



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 17th January 2018

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

Volume 7, No. 1

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. 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,
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

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

Ms C Foster (H.M. Deputy Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller); Deputy E. A. Yerby (*relevée à 10h 46*), Alderney
Representative S. D. G. McKinley, O. B. E. (*relevé à 11h 38*)

Business transacted

Evocation	5
Convocation	5
Statements	5
General Update – Statement by the President of the Committee <i>for</i> Employment & Social Security	5
Questions for Oral Answer	11
Bus service – New timetable and December night bus trial	11
Billets d’État II and IV	15
I. Election of two Members of the Committee <i>for</i> Economic Development – Debate commenced	15
Billet d’État II	18
Ordinances laid before the States	18
The Document Duty (Guernsey) Law, 2017 (Commencement and Amendment) Ordinance, 2017; The Document Duty (Rates) Ordinance, 2017; The Document Duty (Anti-Avoidance) Law, 2017 (Commencement and Amendment) Ordinance, 2017; The Document Duty (Anti-Avoidance) (Rates) Ordinance, 2017	18
Statutory Instruments laid before the States	18
Animal Welfare (Amendment) (No.2) Order, 2017; Animal Welfare (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations, 2017; The Fire Services (Fees and Charges) (Guernsey) Regulations, 2016; The Income Tax (Pensions) (Contribution Limits and Tax-Free Lump Sums) (Amendments) Regulations, 2017	18
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 10.59 a.m. and resumed its sitting at 11.08 a.m.</i>	19
Billet d’État II and IV	19
I. Election of two Members of the Committee <i>for</i> Economic Development – Debate continued – Deputies de Lisle and Tindall elected	19
Billet d’État II	20
II. Election of a Member of the Committee <i>for</i> Education, Sport & Culture – Deputy Lester Queripel elected	20
Billet d’État III	21
I. Election of a Member of the Committee <i>for</i> Health & Social Care – Deputy Tindall elected	21
Billet d’État II	22
III. The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick – Debate commenced	22
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.07 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2 p.m.</i>	37
The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick – Debate continued	37
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.33 p.m.</i>	79

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 10.12 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

CONVOCATION

The Deputy Greffier: Billets d'État II, III and IV. To the Members of the States of the Island of Guernsey I hereby give notice that a meeting of the States of Deliberation will be held at The Royal Court House on Wednesday 17th January 2018 immediately after the meeting of the States of Election convened for 9.30 a.m. to consider the items listed in these Billets d'État, which have
5 been submitted for debate.

STATEMENTS

General Update –

Statement by the President of the Committee for Employment & Social Security

The Bailiff: We begin this morning with a general update Statement from the President of the Committee for Employment & Social Security, Deputy le Clerc.

Deputy Le Clerc: Thank you, sir.

10 Sir, I would like to use this speech as an opportunity to provide an update on some of the Committee for Employment & Social Security's responsibilities and work streams that we have undertaken over the past year. I will focus particularly on work streams that have progressed significantly since my most recent update to the States. I will not cover Longer Working Lives as you already have our policy document. One of the main updates that Members may be keen to
15 hear about is how we are progressing with the Disability and Inclusion Strategy.

On the disability discrimination legislation work stream, it became clear that there was a need to inject more pace and the only way we would be able to do that was to find a subject matter expert who could help the Committee select legislation from another jurisdiction on which to model our own disability discrimination legislation. We have met with representatives of the Policy
20 & Resources Committee to discuss the extra funding needed to recruit this expert, and we are in the process of finalising a business case for P&R's consideration.

Following a competitive procurement process, we are now very close to appointing a leading academic in the field to undertake this work during the first quarter of 2018. I am personally really excited about the calibre of candidates that we have attracted to apply for this position.

25 The Committee's work towards developing an Equality and Rights Organisation (ERO) that would be suited to Guernsey's needs is also moving forward at a good pace. Some initial meetings with stakeholders have taken place on aspects of the work stream, including some

project team meetings. In December, we hosted a workshop to engage stakeholders and begin mapping out the principles of the ERO. It will be a statutory body, designed to foster fairness and inclusion for all Islanders. Our work on this project includes close consultation with members of the Equality Working Group, which also includes a wide range of stakeholders.

Earlier this month, another workshop took place on raising awareness of disability matters, and this also involved a range of stakeholders. During the last quarter of 2017 Dementia Friendly Guernsey ran a campaign to raise awareness of dementia and over 1,200 new dementia friends have signed up following awareness training sessions. Autism awareness training has also been arranged for frontline staff at Wheadon House, and there have been many other activities to provide information and raise awareness of disability issues in recent months. Many more are planned for 2018.

Further discussions on progress with the Disability and Inclusion Strategy will be held at the Scrutiny Management Committee's public hearing on 31st January. We are keen to engage with this hearing, and to address any concerns.

The next topic I would like to update on is progress with Secondary Pensions. Since April last year, actuarial consultants BWCI have been working on the scheme projections and an economic impact assessment for the forthcoming new Secondary Pension Scheme. This is a very important piece of work to support the Committee's progress with the introduction of the scheme. The results of BWCI's actuarial modelling were presented to the Committee in November, and have also been discussed at a joint meeting with the Policy & Resources Committee. The report was published to the media yesterday.

It is estimated that in 2020 around 9,000 working age people will be contributing to a private pension. When the scheme is launched, it is expected that an additional 16,000 people will start contributing to a second pillar pension.

The Old Age Pension was only ever intended to provide a basic platform level of retirement income which, at a full level, represents an income replacement rate of 40% for a lower quartile earner. The projections show that, with the introduction of the proposed auto-enrolment system, an income replacement rate of about 80% can be achieved. We are pleased to see that this exceeds the target income replacement rate recommended by the UK's Pension Commission.

BWCI's economic impact assessment illustrates how the introduction of the Secondary Pension Scheme could potentially have implications for individuals and households, employers, the Government and on the economy.

The projections show that the impact on individuals is overwhelmingly positive and that the drag on the economy is far smaller than might be feared. However, we recognise that there are circumstances where people would prefer not to be a member of the scheme. As such, it will not be compulsory, and everyone will retain the option to opt out, albeit with regular reminders to opt back in.

While some employers might find the prospect of an additional cost worrying, we are committed to developing a low-cost scheme with minimal administration burden to limit the impact on employers. It is also worth mentioning that the UK has recently been getting very positive feedback on their Secondary Pension Scheme – in particular, from small businesses who had found it easier than anticipated to set up a pension scheme for their employees. The next phase of work is to go out to tender for a provider of the new scheme.

Turning now to Income Support. The implementation of the 2016 SWBIC proposals has been one of the Committee's top priorities since the start of this term. We are pleased to say that the policy letter on the implementation of Income Support, including transitional arrangements, is being finalised for submission next Monday, and we are hoping that it will be considered by the States on 28th February, so that the new Income Support Scheme can commence on our target date of 6th July.

Social welfare is one of the States' agreed top 23 priorities in the Policy & Resource Plan. It is encouraging that the States has recognised the importance of ensuring that everyone in society has enough money to live on, and is able to fully participate in society. This has been

80 demonstrated by the increase in the Committee's cash limit for 2018, to account for the implementation of the welfare reform proposals.

The final topic I would like to address in this Statement is that of off-Island travel medical insurance. The Committee have been in discussions with an insurance provider following the completion of the tendering process during 2017. The outcome of this is that we'll be bringing a recommendation to the States in the next few months to implement a new form of insurance scheme, which will protect Islanders from large medical bills should they fall ill while travelling in the UK. The intention of the scheme will be to target those who would struggle to obtain medical insurance for travel in the UK, due to prohibitively high costs. This is not a direct replacement for the former Reciprocal Health Agreement. More information will be provided on this, and the other options considered, in the policy letter which we will be aiming to publish during March.

90 The Committee have, in conjunction with the insurance provider, designed a scheme that is fair and reasonable for both the taxpayer and the individual who may need to make a claim. The scheme would be funded through the Guernsey Health Service Fund, initially on a trial basis, and more details will be available when the policy letter is published at the end of March. The Committee hopes that the scheme can be launched later this year, subject to approval by the States.

Sir that completes this update and I am happy to take questions on any matters within the Committee's mandate.

Thank you.

