared with Guernsey, on the gold standard A*-C at GCSE, including English and maths and Deputy de Sausmarez mentioned it in her speech. I thought I would look more into that, just to get a better idea of the schools in Hampshire. Now, I looked at the best performing schools and found that the average number of pupils in those schools achieving over 70% was 1,400. None of them had less than 1,000 pupils. Conversely, those with less than 40% had, on average, half that. Under 700. None of them had more than 1,000 pupils.

So, the smaller the school, the worse they performed. At 61%, based on the size of schools, you could in fact say that Guernsey schools were outperforming. Whatever. The truth is, comprehensive schooling does not work unless you have large pupil numbers. We are told that you can still have selection within an all-ability school through setting. Deputy Roffey says he does not believe in all-ability schools without setting. Well, I get that. That is the one reason why I am not opposed to all-ability schools in principle. I really am not.

However, setting requires a large enough cohort to ensure that you can stretch the best and focus on the most challenged. Deputy Leadbeater says he wants to see the end of selection, but retain four schools. Well, sorry, but you cannot have both. Of course, those against selection want to separate this debate from the number of schools but, in reality, you cannot. With all-ability schools, at least one school will need to close. That is if we really care about giving our children the best education and are not just doing so for ideological reasons.

Bigger really does mean better and, of course, that was always the Education Department's motto. Certainly, for primary schools.

To get to anything approaching 1,400 pupils, we would need to get down to not three, but two schools. Even then, we would only have 1,300 pupils and that might work in the UK, but how would that fit on this small Island? What school should be expanded? Can they be? How much will it cost? Is that where money should be best spent, or teaching resources?

That is it in a nutshell for me. It is all very well having ideological fancies, but you have to think of the practicalities. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) The reality is changing to comprehensive schooling will not sort out the problems we think it will solve and, quite frankly, to make it work at all will need major upheaval, not only of the education system, but the estate. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2880

2865

2870

2875

2885

2890

2895

2900

As an aside, I remember Deputy Le Clerc saying during the last debate about she had felt a failure for not passing the 11-plus and it really scarred her for life. In reality, she should be telling kids that the system has enabled her to be a success. Deputy de Sausmarez, going on the same lines about the psychological impact, it sounded like my daughter, actually, who is doing A-level psychology, it was quite interesting. Nowhere do you talk about potential. Have people who have gone to the high school not reached their potential compared to those at the Grammar School? We do not have that conclusive evidence.

Back to the alternative. We hear Deputies Fallaize and Stephens say that those pro-selection have not got an alternative to the 11-plus, but the truth is, when we say all-ability schools, we do not actually know what that means. Deputy Roffey spoke about how we should not slavishly follow the UK, so what is the answer then?

So, finally, I want the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, to be looking at the quality of teaching. Mental health issues. Getting more students into the top universities. Lifelong learning. Increasing the number of apprentices. And through all that, provide equality of opportunity and social mobility.

Changing the system will not do that. At best, it will be a distraction. At worst, it could be very destructive.

As we get closer to the end of this debate, I would just like Members to think on this. No, we do not have a perfect system. Neither is our system broken. Equality of opportunity does not mean the same size fits all and just changing to a new system of education will not improve social mobility. In fact, this is the point. Spending years putting a new system in and, believe me, it will take years, reorganising schools, trying to recruit the extra teaching staff needed, are years where the real issues in our education system, our wider society, would not get the full attention that they deserve.

We hear a lot about experts in this debate. Pedagogical insights abound. But what we really need is just a bit of common sense and, for that reason, I will be supporting the amendment. (Applause)

The Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

I find myself in an odd place. As an actor and an improviser, when I am on stage I follow a rule that says do not come on stage to be funny, come on to stage to move the story forward. Such a divisive debate as this, stretching back many years, clearly warrants that we in this Assembly should be looking to move the story on. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Sometimes on stage, when I am improviser is in a scene and they are not taking the story forward and they are wandering around the story and things are not really happening and they are going in circles, they are not getting anywhere and they are going back and they are struggling to find meaning and purpose and, frankly, it is not very entertaining to watch. This is called 'wimping'.

This, it is sad to say, sir, is what we are doing in this polarising debate. We as an Assembly are wimping. It is time to challenge and change. It is often a good idea to look at those who have, in difficult circumstances, steadied the ship in rough waters and given people hope. So, I quote one of my heroes, Nelson Mandela:

'Education is the most powerful weapon you can use to change the world.' $\,$

Personally, I would settle for transforming Guernsey into a knowledge-based economy. We should, after all, set achievable targets.

To select, or not to select. That is the question we are talking about now. We heard today and yesterday from some about their election experiences and I am not going to bore you with my own story but, suffice to say, if the people voted only on education, then I have a mandate to listen to the teachers and vote against selection.

2960

2915

2920

2925

2930

2935

2940

2945

2950

2955

But I do not think it is as simple as that and others have explained exactly why. We should listen to the voice of the people. We should listen. That is a good word. Having spent many years teaching improvisation, one of the key skills I teach is listening. So, how do you listen well? Listening is not the same as hearing. When you listen, you must pay attention not only to the story, but how it is told. A good listener will listen not only to what is said, but what is left unsaid. They will explore the subtext and find the hidden meaning behind.

Listening to the many people during the election, after the election and, most recently, in emails, I have listened and tried to step back and see the whole picture. People have said they want to get rid of the 11-plus, but keep some form of selection. But what is unsaid? We have touched on it here. It is what is wrong with the 11-plus. Girls develop sooner than boys. Tutoring is unfair. It does not always select the right people. It does not catch the later developers. But the most damning evidence for me and something that I heard during the election as well is that at least 40% of the students who are told they are capable of the grammar education do not get a place in the Grammar School.

Are they selected for the right school? Let us keep in mind the reasons and context as to why people do not want the 11-plus when we consider maintaining selection.

The trouble with selection is that education is not binary any more and Deputy Soulsby said we are concentrating on giving everyone the same academic pathway. This is not true. It is not a binary choice. We know this. There is academic, there is vocational. Children, as all humans do, fall in a spectrum. We should be treating them as individuals, giving them individual pathways.

Deputy Graham made some very interesting observations yesterday and I do not think that the things that the things he was saying about the College of Further Education and apprentices and going at 14, why do we need to determine that at 11? He did not explain why we would need selection to do that. I believe we can do it in our system. We have to, as Deputy Soulsby said, move forward past this debate and create those pathways for all of our children to get them to the best of their ability. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

We can provide different pathways in an all-ability system. In my investigations, I was delighted to find that some of the work on pathways has already been implemented at, for instance, Les Beaucamps High School, with their blue and silver pathways. Should we not look to build on that work that has already taken place, rather than wimping?