100 **The Bailiff:** I would just remind Members that they may not include any item that is on the agenda for debate today, such as the Longer Working Lives policy letter, which is up for debate later. But apart from that, questions can be on any topic which forms part of the mandate of the Committee.

105 Deputy de Lisle, did I see you moving to rise?

Deputy de Lisle: Yes, thank you, sir.

Can I ask in terms of the proposed Secondary Pensions Scheme, will the Committee in its deliberations be taking special consideration of concerns emanating from the small business community, at 3.5% added cost it is considered burdensome by many.

110 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

115 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Well, sir, as I have indicated, the nest scheme was launched in the UK and it has been very positive from small businesses. But if we look at the Guernsey facts and figures, and we look at the number of businesses by size and we have got, with one to five employees, a total of over 1,600 businesses employing one to five. So if we were to exclude those small businesses from the scheme then we would be missing a lot of people and the potential for those people to save. So I do think that, yes, we will bear that in mind, and that is one of the reasons why we are trying to keep the costs to a minimum.

The Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

125 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Thank you, sir.

Thank you, President, for updating us on some of the developments in the Disability & Inclusion Strategy. I wonder whether the President would be able to say whether there would be a new commitment to a deadline for the implementation of the legislation?

130 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Clerc.

Deputy Le Clerc: Sir, at the present time I am unable to commit to that deadline. We had some very positive interviews yesterday with the experts on the legislation, and we have set a deadline for them coming back with the choices of the legislation that, hopefully, we will base our own legislation on by the end of March, and then there will be the second phase and that will be the work on that. But I would like to see the paper come back towards the end of 2018 or the beginning of 2019. But I cannot be more specific until we have had that feedback from those experts.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: As I am aware, as a Committee Member, we are doing everything we can to ensure the Income Support changes that will benefit the community and will be well understood, but I have indeed met people who identify there may be a category of persons in Guernsey who require further assistance in understanding the changes, so I welcome the assurance that we would perhaps have an open door drop-in policy for those people and, as some of those people appear to be lonely people, perhaps we should have a 'Minister of Loneliness' as well here.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc, I am not sure there was a question in there, but if you spotted one.

Deputy Le Clerc: Thank you.

I am sure I can get some answers for Deputy Gollop. Dealing with loneliness is part of the SLAWS work, and there is a working group looking at loneliness. With regard to those people that will be brought into the Income Support system, we have already written to our social housing tenants, and we will be writing to everybody that receives Income Support. We are already working on some focus groups, and once we have conducted those focus groups and had that initial feedback we will be holding some public meetings for tenants and those that Income Support will affect.

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

I am sure Deputy Le Clerc will correct me if I am wrong, but I think she made some comments on the radio that people in their housing and our benefit system, there are no section in the housing and benefit system that do not abuse the system. Can she just confirm that that is the case, and if that is the case is that not a naive outlook?

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

Deputy Le Clerc: Sorry, there will be occasional people that do abuse the system, but we have process and procedures in place to deal with those people. Very often there are underlying issues and we would be dealing with them in a sympathetic way, but ultimately if they continue to abuse the system we do take people to court, and I think you will see in the newspaper that that would be a last resort. We would want to work with those people first and understand the issues, because we are the port of last resort for many of these people.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, yes, Deputy Le Clerc mentions how the vast majority of people are employed by small businesses. I would just like her assurance that she will seek to minimise the additional bureaucracy that will impact on those businesses, as a result of introducing a Secondary Pension Scheme.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

185

Deputy Le Clerc: Yes, sir, I would just like to say to Deputy Soulsby it is one of the topics that I bring up regularly at working groups, and that is to ensure that it is not a bureaucratic process. I think it will help because the collection of the funds will be through the same system that we use for collection of insurance contributions, so we are going to make it as simple as possible, and we will be working with the provider, and part of that bidding process is to ensure that the fees are as low as possible for both the employer and for the employee. If we see huge fees we are going to be putting people off joining the scheme.

190

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley Owen.

195

Deputy Dudley Owen: Yes, I wonder whether Deputy Le Clerc might be able to share with the Assembly whether there might be any thoughts of any innovative exceptions to the rules for small businesses, especially for start-ups, in order to encourage more diversity in our economy?

200

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

Deputy Le Clerc: We are still finalising all the detail, we want to try and encourage as many people to save because it is taking responsibility for peoples futures, but it will be part of our considerations looking at small businesses and looking at start-ups. I cannot say at the present time whether there will be exemptions for those businesses, because I think it is really important that everybody is able to participate, but we will work with businesses, and when we have got more information – and that will come after this next phase of the bidding process – and when we know the providers and what the scheme is going to look like, that we will do some more consultation work.

205

210

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, could the President please expand on the role of the person who will be employed to progress the Disability & Inclusion Strategy. Presumably they will be expected to co-ordinate and lead, but what exactly will their daily involvement be, please?

215

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

Deputy Le Clerc: Sorry, sir, I did not quite catch the question. Would you just be able to repeat the question, Deputy Queripel?

220

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I was asking the President if she could expand on the role of the person who is going to be employed to progress the Disability & Inclusion Strategy, what exactly will their daily involvement involve?

225

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Le Clerc: Thank you, Deputy Queripel, and I apologise for not hearing the first time. Well, we have picked out six jurisdictions that we would like the experts to look at. They will rank those jurisdictions in priority, the strengths and weaknesses of those priorities and then ultimately it will be a small working group, including two members of the ESS Committee, that will have a look at those jurisdictions and see what proposals are the best. They will not be based – probably not based – in Guernsey, because the three shortlisted groups are all off-Island, but we are going through the interview process at the moment and there will be a lot of working and some initial workshops on the Island and then they will be coming back to present. So there will

230

235 be a lot of interaction between the experts and the people in Guernsey, the GDA, ESS and other interested groups.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

240 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, sir.

Traditionally pension contribution schemes have two thirds from employers and one third from employees. In the proposed Secondary Pension Scheme, the balance is the almost opposite way round. Is the Committee concerned that 6.5% will put employees off contributing and therefore result in less of a take-up that these would perhaps be if it was a lower contribution rate?

245

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

Deputy Le Clerc: The initial contributions will be 1% and 1%, so it will be over a seven year period that increases to the 3.5% for employers and the 6.5% for employees. I think realistically if we do not go up to the full 10% then actually the amount in the pension pot when someone comes to retire will not be anywhere near their income replacement, and we know there is already pressure on the Old Age Pension. So if we do not go down the route of the second pillar pension we would probably need to increase the insurance contributions at some point in the future. The benefit of this scheme is that people will be saving in a pot in their own individual names, so that is the encouragement, that they are taking responsibility for themselves, and the saving will be for them at some point in the future.

255

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

260 **Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you, sir.

Decisions of this Assembly, Resolutions of this Assembly, particularly with regard to social policy have left the Committee of the ESS with a colossal workload. Is the President content with the volume of resources given to that task in those areas, and does she believe that these policies will be delivered timely, with the resources available to them as a Committee?

265

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

Deputy Le Clerc: Thank you, Deputy Brehaut.

Yes, the mandate is huge, and we have had some pinch points. But I am pleased to say that when we have identified the pinch points – and perhaps the Disability & Inclusion Strategy was an area where we did not identify it soon enough, but when we have needed the extra resources – we have spoken to Policy & Resources and they have come back and said, yes give us a business case. I feel that I am getting the support, particularly on the Disability & Inclusion, and I think, again, it is on a case-by-case basis; as we identify a need we will go to Policy & Resources. We have been fortunate that five of our priorities are in the Policy & Resource Plan and part of that will be as on a needs basis that we will come to them for the additional requirement.

275

The Bailiff: I see no one else rising.

Before we move on to Question time, those who wish to do so may remove their jackets.

280

Questions for Oral Answer

COMMITTEE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Bus service – New timetable and December night bus trial

The Bailiff: We go to Question Time and there will be some Questions from Deputy Gollop.
Deputy Gollop.

285 **Deputy Gollop:** Thank you, sir.

La Gazette Officielle, in late autumn 2017, indicated that there would be significant bus service changes and improvements for 2018 announced for public consultation, but these have yet to be implemented. Have the new night bus routes, which were prematurely launched before Christmas, as a test, Routes N1, N2 and N3, with extended routes northwards and out west to the western
290 parishes on a higher fare scale, been successful in terms of revenue rise and passenger numbers.