The question remains, why would we need to select by perceived ability at 11? We have yet to hear a compelling argument that would move the story on. I have heard many that are trying to kill the story or that the story has already been told. But nothing we have done so far is moving the story on.

Deputy Dudley-Owen touched, yesterday, on employers are increasingly requesting greater elements of vocational training. They are asking for something different from people coming from our workforce. It should be introduced alongside academic studies as an option. Something which many universities are now responding to, one example being vocational training for medical students to prepare them more thoroughly for responsibilities like dealing with patients or managing staff. Combinations of the two are more and more sought after by employers in order to produce new workers with a more rounded skill set, who are better prepared for all the demands of the roles they are taking on.

Perhaps the most important lesson of all is that young people need to be provided with a greater understanding of the variety of options available to them and should shake off any preconceptions that vocational training can only lead them to a second-class career. On the contrary, it can lead to valuable, lucrative, fulfilling professions.

Do we need to select to a separate school at 11 to do this? I have not heard any argument to suggest that we need to. Another concern I have heard and listened to was that there would be no academic pathway if we moved to an all-ability system. In the material provided by the head teachers in their invitation to all the Deputies, there were demonstrations of the kind of different pathways that may be available.

2985

2965

2970

2975

2980

2990

2995

3005

3000

3015

One would be, for instance, a purely academic pathway, so I certainly am comfortable that we would not be losing that if we were to maintain the status quo. Obviously, I would expect to see far more detail on the pathways when the Committee returns next June, after of course we vote against reinstating selection today.

3020

I have listened to a concerned parent who pointed out no concessions were made for a disabled child taking the 11-plus, unlike they do for other exams. At the moment when a child in Guernsey with a disability takes their GCSE or A-level examinations, they are able to have special concessions that allow for a wide range of special alterations in the exam. For the 11-plus, it is very, very limited. If your child has a visual impairment, you can be provided with large versions of the test papers and answer sheets. That is it. If your child is dyslexic, he can have colour films.

3025

Yes?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen?

3030

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you for giving way, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

This is something that was brought to our attention as a board recently when we had an induction training, myself and Deputy Leadbeater, and it is something that we want to bring back to the board to discuss in greater detail about the lack of advantage, or time given on 11-plus for individuals with special needs.

3035

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

So, at the moment, in an all-ability system, they could be included in the school and be given access to the same pathways as any other child. How is it acceptable not to do that in an inclusive society? I would maintain we do not need selection at 11 to achieve this.

3040

I have listened to parents' concerns that the gifted and talented would not be catered for, but the Heidi Soulsby amendment from the March debate asks for the provision of gifted and talented. With different pathways, you can create a truly unique pathway for a gifted child. Do we need to select to an entirely different school to achieve that? No.

3045

I have listened to many Deputies in this debate. Deputy Prow explained yesterday the new Progress 8 measure and how it is a much better benchmark because it relies on adding value and the learner achieving the expected progress and perhaps even excelling their expected progress. I agree that we should be encouraging our teachers to have high expectations of every pupil and value added techniques monitor how well they are being stretched. Targets should be set for each pupil, each year group and each subject. All children should give of their best and are expected to reach their potential.

3050

As part of researching this debate, I was fortunate enough to get much information from the civil servants in the Education Department. I would like to thank them for their invaluable information that they provided.

I had the opportunity to look at how they do monitor progress and expected performance. I am immensely proud of the hard work behind the scenes making sure that our children are stretched to the full limits of their ability, unlike what Deputy Smithies claimed yesterday.

3055

It occurred to me yesterday that perhaps other Deputies were not aware of these internal monitors. Perhaps it would be something for the Committee to consider so that other Deputies can be as assured as I was, looking at how fully aware they are of where each child should be and where they are at.

3060

Our children are not league tables. They are not a gold standard A*-C. They are not numbers. They are individuals who deserve to be treated as such.

Many parents used the word 'thrive' when they were describing how their children were going to the Grammar School and they thrived there. I like this word. Thrive. We should be striving to thrive. Sorry, I almost thought of some beat poetry like Deputy Lester Queripel yesterday.

3065

We should be aiming for all our children to thrive. We should be giving them the environment to thrive and creating that environment. Do we need selection at 11 to do that? No. I listened to

the teachers. Those pro-selection teachers who spoke of the wonderful progress results they were proud of. Could these progress results be achieved in an all-ability intake? Well, we had a letter in the *Press* from a young educator from Guernsey, Ladies' College-educated, who worked in an all-ability school in London and helped them achieve even better progress results. Do we need selection at 11, to get good progress results? No.

I listened to many, many passionate teachers who want to carry on the work of educating our children in an inclusive, non-selective environment. Can I remind Members that in any examination of best-performing countries in the education stakes, high valued, well-educated teachers are the backbone of any successful school system and we should be doing everything that we can to recruit them and keep them here. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Not let them go.

I listened to those who wanted to keep the Grammar School and, with all the listening, this is one of the subjects that is the most touchy. What is it about the Grammar School? The building? What will we lose? The academic curriculum, the ethos, the teachers? It is a delicate matter and if we are to consider, if we are ever to consider closing any school, it should not be decided on the hoof in the Assembly without proper evidence and consideration behind it. But we are not deciding on any school closures today, we are only deciding on selection or not.

That is for the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to go away after this debate and then look at the educational estate and make a considered and evidence-based decision. If we are to close a school, the students, teachers and parents should not have to hear about it on the radio. We need to do better. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We need to communicate these difficult decisions clearer and delicately with those who will be affected. We need to ensure that the transitions are properly managed if that is to be done. Most importantly for the Island, we must not pit one school against another.

But we do need to make a decision.

Through all this debate, I have still not heard what form selection will take. The elusive panacea that Deputy Fallaize called it, tutor proof that can accurately predict a child's academic ability at 11 and takes into account late bloomers, and boys. Do not forget the boys!

There is mention of selection that takes all who are capable ... I was lost on the boys! (Laughter)

Deputy Trott has spoken of risk, but has not given a solution to the conundrum of creating a knowledge-based economy, which I think he should be interested in.

The Committee has already gone away and spent six months looking for an alternative selection and, if we are to vote on the retention of selection, then they will find this form of selection without all associated problems. As Deputy Roffey stated yesterday and Deputy de Sausmarez has said today, are we just kicking the can down the road? We have heard in this debate 'we are not ready', 'this is not the time'. Well, then, when? When is the time? We cannot solve the problems of selection. We must move the story forward to an inclusive system and remove the shackles of selection.