The Bailiff: Questions will be answered by the President of the Committee *for the Environment & Infrastructure*, Deputy Brehaut.

295 **Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you, sir.

I thank Deputy Gollop for his Questions.

I can confirm that a largely positive response was received from the general public. There was particular interest in relation to the proposed expansion and rebranding of the night bus service to include new destinations, such as Pleinmont, L'Eree and L'Islet; and in light of this it was agreed
300 with CT Plus that they could trial this extended service throughout December in the run up to Christmas, but it would have to be at the existing maximum fare of £2 per person.

Secondly, with regard to the trial itself, I am pleased to report that a total of 2,523 passengers were carried across the three night bus routes over the five weekends in December. This compares to 1,670 passengers carried over the same period in 2016. That is an increase of 853, which is
305 about a 50% increase in passenger numbers overall. Income at a maximum fare of £2 was £4,982 as compared to £3,251 in 2016.

Only time will tell whether the expanded and rebranded night bus service with a new standard fare of £2.50 will be a success. But if the December trial is anything to go by then there is every chance that that service will be.
310

The Bailiff: Any supplementaries?

Deputy Gollop: My supplementary is: following the successful implementation of those routes, when will the rest of the changes be made, for example, new route 62 running in the day
315 to the Airport via King's Mills?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: An aspect that does arise from the answer to the second Question, but the
320 short answer is as timely and as quickly as we can – is the short answer.

The Bailiff: Your second Question, Deputy Gollop?

325 **Deputy Gollop:** My second Question is, when and if the new bus service package change, both day and night including Sundays, are introduced permanently, how will these changes be effectively promoted, advertised, communicated and monitored, for key and critical success factors?

330 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

I can confirm that a new improved scheduled bus service timetable will be introduced with effect from 5th February 2018. A new timetable which is currently in the process of being printed will also be made available on buses.gg in the coming days. The changes will also be publicised by CT Plus through other tried and tested methods, including focused media campaigns and a greater on-the-ground presence by CT Plus staff at the Terminus and out and about in the parishes, and we have had two drop-ins with the public to date.

340 These latest changes will be closely monitored. However, the success of the bus service cannot simply be measured by analysing passenger numbers on individual services, but rather on the uptake of services across the network as a whole. In order to present a viable alternative transport solution it is accepted that some bus services will inevitably need to operate at times when there is less overall demand.

345 The night bus service is seen as more of an economic enabler than an essential service, and with an extended route and standard fare of £2.50 it is expected that this service will be largely self-funding.

I am also delighted to report that the latest analysis shows that 2017 was a record year for bus passenger numbers, with a total of 1,778,577 passengers carried across the scheduled bus network. This represents an increase of 133,849 passengers compared to 2016, which is the equivalent to an increase of just over 8%.

350 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

355 **Deputy Gollop:** Whilst I acknowledge the impressive statistics given, there was recently an editorial in the Island's newspaper suggesting we need more data on how well the Traffic and Transport Strategy is going. Does the Committee undertake to communicate these other indices to show the taxpayer's money is being well spent?

360 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: We are under a Resolution, sir, to report back to this Assembly with regard to progress made on the Integrated Transport Strategy and these are just the type of indicators that the Committee would be bringing to this Assembly to show aspects of improvement and enhancement in areas that perhaps clearly need improvement.

365 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Sir, I am delighted to learn of the extension of the evening night buses to L'Eree and Pleinmont. The walk from the Airport was very long in the past. *(Laughter)*

370 But I would like to know, sir, in the next change will the P2 service be re-evaluated because take up is still fairly mean with costs of £10 per ride, as I understand it.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: The P2 service is constantly under review, and remember the starting point was one to two people per journey, now we can get seven to eight people per journey. But the value contained within that is what are these people doing? These people are going to work; they are being taken to the blood clinic; they are being taken to the Hospital; they are contributing; they are paying tax. So you have to ask yourself the question, what does the P2 enable people to do? It enables people to participate, which covers a number of policies that this Assembly has approved. So it is easy to see the service in isolation, but it is integral to a great deal of other things in getting people to get to the places they need to be so they can take part in society and community like we all do.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Following on from Deputy de Lisle's question, would the Committee welcome ideas from Deputies and other people on how the P2 could in the future be even more popular and useful to the Island?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: We do obviously welcome any ideas that people wish to come forward with. There are times when we get representations from the public because they would like the P2 to run closer to where they live, but things such as turning points become a problem, for example, so some areas are more difficult to reach than others.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Sir, to Deputy Brehaut.

Just on the P2, I do want to pursue this a bit and this is about sort of value for money; there seems to be a fixation with the actual bus itself, but if you look at the route, and it is commendable that your team have managed to move it from two passengers per journey up to seven, but –

The Bailiff: It should be through the Chair, Deputy Inder. I do not think I have done anything –

Deputy Inder: I do do that a bit, I apologise, sir. Through you, sir. If I remember correctly the cost of the – I will run out of my minute – could you not do it cheaper with a taxi service, a seven- or eight-man wagon, paying £30,000/£40,000 a year and do it an awful lot cheaper than you are currently doing? There are so many different ways of delivering that than having that bus running up and down the route.

The Bailiff: I think that question was directed to you, Deputy Brehaut! *(Laughter)*
Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you.

Let's assume it is. The issue with, incidentally, an aspect of the Transport Strategy that is overlooked is the fact that it enabled licences to facilitate disabled taxis which would help people take part as well. *(A mobile phone rings)* Sorry, there is a telephone going, it distracted me.

But with regard to, if the availability of a door-to-door car service, pre-booking a taxi, it can be, for some people, more difficult on availability grounds than simply turning up at a bus stop and knowing that you are going to be taken somewhere. But all bus services are the same, they start from a very low base and they grow; at any point during that growth you can say stop, end this service and you will never know what outcome could have been achieved. So if we were to intervene when there was one person per service it would have been the wrong thing to do. Why

430 should we then look to intervene when numbers are on the increase, and of course this is an element of a contract, so the contract overall delivers a lot of other things as well as the P2 service.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Just a supplementary to that, sir.

435 I do not think I was actually criticising the service I was just actually, through you, sir, as usual, asking if there was not another way of delivering it than the current costs, because I genuinely think there are cheaper ways of delivering the service.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

440 **Deputy Brehaut:** The broader issue of how we provide the bus service and the way that the bus service has evolved in Guernsey is interesting, because the round-Island routes, when I think some years ago there were more radial routes, for want of a better description, and I think that with a longer look and a longer focus on the bus service over a longer period of time then clearly I
445 think some bus routes could be more productive, but we know, we have got to a figure now of, the figure I have given, well over one million people. That is because buses are reliable, they are clean, they turn up, and people understand they will be there. If you then rejig and try a completely different service you jeopardise the success that you have already banked, so that is what we have to be careful of.

450 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, does the President agree with me that greater use of the P2 could help to alleviate the periodic parking problems at the PEH?

455 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Yes, indeed it could. We are aware that we need to do a great deal more promotion with the P2. More recently, the Bailiff's Road closure has meant that perhaps numbers
460 could have dipped for a period of time, but it does surprise me the times when the P2 is literally running past people's front doors going to the Hospital, a number of people work there and I think a few more people could certainly take advantage of that.

The Bailiff: I see no one else rising.

465 Before we move on, Deputy Yerby, do you wish to be relevée?

Deputy Yerby: Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: Right. Deputy Yerby is relevée.

470 We will move on to Elections.

Billets d'État II and IV

COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

I. Election of two Members of the Committee for Economic Development – Debate commenced

Billet d'État II – Article I.

The States are asked:

To elect a sitting Member of the States as a Member of the Committee for Economic Development to complete the unexpired term of office, that is to the 30th June 2020, of Deputy J. Kuttelwascher who has resigned from that office, and whose letter of resignation is appended hereto, in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

Billet d'État IV – Article I.

The States are asked:

To elect a sitting Member of the States as a Member of the Committee for Economic Development to complete the unexpired term of office, that is to the 30th June 2020, of Deputy J. S. Merrett who has resigned from that office, and whose letter of resignation is appended hereto, in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

475 **The Deputy Greffier:** Billet d'État II, Article I – Election of a Member of the Committee for Economic Development

The Bailiff: And I think we should take the two together.