We must take all that we have learned from this divisive debate, acknowledge it and build on those ideas and it is time I used the wise words of Nelson Mandela.

'Nothing is impossible until it is done.'

Thank you. (Applause)

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, thank you.

I will be brief. First of all, I do not accept that any of this is binary. The choice that we are being encouraged to make, a straight choice between selection by ability at 11 or a Leviathan image of an English model of comprehensive education, that is not the choice that I think is before me. I think the real choice is between on the one hand continuing with some form of selection by ability at 11 and, on the other hand, an opportunity to create something unique in Guernsey, with

3090

3070

3075

3080

3085

3095

3105

3100

3110

schools having proper autonomy, proper diversity, proper specialisation and proper pathways at a later stage of development.

That is what the former Education Board, that I was a member of, originally proposed in our Policy Letter in February or March of 2016. Of course, all of that got lost in the amendments and all of that got taken out by amendment. So, I do not accept that this is a binary issue. I think that way of looking at it has been imposed from other people and I do not want to pigeonhole myself in that regard.

But, of course, one has to still face the question that this amended Proposition is asking us to consider and that is it is about the reinstatement of selection at 11 that was removed in the March debate. So, I do not accept that this is entirely a binary choice.

I think we are fundamentally asking the wrong questions by focussing so heavily on structures. We do need to put this issue to bed one way or the other and then we need to get on with addressing the proper questions that this debate has flushed out, to some extent.

Perhaps not to a significant extent, but to some extent, particularly today, which is how do we raise the attainment and the standards of education across the board for all pupils? How do we properly and effectively delegate financial and other powers down to the head teachers? It was a great disappointment of mine that in the last four years the former Education Department did not get any further with the so-called local management of schools, or LMS agenda, because I think that is the way that you will derive and drive standards going higher in the future. As others have said, the head teachers in this Island are crying out for it and we need to deliver on that sooner rather than later.

But, constantly going on about structures gets in the way of all that. So, we really do need to put this to bed today and get on with that proper agenda of standards and of school autonomy.

I have never been terribly sure that the label that you attach to a secondary school is a terribly critical way of ensuring that you get the best outcomes. Whether you call a school a secondary modern or a grammar school or a comprehensive or an academy or a free school or public school, essentially what really make a school work are two things. It is about excellent leadership and it is about good quality teaching and learning. I would add a third. It is also about devolved financial management to the head teacher.

I think that is where our chief focus needs to be from now, going forward. It is also about a school, whatever its label, having the right ethos and the right tradition and the right atmosphere that facilitates good outcomes for all children, excellence and all children reaching their full potential. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

Once that decision is made this week, hopefully today, we must get back to focusing on those sorts of issues. About how we can maintain and, if possible, improve our standards across the board, because our economy needs it, our Island needs it and, bearing in mind the competitive nature of our world that we inhabit, we have to do that, there is no choice in the matter, we have to do that.

Deputy Trott, in what I thought was a good speech, on behalf of the pro-selection at 11 side of the argument, talked about risks and I think he said there were, in his view, five tests and he went through those. The first one was about risk and it was a clever point, undoubtedly and, I would say, probably up there with Deputy Graham and Deputy Ferbrache's speeches, in terms of being the strongest on that side of the debate.

What he did not say was, and I have only just thought of this myself, actually, is what is the risk in us not changing to a non-selective school? I pose the question rhetorically but there must be, equally, some risk in us not moving to a system which actually not only delivers excellence for the very best brains in our community, but also provides the very best stretching of everybody. That is the kind of thing that we need to be focusing on.

The end objective for any secondary education policy, in my view, should be to create an effective system of education that combines excellence in all schools with genuine opportunity for all students. A system that enables all individuals to reach their potential, that readies all students for the modern technology centric world and provides them with the core skills and resilience that

3165

3120

3125

3130

3135

3140

3145

3150

3155

3160

25.44

all our young people need to succeed in life, whatever they do. As I say, the system also needs to stretch and challenge the very best minds.

So, the question is, what is the best structure to best achieve and to underpin those aims?

Now, I want to give some credit to the members of the Education, Sport & Culture Committee, because they have come under a lot of criticism. They have a very difficult job to do, sir, and I think it is probably fair to say that being on Education is something of a poisoned chalice in our community. I think, bearing in mind how difficult their job is and bearing in mind the heavy criticism that they have faced in recent months, I think they deserve some credit for the way in which they have approached this debate. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

I do not think anyone can doubt that they are honestly doing their best in very difficult circumstances. I do not think anybody should disabuse that notion.

Deputy Lester Queripel, it is a long time ago now, he made a very valid point, which was that nobody was saying anything new in this debate and I agree with that I would also say I do not think there is any great development of the evidence base that Members have before them since the debate in March, either.

There are no new arguments that are circulating and there is no new evidence, really, on where we were in March, when the decision was taken.

One can get awfully legalistic about these things but, if one was going to consider where the burden of proof lies in a debate like this, it is probably with those who are seeking to reinstate selection at 11, rather than those who are advocating for the March Resolution to continue.

Sorry, sir, the trouble with speaking so late is there are so many issues to cover, but I will try and be as brief as I can.

I think, in the end, the real case for reinstating selection at 11 really comes down to the desire to stick with better the devil you know, I think was the phrase that Deputy Le Tocq used. Better the devil you know than the devil you do not and a certain fear of worse outcomes; fear of the unknown.

That, as others have said about the psychological nature of that, is an interesting thing to see. Nobody can guarantee anything in life, really, apart from death and taxes. Not many people can guarantee that the alternative system would be any better or worse. We are not in a position to guarantee either.

But I often think in terms of would we design the secondary education system that we currently have if we had a blank sheet of paper, if we were starting from scratch, knowing what we know about the way that children develop? Others have talked about growth mindset. Knowing what we know about the global economy. Knowing what we know about Guernsey's economy. Knowing what we know about how the economy of the future is really going to have to rely on extracting potential out of every individual. Human capital.

That is the question. Would we design this system if we had a blank sheet of paper? I am not sure we would.

Now, a lot has been said about social mobility and I do not really want to go over the points there. I think Deputy Ferbrache was probably the most persuasive on that and I think, as others have said, Deputy Fallaize, I think, said this, one of the most respectable arguments for maintaining the Grammar School is the social mobility argument.