480 **The Deputy Greffier:** Billet d'État IV, Article I – Election of a Member of the Committee for Economic Development.

The Bailiff: There are two vacancies on the Committee for Economic Development. Are there any candidates proposed? Deputy Ferbrache.

485 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Yes, sir, I nominate Alderney Representative Louis Jean.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Jean. Is there a seconder?

490 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** I am seconding the nomination, sir.

The Bailiff: You are seconding, Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Yes, sir.

495 **The Bailiff:** Thank you.
Deputy Parkinson.

500 **Deputy Parkinson:** Yes, sir.
I am nominating Deputy de Lisle and Deputy Tindall.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle and is there a seconder for each of those?

Deputy Dudley Owen: Yes, sir.

505 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley Owen, you are seconding them both.

Deputy Dudley Owen: Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Are there any other nominations? No.

510 Well, as we have more nominations than there are places, each proposer may speak for not more than five minutes in respect of each candidate proposed by that person.

Deputy Ferbrache.

515 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, I nominate Alderney Representative Jean, not just because of his personal qualities, which I will touch upon in a moment, but because of the fact that we are the Bailiwick of Guernsey and it is important to have the interests of Alderney represented. There are so many interests particularly in connection with air and sea links.

That takes me to a person that I am actually nominating. We have seen over the years' speeches made by Alderney Representative Jean, and he speaks with passion, and he speaks with pride and he speaks with clear ability and experience. Now everybody knows my overburdening and ever increasing support for 'i' dotters and 't' crossers, they are the core of my being, but Alderney Representative Jean is the absolute opposite of that. He is a person who has experience. He has represented Alderney in the States of Guernsey in various periods over a long time. He has actually run businesses. He has actually had to tell people that times are difficult. He has actually had to make commercial decisions. He has actually had to put his own property on the line when he is making commercial decisions. It is very easy to do that in theory; it is much more difficult to do that in practice.

525 Therefore we have a person of integrity, ability, experience and – I come back to that word I used before – passion, and we need a bit more passion in the States, and we need passion in relation to the Committee *for* Economic Development because we need people that can actually promote policies and make sure they are achieved.

The Bailiff: Next Deputy Parkinson will speak in favour of Deputies de Lisle and Tindall.

535 **Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy de Lisle served on the Commerce & Employment Committee in the last term of Government, assisting on a number of sub-groups, including the Construction Committee, the Air Transport Licencing Board and the Renewable Energy Team.

540 He is interested in connectivity both through air and sea routes and digital, and I will speak a little bit more about his experience in air connectivity later.

He has commercial experience too, with shops and office accommodation in Town, and interests in farm land in the western parishes.

545 He has a successful record of economic development in public service in Canada. His PhD in Economic Geography at Magill, specialising in regional economic development, led to a post in Manitoba advising on the diversification of the agricultural base of that province, and then to the Sudbury metal mining community. This experience led to an appointment by the Federal Government to help expand and diversify the employment base in Ottawa.

550 He later worked in the private sector for Thompson Hickling Aviation as a consultant evaluating transportation infrastructure providing systems integration and project management to modernise Canada's air traffic control system. He conducted cost benefit analysis for Transport Canada.

He is now in his fourth term as a States' Member and has served on Environment, Education, Commerce & Employment and Scrutiny Committees. He is a Member of the Legislation Select Committees.

555 Now, I go on to Deputy Tindall. Deputy Tindall, her involvement in business started at a young age, in her early teens when her family bought a small shop selling mainly ladies clothes. Having enjoyed trips to London to purchase the latest fashions, Deputy Tindall was invited to join a wholesale supplier, and then worked for three years at Alders, a large department store, in the stock control department. She used her income from these jobs to support herself through school
560 and university where she studied accountancy, politics and law.

She took the Law Society' solicitor's final exams in 1988. After qualifying, and having worked for the leading UK provider of employee benefits, and a major law firm, she decided to set up her own law firm in Cardiff. With up to six employees she offered advice to private clients on matters ranging from the administration and litigation of trusts and estates, to capital taxes, community
565 care planning and welfare benefits.

She later transferred her legal practice to a local firm and moved to Guernsey where she worked for a local accountancy firm as a tax advisor mainly to local businesses. When that firm was taken over by a major worldwide firm she became a director of a local trust company offering offshore pension products, and she later worked as a compliance officer and in-house counsel.
570 She has been a member of the Intellectual Property Group for a number of years, and was involved in developing the world's first image rights register.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Members, I remind you that there are three candidates for two vacancies. Alderney
575 Representative Jean, proposed by Deputy Ferbrache, seconded by Deputy Lester Queripel; Deputy de Lisle, proposed by Deputy Parkinson, seconded by Deputy Dudley Owen; and Deputy Tindall who is proposed by Deputy Parkinson and seconded by Deputy Dudley Owen. Please now cast your votes.

When you are ready can the voting slips be collected up?

580 Have all the voting papers been collected? Yes. Fine. One more.

Well, Members I suggest that we should not proceed with the other elections until we know the result of that election, but rather than rise, as we have a busy agenda, I suggest perhaps we get on with the legislation and start with some of the legislation while those votes are counted.

Greffier.

585

Billet d'État II

ORDINANCES LAID BEFORE THE STATES

The Document Duty (Guernsey) Law, 2017 (Commencement and Amendment) Ordinance, 2017;
The Document Duty (Rates) Ordinance, 2017;
The Document Duty (Anti-Avoidance) Law, 2017 (Commencement and Amendment) Ordinance, 2017;
The Document Duty (Anti-Avoidance) (Rates) Ordinance, 2017

The Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État II. The following Ordinances are laid before the States: the Document Duty (Guernsey) Law, 2017 (Commencement and Amendment) Ordinance, 2017; the Document Duty (Rates) Ordinance, 2017; the Document Duty (Anti-Avoidance) Law, 2017 (Commencement and Amendment) Ordinance, 2017 and the Document Duty (Anti-Avoidance) (Rates) Ordinance, 2017.

590

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS LAID BEFORE THE STATES

Animal Welfare (Amendment) (No.2) Order, 2017;
Animal Welfare (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations, 2017;
The Fire Services (Fees and Charges) (Guernsey) Regulations, 2016;
The Income Tax (Pensions) (Contribution Limits and Tax-Free Lump Sums) (Amendments) Regulations, 2017

Deputy Greffier: The following Statutory Instruments were laid before the States: Animal Welfare (Amendment) (No.2) Order, 2017; Animal Welfare (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations, 2017; the Fire Services (Fees and Charges) (Guernsey) Regulations, 2016; the Income Tax (Pensions) (Contribution Limits and Tax-Free Lump Sums) (Amendments) Regulations, 2017.

595

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Green, you are –

Deputy Green: Sir, yes, I had a brief point to make in relation to the Document Duty (Guernsey) Law.

600

The Bailiff: I think that is just being laid, isn't it? That Ordinance has already been made, I believe, is that not correct? Sorry, I do not have the –

Deputy Green: It is in effect, sir, already, yes.

605

My Committee, the Legislation Review Panel, wanted to make a specific point in relation to that.

The Bailiff: But there is no motion to annul the Ordinance. So –

610

Deputy Green: Right, sir.

In which case I will not make a point about – *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Sorry, you had given me notice yesterday, and I had not appreciated that the Ordinance had already been laid at that point, or I would have raised this with you yesterday, but as there is no motion to annul the Ordinance, you will have to find some other way of making the point that you wished to make.

Deputy Green: That is understood sir.
Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: You can write to Policy & Resources, or raise a question, or do it in some other way. Sorry about that.

Well, hmmm, I think we have run out of business. Unless we can conclude the Education debate in the next 10 minutes! *(Laughter)*

Well, if we rise it takes a long time to get everybody back in the Chamber, I suggest that we just wait.

There is a suggestion that we take No. VII. No, I think – Deputy Lowe is suggesting that Article VII, the Merchant Shipping Legislation, may not take very long. Is there going to be any debate on that? Is anybody going to want to debate that if we take it? No. Well shall we –

Deputy Tindall: Sir, I do apologise, but I had anticipated it being at the end, I have not actually been able to write a speech, but I was hoping to make a comment or two.

The Bailiff: In that case, we will not take it out of order.

We either rise for five minutes or we, I think, stay put, and then we can get going as quickly as possible. Perhaps we should just cut off the link to Radio Guernsey for the moment so that we do not broadcast proceedings.

*The Assembly adjourned at 10.59 a.m.
and resumed it sitting at 11.08 a.m.*

Billet d'État II and IV

I. Election of two Members of the Committee *for* Economic Development – Debate continued – Deputies de Lisle and Tindall elected

The Bailiff: Will you take your places, please, and can you reconnect the link to the radio? I think we are almost ready to resume and the radio link has been reconnected.

I have just been handed a sheet with the result of the voting for two Members of the Committee *for* Economic Development. Alderney Representative Louis Jean received 14 votes, Deputy de Lisle 26, Deputy Tindall 24. There were two blank, I assume two blank papers rather than two blank votes. I declare Deputies de Lisle and Tindall elected.

Thank you.
We move on to the next election.

Billet d'État II

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

II. Election of a Member of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture – Deputy Lester Queripel elected

Article II.

The States are asked:

To elect a sitting Member of the States as a Member of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to complete the unexpired term of office, that is to the 30th June 2020, of Deputy D. de G. De Lisle who has resigned from that office, and whose letter of resignation is appended hereto, in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

The Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État II, Article II – Election of a Member of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture.

650

The Bailiff: Do we have any nominations?
Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: Sir, I wold like to propose Deputy Lester Queripel.

655

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel. Is there a seconder for Deputy Lester Queripel?

Deputy Dudley Owen: Yes, sir.

660

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley Owen, thank you.

Any other nominations? No. Well there is a single nomination then for a single place.

I put to you the Proposition that Deputy Lester Queripel proposed by Deputy Le Pelley and seconded by Deputy Dudley Owen be elected a Member of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

665

The Bailiff: I declare him elected.

Billet d'État III

COMMITTEE FOR HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE

I. Election of a Member of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care – Deputy Tindall elected

Article I.

The States are asked:

To elect a sitting Member of the States as a Member of the Committee for Health & Social Care to complete the unexpired term of office, that is to the 30th June 2020, of Deputy J. I. Mooney who has resigned from that office, and whose letter of resignation is appended hereto, in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

The Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État III, Article I – Election of a Member of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care.

670

The Bailiff: Do we have any nominations?
Deputy Soulsby.

675

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, yes.
I propose Deputy Dawn Tindall.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dawn Tindall. Is there a seconder?

680

Deputy Tooley: Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tooley.
Do we have any other nominations? No.

685

Well, I put to you the Proposition that Deputy Tindall, proposed by Deputy Soulsby and seconded by Deputy Tooley, be elected as a Member of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare Deputy Tindall elected.

Billet d'État II

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

III. The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick – Debate commenced

Article III.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter dated 10th November, 2017, of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, they are of the opinion:

1. That full-time 16-19 education should be separate from 11-16 education, with A levels and International Baccalaureate qualifications delivered alongside full-time vocational, applied general and technical courses.

2. That mainstream States secondary schools should be a minimum of 600 pupils and a maximum of 1000 pupils aged 11-16 in line with research on optimal secondary school size.

3. That 11-16 education should be provided on three secondary school sites from September 2021 or as soon after as practical, with a transition period between September 2019 and September 2023.

4. That post-16 provision should be located on Les Varendes site (current Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre) and the Les Ozouets Campus of the College of Further Education.

5. That the three secondary school sites should be Baubigny, Les Beaucamps and a new secondary school on the current La Mare de Carteret site.

6. i. That a new 8 form entry secondary school should be built on La Mare de Carteret site.

ii. That enhanced sports facilities should be included as part of this development.

iii. That a new La Mare de Carteret Primary School should be built on La Mare de Carteret site subject to prioritisation in the next capital prioritisation cycle (from 2021).

7. That post-16 provision should be organised as follows:

i. A Sixth Form College on the Les Varendes site offering full-time courses (including A Levels, International Baccalaureate and full-time vocational, applied general and technical courses) predominantly aimed at 16-19 year olds; and

ii. A Further and Higher Education Institute on the Les Ozouets Campus offering apprenticeships, further and higher education, and part-time courses.

8. That the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture should return to the States by March 2019 with a policy letter setting out how post-16 provision will work in partnership with the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and the GTA University Centre to become the Guernsey University College, including a co-designed governance model.

9. To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to provide funding from the Capital Reserve for a feasibility study of the Les Ozouets Site and to develop a plan for that site, which includes any synergies identified in Proposition 8, and for that plan to be presented to the States by March 2019.

10. That the following projects will be included within the Education Estate Development Phase 1 within the current capital prioritisation cycle (2017-2020) (Estimated total cost of £74m):

a. A new 8 form entry secondary school and, if approved under Proposition 6ii) enhanced community sports facilities, on La Mare de Carteret site;

b. Refurbishment and remodelling of Les Varendes site for post-16 provision.

11. That the following projects be included within the Education Estate Development Phase 2 (pipeline) and bids made during the next capital prioritisation cycle (2021 onwards) (Estimated total cost of £36m-£40m):

a. The redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Primary School;

b. The redevelopment of Les Ozouets site for a Further and Higher Education Institute, including new workshop facilities;

c. If required in the future, an extension to Les Beaucamps High School to 6 forms of entry.

12. To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to:

a. Following a review of the outline business case for the new secondary school, give agreement for the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to go out to tender for the rebuild of an 8 form entry secondary school and sports facilities on the La Mare de Carteret site; and,

b. Following a review of the full business case, open a capital vote of a maximum of £52.6m for this project, including phase 1 programme management costs, funded from the Capital Reserve.

13. To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to:

a. Following a review of the outline business case for the Les Varendes Site, give agreement for the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to go out to tender for its refurbishment and remodelling for post-16 provision; and,

b. Following a review of the full business case, open a capital vote of a maximum of £21.4m for this project, funded from the Capital Reserve.

14. To increase the authority delegated to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve funding, from the Transformation and Transition Fund, for the Transforming Education and Training Services Programme by £2m to £2.75m in order to provide funding of a maximum of £2.5m in respect of the additional anticipated costs for the transition to the new system of secondary and post-16 education.

15. To note that the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture is committed to an inclusive system of education, ensuring that all children and young people have equality of opportunity to achieve their potential. All the proposals outlined in this policy letter support the aims of the Disability and Inclusion Strategy and comply with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

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

In accordance with Rule 4(4) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees, it is confirmed that the propositions above have the unanimous support of the Committee with the exception of 6ii and 6iii and 11a which Deputy David De Lisle does not support.

The Deputy Greffier: Article III, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture – The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick.

The Bailiff: Just before I invite Deputy Le Pelley to open debate, can I just remind all Members of Rule 17(6) that says debate must be relevant to the matter before a meeting. I do ask people to keep the debate relevant to the issues and not to the personalities involved.

Deputy Le Pelley will open the debate.

Deputy le Pelley: Thank you, sir. I will bear that in mind.

Sir, Members, I have the honour of opening this debate today and laying our recommendations before you.

I say 'honour' because I believe that what we are proposing will transform our education system and set us on a journey to deliver the world class education that we aspire to, and that our children and young people, and our wider community, absolutely deserve.

I say 'honour' because I am proud of my Committee, the professional officers and our teachers and support staff, and our pupils for the work they do every day and the dedication they show.

I say 'honour' because we have a chance today to implement a new structure which will improve our education outcomes, to show that we value all of our young people equally, and give equal importance to the pathways they choose.

For someone who has spent most of his career in the classroom, it is an honour for me to be leading these exciting developments to truly transform our education system. It is vital we make a decision at this meeting. We are absolutely sure that our recommendations represent the very best for the future education of our children and young people.

Sir, Members, I do not need to tell you that this has not been an easy journey for us to get to this vital States' debate, but we are here, and I appeal to Members to listen to the evidence, not to the rhetoric, set aside the emotion and make a decision based on the facts. Think of the long-term benefits and not the short-term pain and, most of all, have the best interests of all our children, and all of our young people, at the heart of the decisions you will make over the next couple of days.