I am not convinced that there is a lot of causation between having the system that we have and social mobility, certainly in the past. The argument is that social mobility has gone downhill, but at some point in the past there was a connection. Certainly, the commentators and the people who know about these things in terms of the UK experience point to the fact that, in the 1950's and 1960's there was some level of correlation between having a selective system of education and greater social mobility, but I think it is only that, it is a correlation. I do not think it is causation, because if you look at the way the UK's economy responded after the Second World War, it was to do with an expansion of their economy. It was to do with many more managerial and other kind of professional jobs opening up that that actually delivered social mobility.

3190

3170

3175

3180

3185

3195

3200

3205

3210

To bring it home back to Guernsey, I often think, I have thought this for many years, one of the best vehicles for social mobility in Guernsey, ever, has been the finance industry. Not the selective system of education. The fact we have full employment and the finance industry is a large part of that, I think about that when I hear people decrying and criticising the finance industry that we have. I think it has been a massive motor for social mobility over many years. (**Several Members:**Hear, hear.)

So, I do not think we should get too caught up in focusing on the perception of how the UK comprehensive system developed. There were massive errors that were made when it was first implement. Some very significant issues and the transitional issues were enormous but, actually, there are some very good academies in England and Wales. There are some awful ones. You cannot just assume that something is poor on the basis of generalisation and there are other examples around the world that you can look at.

A few other people have talked about the education report that my former Education Board colleague, Denis Mulkerrin CBE, wrote in 2011 and I just want to quote from that, because his report was a heavy influence on the previous Education Department Board and our policies, particularly in relation to granting schools more autonomy, but also the essentials of what makes schools work. He did have one paragraph, or one section of that report, addressing the issues of comprehensive schools and I was intrigued to see what he had written on that, because he is not somebody that you would easily say is of the left, quite the opposite.

I will just quote a bit of what he said in that report, under the heading Comprehensive Schools, this is Denis Mulkerrin in 2011:

The absence of a comprehensive school system is very much the elephant in the room regarding Guernsey education. In the UK, over 90% of secondary schools are comprehensives. There are only 164 grammar schools remaining and most of these are in Kent, which has long been a Conservative-controlled local authority.

It would be wrong to imply, however, that comprehensives are simply a left versus right political issue. More comprehensive schools were established under Margaret Thatcher than any other education secretary before or since. 'Given that there are no comprehensive schools in Guernsey, factual information about them is variable in the Island. Those teachers in the secondary sector who are, in the main, positive about comprehensive schools, are the ones who have had recent experience of teaching in them in the UK.

'Outside this group, virtually everyone who has spoken with me had perceptions which tend to be coloured by the well-publicised early problems of comprehensives. This is understandable.'

Just one further bit:

'Much of the reorganisation in the 1960's and 1970's was done too quickly. Planners failed to understand the problems of combining grammar and secondary moderns together. In the main the pupils were fine. It was combining staff from the schools together that created the real problems.'

He concludes that particular section of his report and he did not make any recommendations in relation to this area on comprehensive schools, but this is what he concluded in that section:

'Despite the States' decision made 10 years ago, to retain selection, in my opinion comprehensives could work in Guernsey. However, they would need outstanding leadership and the overall gains could take a long time to be realised. I have received three very strong letters advocating comprehensive schools. However, among all of the people who have seen me, I have not encountered any great demand to change to a comprehensive system. Certainly, the recent results in some of the high schools have not helped.'

That is how he concluded that section. I think that is a very balanced way of looking at the matter.

But we are not being asked, I do not think, to vote today on moving to an undifferentiated uniform system of comprehensive schools from the 1970's. I think we can do much better than that. We are being asked to reinstate selection by ability at 11. That is the key question and that is the question that I am giving most thought to.

Now, I thought Deputy Graham made an excellent speech yesterday. I did not agree with much of it. Or any of it. (*Laughter*) But, nonetheless, it was a fine speech and he made some very good points, I think, about Finland. He also made some very good points about the need for greater

3250

3245

3230

3235

autonomy. He sought to distinguish Finland from the Guernsey situation and I think he did that quite well, in the sense that an awful lot more resources go into schools in Finland, a very different high-tax society. Those schools have much greater autonomy, compulsory school starts at seven in Finland. He made a good case of distinguishing Finland from the Guernsey system.

I think some people in this debate and outside this debate, you can over-do the application of something like that to the Guernsey context, but on the other hand I do not think we can disregard that model entirely because, as Deputy Graham very rightly said, it is a non-selective system that is, if not quite at the top, it is pretty high up the Premier League, as it were. You cannot really dismiss that entirely.

Now, I think Deputy Smithies possibly confused selecting for specific talents with selecting for general academic ability. I think we all understand why some people get to play in the Guernsey football team and other people do not. It is because of a specific talent and, in a way, it is quite right that we select for specific talents. But the 11-plus does not seek to select specific talents, the notion of it is that it is trying to select general, academic potential at a certain age and there is a world of difference, I think, between selecting for a specific talent or ability and selecting in the generality of things.

The reality is that life is not always like that. Many people are good at some things and not so good at other things.

I think Deputy Smithies also talked about equality of outcome. I certainly hope that Members are not seeking to change the system of secondary education on the basis of equality of outcomes, sir. I do not think anybody should support the equality of outcome.

Some speakers have touched upon the fact that the grant-aided colleges are the only examples of all-ability schools in this Island. I do not really buy that, actually. I am not sure on the exact figures, but I am not sure there are so many people in the grant-aided colleges at the very lowest band of ability. So, I do not think, really, you can make that point.

Well, the point is made, clearly, but I think you can over-do it.

I think the issue of choice has probably been done to death, as well. I probably will not say too much about that, apart from the fact that I think we need to make sure that choice in our system is more meaningful than it is at the moment.

A parent will only have choice for their child if that child gets a sufficient mark in the exam. So, it is a qualified choice in any event. I think we can do much better than that, by giving meaningful choices to parents and to students at all stages of secondary education. I think that is where school specialisms will actually get you more choice in the final analysis.

I also think that, generally, we need to look at catchment area policy again. When Deputy Le Pelley sums up, I would like him to, perhaps, offer a few thoughts on where his Committee are with regards to catchment area policy. There is no area that catchment area policy is a very inflexible policy. I know there are reasons for it. I never really accepted those reasons when I was on the Board in the previous term, but I know there are reasons for it. I think it would be helpful if I got a sense from the Committee that they are trying to tease out why, exactly, the catchment areas need to stay in place.

If you are not going to actually do away with catchment areas entirely, which is an option, then you could have a much more flexible policy, a much more liberal policy, which could give parents and children more choice.