Sir, my role in opening this debate is to describe to Members the overwhelming advantages and benefits for young people of the new structure that we are recommending. There will be ample time for me to explain to you the disastrous implications of some of the alternatives being proposed later on in this debate, and I will welcome the opportunity to do so at the appropriate time.

No, I will not be scaremongering or contributing to project fear, as I and some Members have been accused, I will be providing a robust and evidence based rebuttal of the one-school two-site option, and will demonstrate clearly how two 11-18 schools and a separate college of FE will not deliver the equality of opportunity that we are all signed up to; will not operate efficiently and effectively, and I will show that these sorts of structures do not deliver the improved educational outcomes that we are looking for. But more of that later.

Sir, Members, our recommendations are evidence based, they take the best from elsewhere but place it in our unique Island context with the aim of meeting the needs of all our young people and our economy. They provide a solution tailor-made for Guernsey.

We have carefully considered how we will transition to our new model; how children and young people will be allocated and moved with support to their new schools; how they will all benefit from our new inclusive post-16 structure, and how our staff will be successfully deployed into new roles with as little disruption to learning as possible.

Under our recommendations, parents have certainty, they know which school their child will go to; they know when the change will happen and what the implications will be for each Year group; they know the size of the schools they will be moving to; they know that their child will not have to move schools to access the range and breadth of courses and qualifications that we want to deliver, and which all students will be entitled to access; children will move with their friends; they will have the chance to become familiar with their secondary school while still at primary school.

They will move to schools that independent research states are within the optimal size for secondary education, and yes the research does state that the impact of school size on attainment is inconclusive, but generally smaller schools are better for those from disadvantaged backgrounds. For every example of a high performing large school, I can provide you with a high performing smaller school. It is not really the size that has the biggest impact, it is the quality of leadership, the quality of staff, the support from parents and the community, but more than that, our three 11-16 schools will be of a size appropriate to Guernsey, large enough to provide the breadth of curriculum our children need, and deserve, but small enough to preserve that family feel, where teachers know each individual student, and where students know their teachers.

Our three schools will be large enough to create a real buzz for learning, where students can be grouped by ability, stretched and challenged, or given the extra support they need, but small enough so that they can still feel like an individual and not feel lost and invisible.

Under our recommendations, our staff have certainty; they know what the changes mean and when the redeployment and recruitment process will begin for our new secondary school, Sixth Form College, and Further and Higher Education Institute; they know that their status and salaries will be protected throughout the transition. Under our recommendations, staff know if they are in scope for the changes, or if they will be unaffected by the move to our new structure. If they are in

scope then they have a clear timetable for the recruitment process that we will undertake and they know when appointments will be made.

760 The communities living around our school sites know what to expect. Under our recommendations there is no real change for those living around Baubigny Schools and Les Beaucamps High; no change to pupil numbers; no change to traffic movements or volumes; no change to buildings.

765 Detailed plans for the rebuild of our new eight-form entry secondary school on La Mare de Carteret site have been shared with neighbours and have received planning approval. These plans have included detailed environmental impact surveys, detailed traffic assessments and solutions have been designed that have been approved by the planners. We have done ecological surveys, noise and light pollution studies. Flood risks have been modelled and drainage improvements have been designed to benefit the whole area, not just the school. Building materials have been
770 chosen and approved. We have a full project team in place, including architects, mechanical and electrical engineers, structural engineers, quantity surveyors and landscape architects, all ready to go, and all of this has been costed and included in what you have before you today.

Those living around the current Grammar School site at Les Varendes will not see any real change either under our recommendations for the creation of a Sixth Form College, as the
775 number of students on that site will remain consistent with the number that are there now. The only change will be that the students will be aged between 16 and 19 rather than 11 and 19.

They all have certainty if our recommendations are approved by you today. I am not sure we can say the same for any of the alternatives. Again I will expand on these very real challenges of the one-school two-sites model at the appropriate time once the amendment has been formally
780 presented.

Sir, Members, let me remind you of exactly what we are proposing. We will establish an inclusive Sixth Form College offering all full-time courses for 16-19-year-olds, including A-levels, International Baccalaureate and full-time vocational, applied general and technical courses on the Les Varendes site. The Sixth Form College will deliver courses from entry level to level three – that
785 is all levels up to the A-level equivalent – and so provide pathways for all students, including those with special educational needs, and students who may need to retake GCSEs, or other level two qualifications, as well as those wishing to study for three A-levels, the International Baccalaureate or full time BTech, or other similar qualifications.

Anyone who wants to go to our Sixth Form College can do so, they will not be stopped if they
790 do not have the right GCSE grades. Students will also be able to move up and progress through the levels if they need to, and most importantly, they will be able to mix and match qualifications, choosing those which best meet their aspirations and interests and which will support them into further or higher education or employment.

The scale of the Sixth Form College, with about 900 learners, will maximise the breadth of
795 choice for students, providing access to a broad range of qualifications, courses and levels. Class sizes will enable groups to flourish in an interactive dynamic and challenging way. This will be provided in one institution without the necessity for staff or students to change site. We aim to give equal importance to so-called academic and vocational pathways. All level three qualifications now provide a route into university, and our young people deserve the right to be
800 able to study the combination of courses which best meet their needs, aptitude and interests.

All our 16-year-olds wanting to stay in full time education will start at the Sixth Form College on the same basis, regardless of whether they join us from Alderney, or which 11–16 school they attend, or whether they are Le Murier or Les Voies students, or whether they join us from the grant aided colleges. Unlike now, they will all have the opportunity of this fresh start, they all start
805 as equals. They can all access the same enrichment, support, impartial advice and guidance. This is a truly exciting opportunity for all our young people, both now and into the future.

Education and qualifications are always changing, we need to make sure that whatever structure we put in place can easily adapt to these changes in future and ensure that our young people are able to access the very best.

810 We will also establish a Further and Higher Education Institute providing learning opportunities for those who have already chosen a course that is delivered in a workplace environment, or they have started work and seek additional skills to support their career pathway. It will provide all part-time work and work-related training, which includes the apprenticeship scheme, further and higher education and other part-time courses. It will be responsive to employer needs and help
815 deliver the aims of the Island's Skills Strategy.

The Further and Higher Education Institute will initially work in close partnership with the GTA University Centre, and the Institute of Health & Social Care Studies with a view to creating a Guernsey University College in the longer term.

820 The Committee will set up an advisory group with all relevant providers to help co-design the most appropriate governance structure. I would like to highlight to Members what an exciting prospect this is for the Island, not just for our children and young people, but for all those seeking to continue their learning throughout their lives. We need to open up a greater number of pathways and opportunities for our young people, not close them down.

825 This is not about splitting the College of Further Education in two and so destroying it in the process – and yes that accusation has been levelled – this is about having the vision to design a new vibrant institution for the future to meet the skill needs of Guernsey, ensuring that we are able to deliver the widest breadth of courses, and the widest choice of options, for our young people and the wider community. The Institute would be a responsive and dynamic institution, responsive to business, able to generate income and be governed by an independent governing
830 body. This is no unorthodox experiment, far from it.

We have taken on board the advice that we received, no one has said our structure will not work, no one has said it will not offer the best for our children and young people. What they have said is that whatever we decide it must take account of our unique Guernsey context. We must ensure that we provide the widest breadth of opportunity for all our children and young people.
835 They do not have the luxury of going to a school or college a few miles down the road if they want to access different courses, or alternative qualifications. Our Guernsey solution must provide the best for now, but also the best for the future. It must be flexible to take into account the ever changing education landscape, but also be adaptable to changes in Guernsey's economy, in our population, and also provide what our young people need to enable them to take their place in
840 the global economy.

Our recommendation is for three all-ability 11–16 secondary schools: the current Baubigny Schools, the current Les Beaucamps High School and a new school built next to the existing La Mare de Carteret High School. Alongside and working closely with these three schools will be Le Murier, Les Voies and St Anne's, Alderney. There will be greater flexibility of school placement for
845 those with additional or special educational needs, with further regard paid to the wishes of the parents, or careers, in where they feel their child will be best placed. This could be through providing direct support in mainstream school or through placement in a specialist base or special school. Every child's placement will be considered on an individual basis through professional discussion in consultation with parents and/or carers.