So, I think in the end it comes down to judgement. A few other speakers have talked about the fact that we are here as representatives and not as delegates. We are not delegates. Edmund Burke very famously said:

'Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgement, and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it for your opinion.'

That is why it is about the judgement. Very often, people will say, 'Listen to the people.' Well, the problem is, the people do not always agree on things like secondary education and which section of the community are you supposed to listen to, anyway?

3275

3270

3255

3260

3265

3280

3285

3290

3295

STATES OF DELIBERATION, THURSDAY, 1st DECEMBER 2016

The majority of parents? The majority of teachers? The majority of the general public? The majority of students? Or just those who completed the consultation questionnaire? Does that mean that the views of the minority are irrelevant or wrong? Brexit reminds me of that. Some 48% people voted to remain in the European Union, does that mean that politicians in the UK do not have to represent the minority? Clearly not.

So, that must apply in Guernsey as well, whoever is in the minority on this particular issue. I do not think I know who is in the minority.

Unless we have a binding referendum on the subject, we will never really know what the numbers are in any objective, unchallengeable, unambiguous sense. So, in the end, it is about judgement, having looked at the evidence, having weighed in the balance of one's convictions, having listened to the contrasting views of the professions and members of the general public.

After all of that, I think, in a nutshell, selection by ability at 11 is too crude, too final and too determinative of a child's ability at too young an age. That is not to say I am against selection generally, because I am not, but I cannot support selection at 11, just as I cannot support a uniform or un-variegated style of comprehensive education.

In those circumstances, I will have to vote Contre.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld. Sorry, Deputy Lowe.

3320

3325

3330

3305

3310

3315

Deputy Lowe: Before we move on, could I just ask HM Comptroller, because my understanding from the explanation this morning was that the amendment does allow for a variation of some form of selection. Could HM Comptroller clarify that, for me, please?

The Comptroller: A second opinion? (*Laughter*)

Deputy Lowe: Second opinion.

The Bailiff: If I recall correctly, I think what the Madam Procureur said this morning is that there are the three sections to the amended Proposition. The third one does mention variation, but she said it would be predicated upon the second element of it, which is that selection at 11 would be reinstated.

I think, my recollection is that is what she said. I do not know if that assists your Mr Comptroller?

3335

3340

3345

The Comptroller: I did not hear ...

The Bailiff: She drew attention to the two semi-colons that appeared and then a full stop at the end. She actually said three semi-colons. I think it is two semi-colons and a full stop.

She said the amended Proposition is actually in three parts. The first part, before the first semi-colon is to rescind the existing Resolution. The second part, I do not have it in front, between the first and second semi-colon, deals with the reintroduction of selection at 11 and the third part then goes on to talk about the education estate and proposals for variations to previous States' Resolutions, which, yes, does mention the word variations, but she said that would be predicated upon the second element of the Propositions, which is the reintroduction of selection at 11.

The Comptroller: In that the final sentence refers to delivery of selective admission means 11-plus?

3350

The Bailiff: I think what she was saying it does not mean that you could scrap selection at 11 and have selection at 14, but you could have some variation. Although there would be selection at 11, there could be some variation of it, which might include some selection later or some variation of the selection at 11.

I think that is what she is saying, but you have been asked for your opinion, so perhaps you wish to think about that? (*Laughter*) Do you wish to think and give that some thought? You have not had the benefit of listening to two hours of debate. Two days, sorry. It feels like two hours!

The Comptroller: I would certainly prefer to give it some thought and come back.

The Bailiff: I do not think it will be today, now. Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Sir, like Deputy Tooley, I have saved my maiden speech for this debate, because I believe this issue is so important to the future of our society and economy.

Virtually every speaker in favour of selection at 11 has expressed a desire to preserve the Grammar School, while admitting that the current 11-plus is not fit for purpose and needs changing. I agree with the desire to preserve an academic fast-track to stretch our more academically capable young learners. However, I cannot support the current, unjust and ineffective 11-plus system that tries to identify 25% of our young learners to participate in this academic fast-track at the age of 10 or 11, specifically excluding the other 75% of young learners until they are 16 years old.

There are two fundamental issues with selection at 11. There is no scientific evidence supporting any test that accurately predicts future academic or vocational performance at 10 or 11 years of age and that selection is divisive and damaging.

The 11-plus causes huge amounts of stress for many of our young people and their parents and feelings of failure and inadequacy for those who are part of the 75% of students who are deemed to have failed the test. The 11-plus sees the heartache of close friends being separating and some perceiving they have failed and others going on to what has been portrayed to you and them as a centre of academic excellence.

The fact is that the 11-plus does cause emotional damage. Damage to self-perception and self-worth and massive impact on future lives.

Deputy Lowe said that she was doubtful that children were damaged or traumatised, but I can tell you from my personal experience that they are, because I am one of them. I failed the 11-plus test and was placed in the D stream at St Sampson's High School, effectively a special educational needs group. I was excluded from studying geography, history and French as I was deemed incapable of succeeding in those subjects. Instead I was sent out with my classmates to weed the gardens of the school on the pretext of horticultural studies.

When I eventually came into my own and started advancing in maths and sciences, I was told I was the first person in the history of the school to go from the D stream to the sixth form. To this day, I still feel distressed when filling out official forms, as they remind me of my test ordeals and, for many years, I suffered feelings of insecurity, due to my perceived failing. I stand before you today, not because of my education but in spite of it.

So, I can assure you that young people are being damaged by the 11-plus process, as many have already stated publicly. Deputy Soulsby raised the issue of mental health. I would so protest that removing selection at such a young age will be a great first step. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

Virtually every Deputy who has spoken in favour of selection has stated that the current 11-plus is not fit for purpose and they would like to see a revised, improved test identified and implemented.

From the earliest days of the formation of this Committee, we have been reviewing alternative forms of selection and I can tell you we have not been able to identify one superior to what we have now.

Deputy Paint referred to the search for the Holy Grail. However, I believe it is more akin to the search for the Tooth Fairy. I would challenge Deputy Le Pelley, in his closing, to tell us what form of selection is better than what we have now, which is arguably the least gainable through private coaching.

3370

3375

3355

3360

3365

3380

3385

3390

3400

3405

Deputy Inder made comments about the perceived hypocrisy of some Deputies supporting non-selection, whilst sending their own children to the independent colleges. I pay for two of my sons to attend to a college, in no small part due to the fact that it is a mixed-ability school and they will not have to face the issues at 11-plus that I did. I support a non-selective system, because I want all schools in Guernsey to provide a quality mixed ability education for all.