850 We have been asked how we are going to continue to resource this more flexible and dynamic approach to supporting young people with additional needs, as there is no new money. I would like to reassure parents that through our commitment to the Children & Young People's Plan and the Disability & Inclusion Strategy, we are always working to ensure that we meet the needs of all our children and young people, including those who are most vulnerable to underachievement.
855 We do that through moving our resources around to meet the needs of our young people, wherever they are.

So the big question is why are we doing this? Well, our number one reason for recommending these changes is to improve educational outcomes. Our education system is performing well but it could, and must, do better. So how will this new structure do this? It is important to understand
860 that this is not about buildings, this is about learning, and I would just like to take a few minutes to share with you how our recommendations will provide better outcomes for all.

At post-16 level our learners will benefit from: parity of esteem between vocational and academic pathways; equality of opportunity; viable class sizes; an inclusive Sixth Form College open to all; our students will attend a single dynamic institution with peers from the same age range. At the Sixth Form College students will have a structured five day a week programme, with supervised study and pastoral care, similar to that of a school environment. But it will not be a school. It will be a much more adult environment providing that important transition from school to university, employment and beyond. All students will experience the same transition into post-16 education. Sixth Form Colleges deliver better outcomes and improved retention rates. Young people will be able to access a broader range of subjects and qualifications. They will be able to mix and match courses at different levels, a language course alongside a vocational business course. They will be able to access a wider range of extracurricular activities, like the Duke of Edinburgh's Award, personal enrichment programmes.

Our structure allows proportionate focussed management to ensure quality of teaching and learning. We will have a focussed provider of further and higher learning, there will be a focus on meeting the targeted skills needed by the Island and by our employers and businesses. Our new structure will provide the opportunity to grow our on-Island HE opportunities, we will be able to respond quickly to employer needs. Our structure delivers efficient and effective use of resources across post-16 education and training providers.

So what about at secondary level? How will our three schools deliver better outcomes? We feel strongly that every young person must have equality of opportunity to access a broad, rich, engaging, challenging curriculum, and that everyone has the chance to reach their full potential. Three larger 11-16 schools facilitate this. Our recommendations deliver an inclusive education system with the best interests of all our children and young people at its heart.

Our three 11-16 schools will deliver the new Bailiwick curriculum which specifically challenges and addresses the need to ensure that all children and young people achieve good outcomes. These are measured across a number of different areas and not just with regard to the more traditional areas of progress and attainment or what we might describe as exam results. These are still paramount and important but there are also other key elements which ensure that children and young people need to be successful in future pathways.

Success for children and young people will include ensuring that irrespective of ability or any additional need that they are prepared for not only accreditation and examinations but also for the world of work and for the future challenges that they will face as they move through life.

Our three 11-16 schools will retain the best of current practice whilst seeking to place greater emphasis on important elements required to secure well-rounded learners, such as learning outside the classroom; promoting positive mental health and wellbeing; developing a growth mind-set; ensuring that our young people are financially literate; that they are critical thinkers able to work as part of a team; are creative; able to reflect on their experiences; are independent and resilient.

Within the new curriculum we also have a bottom line, which will have a wide range of tools and methods for capturing success. These include using existing high quality assessment schedules, such as How Good Is Our School, which is Education Scotland's external inspection framework. Also the development of new key performance indicators that enable us to put measuring progress at the forefront of reporting good outcomes. We will measure success across all areas identified on the bottom line using qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection. By doing this we can measure how all our children and young people make good progress and attain; show positive attitudes to learning; demonstrate high aspirations; make healthy lifestyle choices; participate in the community; and have respect for themselves and others.

I will say again, this is not about buildings, it is about learning. This is not driven by saving money, it is driven by a desire to have the best education system we possibly can.

I would just like to touch on the future governance and local management of the schools and establishments that we are recommending to you today. Our policy letter is clear, and our

intention to establish independent governance once the new structure is decided. Indeed we are committed to returning to this Assembly by March 2019 with governance plans that will have been co-designed with those running our existing institutions. We plan to build on the pilot governance model introduced at the College of Further Education and learn from this experience to ensure that we design something that works in our local context.

The same applies to local management of schools, or LMS, which I prefer to call delegation of budget and further empowerment of schools. Yes, this is important. Yes, we are pursuing it. Yes, we have already delegated further budget and accountability to schools. Yes, it may lead to further efficiency savings, but it is not necessarily the panacea that many think it is. Any system of delegation should not be solely about making savings, it should be about improving outcomes.

It is interesting to note that the States of Guernsey, largely through its public service reform plan, has been centralising services and function to achieve the very same efficiencies. What we are looking to achieve, yes, but by doing the polar opposite. LMS means decentralising budgets, functions and services, and delegating them back out to the schools. I say this not because I believe that savings cannot be made in this way but purely to sound a note of caution. LMS in other jurisdictions has required more stringent monitoring and challenge not less. Schools are required to have a more sophisticated approach to financial management. It is essential that they have the skilled staff and receive the support necessary to enable them to link financial planning to improvement priorities, and for any local authority, or indeed central Government, to monitor the use of resources against these priorities. Accountability matters and unless delegated school management is held accountable for outcomes, as well as financial efficiencies, the probability that it will substantially improve performance is low.

As a final aside on local management of schools, the functions most likely to be devolved do not currently sit with the central education office, they are the centralised functions provided by Policy & Resources, specifically finance, human resources and IT. We will be looking for the support of P&R, and its officers, in helping design and implement a scheme of delegation that is appropriate for our Guernsey schools and post-16 providers, that provides the autonomy our school leaders want, but also retains sufficient checks and balances to ensure that we are able to closely monitor the performance of our schools and to provide support where necessary.

But we cannot ignore the fact that there is no magic pot of money to pay for all of this. Sir, all of us in this Assembly have an obligation to consider the Island's financial situation, we cannot sign up to a structure with no known price tag. We must consider how to use the existing resources that we have in the most efficient and effective way as possible. We do not have a blank page to start from.

Our recommendations are fully costed, you have all the information you need in front of you today, your decisions are clear, vote for the Committee's recommendations, they are detailed, costed, evidence based and ready to go. They provide certainty to parents, students and staff, and equality of opportunity for all children and young people.

My Committee is confident that our proposals will deliver improved educational outcomes and will also provide flexibility for the future and make efficient and effective use of resources. I have outlined this to you today, and we have also explained this in detail in our policy letter.

The recommendations take the best from education systems elsewhere but set them in a context appropriate to the size and nature of Guernsey. We are determined to build a truly world class education system for those in our education system today, and for those who will be coming through it in the future.

Sir, Members, do not delay, it is time to decide. You have a responsibility today to do what is right for all our Guernsey children and young people, and by Guernsey I mean Bailiwick of Guernsey. We need a decision so that we can move forward and put all of our efforts and energies into making sure that we manage the changes coming with as little disruption to our children and young people as possible. They only get one chance, we only have this chance to show them that we have their best interests at heart.

Sir, I commend our proposals to you.

The Bailiff: Before we move to the amendments, Alderney Representative McKinley would you like to be relevé?

Alderney Representative McKinley: Thank you very much, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Six amendments have been circulated. I understand there may be a seventh; hopefully it will be possible to circulate that at lunchtime.

But we will begin with amendment 3, to be proposed by Deputy Le Pelley, seconded by Deputy Dudley Owen.

Deputy Le Pelley, would you like the amendment to be read?

Deputy Le Pelley: I think people have heard enough of me, sir, it would be nice to have another voice.

The Bailiff: Greffier, can you read amendment 3?

The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley.

Amendment 3.

To delete Proposition 8 and to substitute the following Proposition:

'8. To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to establish an Advisory Panel including representatives from existing secondary, post-16 and training providers, including the Sixth Form Centre, the College of Further Education, the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and the GTA University Centre, with responsibility for advising upon an appropriate governance structure for the future provision of secondary and post-16 education; such Advisory Panel to consider, inter alia, the advantages and disadvantages of -

a) Governance over all post-16 education and training providers

b) Governance over the Further and Higher Education Institute, Institute of Health & Social Care Studies and GTA University Centre

c) Governance over the Sixth Form College and three 11-16 schools

d) The creation of a Guernsey University College

and return to the States by March 2019 with a policy letter setting out proposals for a preferred governance model, which take into account the considerations of the Advisory Panel.'