3410

Deputy Lowe and Deputy Tooley referred to the constant selection within our education system and life in general. Deputy Lowe used the example of being selected for drama or sports, or other team activities. But, in drama and sports, you can work hard and train and have another go. Try and make the team next year. You cannot do that with the 11-plus.

3415

Like Deputy Roffey, I want more selection, better selection. Selection will continue in our schools if you vote Contre today.

Sir, I ask all Deputies not to vote for one test at age 10 or 11, the results of which influence the rest of a young person's life. Many have commented on the quality of our teaching profession. Deputy Ferbrache said that one of his teachers was one of the greatest influences in this life

3420

I am sure it is true of many people. Outside of our parents, teachers have probably the greatest influence on all aspects of our development and our ultimate life choices. As parents and as a society, we entrust our greatest asset, our children to their pastoral care and tutorage. Yet some Deputies would have us ignore their voice when they are telling us there is a better way to educate our children and that the current system actually damages many of them.

3425

Most of the comments I have heard in favour of preserving selection have actually been about saving the Grammar School, based on nostalgic memories of a much-loved institution and, while I sympathise with them, I am certain that we can develop a non-selective system where the ethos of academic focus of the Grammar School is preserved, but access is broadened to all students, rather than less than 25% selected and separated at age 11.

3430

We can take the best of all schools and combine them into high quality, high-performing, non-selective schools. There have been many comments about the woes of the English comprehensive system. Let me assure everyone that I would not vote for a 1970's style comprehensive system.

The non-selective system we will develop will be unique to Guernsey, drawing on the best practices from around the world to produce the best possible outcomes for each and every young person.

3435

Deputies Brouard and Trott seem particularly concerned about the risk of change, but as Deputy Green mentioned, there is greater risk of standing still, of not changing.

In our modern, knowledge-based, fast-paced economy, we need to ensure that all of our young people achieve their best possible outcomes so that skills are available to our business and our economy. Not doing so reduces productivity and makes us less competitive than other jurisdictions.

3440

By perpetuating a system that undermines social mobility, a system designed for the post-war era, we are missing an opportunity to make sure that all members of our community are economically active

3445

We want an education system that engages with all members of our society and encourages them to become economic contributors. That breaks down social barriers and increases inclusivity for the good of our Bailiwick. We do not want, nor can we afford to have any of our community written off.

I implore this Assembly to seize this opportunity to allow our Committee to explore the beneficial changes to our education system, whereby it would evolve into an exceptional, world-class offering that is truly the envy of other jurisdictions.

3450

I realise that significant change brings many challenges, but we are up for these challenges. Our workforce is up for these challenges. Trust them. Trust us. Trust your educators to do this knowing that this Committee and this Assembly will be involved in the process and will drive and support them all the way.

3455

We can, we should, we must and we will, with your support, make this happen.

Consequently, please vote Contre to this Proposition. (Applause)

The Bailiff: I remind Members that is a maiden speech. Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: It is hard to follow such a strong, focused maiden speech from somebody who has shown significant leadership qualities and is a high achiever, even if they did not pass the 11-plus.

I feel a bit like one of Deputy Hansmann Rouxel's wimps, in that I have been perhaps one of the relatively few Members here who have been moving around the floor a bit, because I think this is a complicated issue. I think we do need to move the story on and there are number of points that I would cover, firstly coming to this afternoon.

It is perhaps hard for some Deputies like myself to be more in listening mode than in talking mode, to quote something else Deputy Hansmann Rouxel said.

I appreciate a lot of what Deputy Soulsby said, but of course I think she cited the example of there being a relatively small proportion of people from state schools in Guernsey going off to Oxbridge, although we certainly have at least one Deputy who has been to Oxford or Cambridge. Of course, that forgets the point that, actually, Cambridge University, although there is a society in Guernsey for it, has been, I think, perhaps, the only university that is currently charging complete overseas international fees, therefore there is a prejudice in favour of people from, perhaps, the private colleges who might have additional family resources. I would point that out and I would also point out that, the point Deputy Soulsby made about comprehensives being more effective when there are over 1,000 pupils –

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: I thank Deputy Gollop for giving way.

He is right about Cambridge offering considerably higher fees, but I think that is relatively recent and, historically, very few children from state schools get to Oxbridge and other top Russell Group universities.

Deputy Gollop: Also, the point being that comprehensives are sometimes at their most effective when they are larger. The argument being mixed ability schools work better on a larger scale. That is an interesting point because it contradicts, of course, a lot of what we have been hearing earlier that the colleges do so well because, of course, Elizabeth College and Ladies' College, let alone Blanchelande, are extremely small schools in relative comparison, but the mixed ability construction there, I think it works.

What I would say, I think, generally, will not be necessarily supportive of either side, although I would very much align myself to some of the comments that have been made, particularly this afternoon, from Deputy Green and Deputy Parkinson, for reasons I will come onto in a minute.

I agree with Deputy Le Tocq, I remember very well the late and great Deputy Dave Jones saying we could do with two grammar schools. That, actually, would by my optimum solution. Of course, the reason why it might work is that it would be more parallel to the German model that Deputy Graham referred to and, of course, it would overcome many of the borderline issues that currently exist, that Deputy de Sausmarez and many others raised. It would also, realistically be more in touch with the knowledge economy and the society and the evolving middle class than the current system which, clearly, is too small a proportion of people who can maximise their potential.

The problem, of course, would be with a two-thirds/one-third split is that it would be even more socially divisive and there would still be a borderline, although I think it might be more obvious where the borders would be. It would create a new problem, the worst-case scenario would be not only further discrimination for those who have educationally learning needs, but a sink school. In a way, it is an idea that, had it been viable, should have been introduced earlier rather than now.

3480

3460

3465

3470

3475

3485

3495

3490

3505

It is, of course, as Deputy Le Tocq rightly said, you can be talented at photography and music, we see especially from the Grammar School, and academic subjects.

What we need to do too, is there have been a lot of challenges made to Members who wish to retain selection about what their vision of the future is, but of course it cuts both ways and we need a much clearer picture of what non-selection will look like.

The ideas that Deputy Green and Deputy Parkinson have outlined, for example, are somewhat different than what we have heard hitherto. Deputy Meerveld has also constructed an impressive vision in a document that he has had support in conversations that the has had, but again that is different to the model the old Education Board presented us with in February and March.

What nobody has talked about today, and I hope to cover mostly new points, is what happened to the federation. Not what became of the broken-hearted, but what became of the federation? Where is it in the scheme of things at the moment?

Talking of songs, to get onto my themes, we heard about the Rolling Stones, *Ruby Tuesday* and so on and Deputy Ferbrache quoting Mick Jagger from Dartford or whatever. I kind of felt like *I Can't Get No Satisfaction* from this debate! (*Laughter*)

Deputy Ferbrache made many key points, of course, and discussed the survey results. Strangely enough, the survey results do seem to suggest that there were a higher proportion of teachers supporting selection than you might have believed from the email traffic or from different levels. Then again, they may have been skewed by those who took part in the results. I think, too, the issue of league table schools has been raised, but I quite like the league tables. I know some Members have not liked that element.

Deputy Ferbrache mentioned the issues of how he appreciated Amherst School and how much social mobility there may have been during his childhood, of a significant cohort of pupils going to either the colleges or the grammar schools. I would argue that may have changed due to a combination of geographical dispersion across the Island, social problems, and, let us face it, an expansion of the middle class. I think that has been one factor that has changed the context of the 11-plus and the grammarian system.

He would, rightly, seek a second or third professional medical or legal opinion in certain circumstances, but I think we have had a very large number of opinions of educationalists and most of them, not all of them, point in one respect.

Deputy Inder mentioned polling and how opinion polls should work. Well, I would like to do a Gallup poll, but it was certainly true that although Deputy Ferbrache rightly supported the homeowners, the 2,400 or so people who own homes who filled in the form, the fact that only 80 people in social housing filled it in is disproportionately small. Hopefully a Gallup poll, not that I would have done it myself, would have tried to have done a percentage of each part of the Island.

Deputy Stephens had a vision and I entirely endorsed, really, the thrust of her points, because I think a crucial issue I would have liked to have done more research on – we did not have enough time, to be honest – is to look at the per capital spend over a decade or two on college pupils, including fees, on Grammar School scholars and on high school, secondary school students and I would suspect that it would show disparities. In fact, I know it did in the 1960's. If you sit in the Members' room and go through the Billets then, it makes very interesting reading.

Deputy Lowe was absolutely right that it was a major doorstep issue and the people, clearly, both in 2001 and 2015, that most Members spoke to, were more likely to go with the status quo, but I will come onto that in a minute. She also mentioned the amendment, which we have just asked HM Comptroller to have a look at again. I think she made an extremely useful point, here, and it has to be said that the amendment is very awkwardly phrased, because it mentions the key point is to agree that all-ability state secondary schools should not be introduced. So, it is saying no to all-ability schools. Actually, of course, although they are not exactly state schools, two of them have States political involvement, Elizabeth College and Ladies' College, I believe one of the sites is owned by the States of Guernsey as well. They are mixed ability. They are, in a way, all-ability schools.

3530

3525

3510

3515

3520

3535

3540

3545

3550

3560

Let me come on to selection by ability. What sort of ability? Woodworking ability, music ability, sporting ability? I do not know. It does not say. Then, at 11 years, 10, 11, 12, some continue to determine. Then of course it goes into the clause about variations. Would that include a 13-plus system? Would it not? We are not really sure.

3565

One reason why I have been wobbling from one side to the other, and it is not entirely linked to the number of coffees I have been drinking with each side, or whatever, is actually I do not support either side and have not for a long while. I think that the arguments, the real issues have not been brought out about raising standards, about maximising potential, about significant investment, about the pupil/teacher ratio, about specialisms, about the style and culture of schools.

3570

What we have are two very solidly entrenched camps who will make points and I am heartened to hear that if it wins, there will not be a UK-style comprehensive school from the 1970's or whatever imposed here. But, we have not had a discussion, as Deputy Parkinson said, on academies, free schools, technical colleges, specialist schools. There are, indeed, grammar schools in various places that call themselves grammar schools, but are not, or they have a proportion of students. Harrogate Grammar School, 83% pass rate, Ramsey Grammar School on the Isle of Man, Watford Boys', Watford Girls' Grammar School.

3575

One area where I would slightly disagree with Deputy Graham on is that he suggested there is a monoculture in the UK when in fact successive political regimes and initiatives by parents and head teachers and other parties has led to a diversity, a patchwork. We have not got any of that here. We have not got secondary faith schools, either. One of the reasons why I have difficulty thoroughly endorsing either camp is, not only are the Propositions flawed, but I think even the strongest adherents of the change today, or rather the reinforcement of non-selection, many of them would agree too, that education has had a difficult path over the last 15 years. It has at times been politically dysfunctional.

3585

3580

We only have to think back to the Torode amendment, the extra expense that that caused, how the La Mare de Carteret still has not been implemented, of the politicking that has gone on, of the wrong prioritisation list of the new build, of the individual difficult case histories that we have come across, of the fact that, according to one source at least, there could be 120 places per cohort year in the Grammar School, but only 80 are filled. All kinds of issues that make one worried.

3590

I must admit, I have heard some very persuasive speeches: Deputy Graham, Deputy Dudley-Owen, Deputy de Lisle and also from Deputy Yerby, Deputy Roffey and Deputy Brehaut. Deputy Brehaut made a particularly interesting point about special needs and the need for ending that kind of discrimination, for greater integration. Now, St Sampson's was a classic iconic example where two schools mix on the same campus, but the integration has not gone as well as it could and I think, again, that represents a critique of the Education Department.

3595

3600

Somebody said, it might have been Deputy Brouard, why does not Scrutiny look at dysfunctional behaviour and teenage exclusion. We did that. Deputy Brehaut's Committee spent a year or two on it. We even went over to Alderney. The work was done and, perhaps, that was at the nadir of the Education Department's fortunes, because many Members have made the point that our standards are as good, if not slightly better than the UK average, better than Jersey, better than the Isle of Man, maybe. The trouble is that might be true in 2016, because of the resources and the work that has been done by the last Education Department board, but it was not during 2009, 2010, 2011. We were below any Kent school, regardless of ability, for at least two of our schools. We had problems and we have to bear that in mind.

3605

The Education evidence is interesting, because I must admit I became pretty drawn to the let us keep the Grammar School camp when I read some of this material. You look at page 1669, 1670 to the evidence, this is not my evidence, nor is it a report from the Daily Telegraph or somewhere, it is from the Institute of Education, UCL, Bedford Way, report for the Guernsey Education Department Committee and included in two Billets.

3610

It says on the top of page 1669:

STATES OF DELIBERATION, THURSDAY, 1st DECEMBER 2016

'There is strong evidence that pupils attending a selective school tend to achieve better academic outcomes than pupils of similar background and prior attainment who attend secondary modern or comprehensive schools. However, there is also strong evidence that selective schools in England and Northern Ireland have far fewer than the average proportion of poor pupils in the local neighbourhood.'

Now, in a way, that is making the point that there is a trade-off and, for me, the problem is I agree, actually, Deputy Ferbrache praised Jeremy Corbyn in a way – no, it was not, it was Deputy Graham, who said at least he was not allegedly hypocritical like some of his colleagues. But Jeremy Corbyn, in his latest campaign against the hypothetical reinstatement of grammar schools by the Prime Minister, has kind of said they may work for some but they are unfair on the majority.

The message we used to get from Education, here, was that the change would be good for everybody. I am not sure that is the case. There are, maybe, as we see in other policies we could think of, taxation being one, welfare reform being another, winners and losers.

I think there is a danger of there being a certain loss of maximum ability, points and credits and examinations passed at the highest levels, from the highest achievers. But there is also a social gain and an equality, egalitarian gain.

In the past, I have been full square behind the Grammar School. Stood on elections on retention and I certainly want the Grammar School to continue in one way or another beyond the ethic. But I also have to contain my long-working with egalitarian, equality issues, disability issues. That has to be important and this new States is clearly much more progressive than its predecessors.

Just to go on a slight digression, but it is interesting. It is not rocket science, it follows on some of the work Deputy Graham did and I will probably get into trouble for it as well. I am guessing here that, of the 40 Members, 16 or 17 are of a certain age, somewhere around the big six-O. Somewhere. By my best guess, and I could be completely wrong, four Members wish to see the end of selection and 13 want selection to remain out of 17.

We then come onto, perhaps, another interesting area, the gender gap. Again, I should not make assumptions, but of the 12 women Members, eight of them want a change away from the current system of education and four of them want the system to stay as it is. As I think.

Then we look at what I would call the new Members. By that, I would mean the Members who were selected in the last year to become new Members of this Assembly and Members who have returned to the Chamber after a break. Approximately nine of those Members, this is the result of the election that we have the mandate on, want the Grammar School system to stay and 12 want it to go. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

One final point, would be in terms of veteran politicians who have served more than two terms in this Assembly, those who want the Grammar School to stay are about nine Members and those who want change are five.

Clearly, we have a generational divide. Maybe, you get wiser as you get older. I do not know. The family motto is to be bold and be wise.

I would say the key issues are pupil/teacher ratio, funding per capita, integration curriculum and special educational needs. We have heard a lot about Finland, which makes me think of Christmas and Lapland and reindeer and everything else, but I do not know if people wanted to make the point that Finland happens to have a 20% corporate tax rate and a 47% income tax rate and a lovely 24% GST. And has smaller classroom sizes.

So, what is the deciding factor for me, because I certainly can look at flawed rhetoric and gaps in the arguments we have heard from, really, the spectrum and I think that we have a lot of unanswered questions and problems to resolve. I am disappointed that the issue of not building La Mare de Carteret has been hinted at and I think we do need, even if it is more costly in the short-term, to go for the model that causes the least disruption and the most potential diversity of choice.

Of course, that is a flip-flop in a way, though, is it not? I am flip-flopping whichever way I go on this, because the States have gone one way and then so on.

3620

3615

3630

3625

3635

3640

3645

3650

3660

3665

What is the best argument I have heard? I would say it is something that Deputy Roffey said yesterday, because the problem we have is an alienation with the educational system from the majority of the professionals directly employed in education. If you combine that with the generational political change we are witnessing and the certainty that this will come back again and again, maybe in this term, maybe in 2020, the difficulty in looking to the future with a knowledge-based economy and the fact that this issue, despite the public's general satisfaction with the status quo, has created a sense of demoralisation and perhaps loss of career potential. As Deputy Hansmann Rouxel said, look after our teachers.

3670

If we are going to attract and retain the best teachers for the future and if the majority feel uncomfortable with our system and it creates a cannot-do culture within education, where people are reluctant, perhaps, to carry out the innovation Deputy Graham would go, then I think we have got to think seriously about how to mend that political break.

3675

Although I personally would much prefer a solution which evolved out of the current system and included within it the wide diversity of schools you are seeing in many European countries and parts of England and Wales, I would nevertheless believe that, on this occasion, I will vote Contre to the amendment and vote for change. (Applause)

The Bailiff: Is there anyone who has not spoken who wishes to make a short speech before we rise?

No? In that case, we will ... sorry, Deputy Le Tocq.

3680

Deputy Le Tocq: I think we should finish tonight, sir. We have been going long enough ...

3685

The Bailiff: We will have to take an adjournment because I know HM Comptroller has been asked for some advice. He wishes to consult HM Procureur. She is not here this afternoon, because she has been attend on some States' business, an IMF or Moneyval meeting, so she is not available.

I do not know whether the President would wish to speak, or whether he is entitled to request the adjournment that he is entitled to have.

3690

Deputy Le Pelley: I should certainly like to have an adjournment. I have got, now, 90something pages of notes. Sorry, I have been taking notes while you lot have been talking! (Laughter)

With respect, sir, through you, if they had not have talked so much, I would not have written so

3695

I do have quite a lot of stuff to go through. It could very well take me two hours to actually present and respond to everybody that has said things, plus my own notes, plus things that have been coming in in email form.

Should I be given the chance to do that overnight, I am sure I can reduce it quite considerably.

3700

The Bailiff: What the Rules require is that the matter will be adjourned as close as maybe to 5.30 p.m., provided that I may propose at any time that the Meeting continues outside those times or is adjourned to another day.

It seems to me there is no point putting it to the Meeting, because it is only fair that the President be given time to prepare his reply to what has been a long debate. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

3705

HM Comptroller has been asked for some advice. It is a complex Proposition that is now before the States, the way it has been worded. It is right that Members should know it is they are voting on. HM Procureur said this morning it is a matter of interpretation, so there is some flexibility there. Nevertheless, if people are not certain what it is that the Proposition means, it is right that they be given clear advice on that.

STATES OF DELIBERATION, THURSDAY, 1st DECEMBER 2016

It is all going to take time. I can see people are tired. They have not been listening thoroughly this afternoon. I have noticed the amount of distraction that there has been.

It seems to me that it is only right and fair to the President that he has overnight and people come back fresh in the morning, ready to listen to him and then there will be a vote at the conclusion of that.

We will rise, come back at 9.30 a.m.

3715

The Assembly adjourned at 5.30 p.m.