Deputy Le Pelley: Sir, Members, I think this amendment is pretty straight forward and the explanatory note covers the reasons why we felt it necessary to propose an amendment to our own Propositions.

This amendment is a sincere attempt to clarify our thinking over the co-design of the future governance of our new secondary and post structure, and yes we are absolutely committed to independent governance once we have decided what our structure is going to be.

The placing of this amendment is a sincere attempt to confirm that whatever governance structure we propose to you by March 2019 it will be informed by those leading and working in our existing institutions. We want them around the table, we want them to share their views and we want them to help co-design something that works in the Guernsey context,

Sir, this Assembly will have the final say as the amendment makes a commitment for us to return here setting out proposals for a preferred governance model, which takes into account the considerations of the Advisory Panel. I would also note that this amendment does not limit membership of the Advisory Panel to just those representatives listed. I believe Deputy Soulsby wishes to see representation from the Committee for Health & Social Care, as one of the largest

customers of the Institute of Health & Social Care Studies, on the Panel, and we are very happy to include such a representative.

1000 So, Members, I do not think I need to add anything further at this stage, and hope Members will support this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley Owen, do you second the amendment.

1005 **Deputy Dudley Owen:** Yes, I do, and may I speak now?

The Bailiff: You may, yes.

1010 **Deputy Dudley Owen:** Sir, I have been one of the key authors in drafting this amendment, so I think it is worth providing some background and more detail to its aim.

It is intended that the Advisory Panel will co-design the most appropriate governance model for post-16 education. The framework and timeline for delivery of this structure will ultimately be proposed by the Committee which will have used the Advisory Panel recommendations to help shape their policy letter to be presented to the States by March 2019.

1015 In our Propositions we give post-16 education its shape, we will create a dynamic organisation for full-time students, 16-19 years old, which is fit for the future, and which is capable of accommodating future changes in educational policy. It will provide the greatest flexibility for future developments and enshrine the principle of creating a secondary environment for 11-16 and separate 16-19 provision. In any governance structure the board of governors have
1020 responsibility for the strategic direction of the organisation, and under good governance structures will hold the head or principal to account for the quality and standards of their school or college. They will also approve budget plans presented by the head and manage the performance of the head teacher. The head or principal is responsible for the operational management of the school, including hiring and firing of staff, or processes linked to teaching and
1025 learning and for the management of the budget.

The deliberations of the Advisory Panel will help to co-design the most appropriate governing structure for the future provision of secondary and post-16. They will consider the advantages and disadvantages of various options as listed in our amendment, which will ultimately define a preferred governance model for our secondary schools, post-16, and further and higher education
1030 provision. Where the governance sits will dictate the ethos, the culture, and how the underlying organisations will work together for the benefit of the students. Here lies the opportunity and possibility for the full-time and part-time schedules of the post-16 environment to be synchronised.

The amendment clarifies the Committee's intention to devolve accountability and
1035 responsibility to college and school leaders; we accept that there is a need for greater understanding for how post-16 arrangements will work in practice, which has been of concern to the College of Further Education. We continue to carry out talks and to work with them to provide further clarification, and this amendment ensures that they, and other key stakeholders, will be included in co-designing the governance model which provides the best outcome for students
1040 and staff. The College, the GTA, the Institute of Health, the Sixth Form Centre, a representative of the secondary schools and others, including, for example, a representative of HSC, are the stakeholders who will sit on the Panel.

Through you, sir, I hope that Members will support this amendment.

1045 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Sir, I came late to the party in a sense and was initially cautious about supporting an amendment along these lines, but I think once the alternative model was published, and many Members of the Committee, more senior than myself, have met with

1050 representatives from the different branches of education, that we knew that this actually was
needed and was useful, because there had been different voices raised perhaps about how things
would move forward. We are confident we have a robust idea and model moving onwards, but
what is needed is dialogue between all the different parties, and this is not a new phenomenon;
indeed about 10 years ago, when Deputy McNulty Bauer was in the States and the late Deputy
1055 Storey, this process started and it is needed now to very much make long awaited progress.

For my part, as an individual, I see the future, assuming Education, Sport & Culture win, as a
very rosy and positive one, but it could be, and probably should be, that within this work stream
that hopefully will be approved today, there will be not only constructive dialogue on structure
and to a certain extent the skills that we need, but there will be synergies. It could well be that
1060 bodies such as the Sixth Form Centre, the College of Further Education, which will be an Institute
or University College, Institute of Health & Social Care Studies and the GTA will find new ways of
working together, and it could well be in the longer term there may well be professionals
lecturers, teachers, who find themselves involved professionally in supporting more than one
organisation with a sort of portfolio of responsibilities, because clearly what we want is
1065 constructive co-operation and efficiency and choice. What we do not want are a duplication
unnecessary with man power and cost dysfunctions.

So I think this is a very useful project and will work regardless of what exactly happens.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

1070 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, why does it take so long? We are talking about a report coming back
in 14 months' time for the States then to decide on the governance. Deputy Gollop talks about
something that started 10 years ago, so we are going to be over 11 years, and then how long after
that is it going to take to be implemented. Hopefully, and there is a degree of circumspection in
1075 the use of that adverb, we will make a decision this week about the future of education. If so, why
can't this start next week. We have got a –

I am not going to give way. If it is a point of correction, fine, but if it is not, I am not giving way.
Deputy Le Pelley has had his speech –

1080 **Deputy Le Pelley:** It is a point of correction, sir.
Just to say that it is not –

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy le Pelley.

1085 **Deputy Le Pelley:** Point of correction, sir.

The amendment is to report back *by* March, not *in* March, it will start much earlier than that
and if we can get back earlier than that we will.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

1090 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Well, I spent until 2 o'clock this morning reading, and it just shows how
important I think it is, I am sure everybody else does, reading the March 2016 *Hansard* debate on
education, because I thought it was important to refresh my memory. I was not in the States at
the time, and there were some wonderful quips from Deputy Perrot when he was interrupted
1095 saying 'I have heard all of that before'.

So I have heard people say they are going to come back earlier than they say to the States
before, but I have seen very little experience of that in my political lifetime. But we have had a
shadow board of governance, or whatever they are called, in relation to the College of FE, why
can't the button be pressed for those people? They are capable people, they are people that
1100 should be doing the job now, and it should all be free from political interference. For goodness'
sake, let us get on with it. If this was the real world rather than this political world where we all

take forever to decide anything and then re-debate it 17 times in the future and still do not make any decisions, and come back to where we started. Why can't we decide that whatever proposals are passed that these boards are given, let's be realistic, by the end of June, which is still five months off, power to operate free from State interference, and I do not care that there might be a Statute that says you cannot do it, or that you have got to amend something. Let's live in the practical world, let's do something constructive. This is far too long; this should have been dealt with years ago.

The Bailiff: I see no one else rising.
Deputy Le Pelley, you may reply.

Deputy Le Pelley: I just think this is a very sensible move; it helps us to move things along. As Deputy Ferbrache has said, March 2019 is some way away, but I would hope that we can move on much quicker than that, but this was a final date, not an intended date, or a target date, we will be moving much quicker than he fears, and we hope this amendment will be passed today.

The Bailiff: We vote then on amendment 3, proposed by Deputy Le Pelley, seconded by Deputy Dudley Owen. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.
We will take next amendment 5, to be proposed by Deputy Soulsby and seconded by Deputy Prow.

Deputy Soulsby, do you wish it be read or will you summarise the effect of it?

Deputy Soulsby: I think I would like it to be read for the record.

The Bailiff: You'd like it to be read for the record. Greffier.

The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Amendment 5.

To insert after Proposition 15 the following Proposition:

'16. To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and the Committee for Health & Social Care to develop collaboratively any strategic proposals relating to the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and to take into account, when developing those proposals, States' resolution 13 of Art XII, Billet d'État No XXIV of 2017 with the aim of identifying and, as far as possible, delivering within this electoral term options to ensure that:-

- the services provided by the Institute are responsive to the needs of the Bailiwick's health and care system, both in terms of the courses delivered and the spaces available;*
- the Institute is seen as a first choice provider of professional qualifications for health and care professionals through providing a competitive offering which is proactively marketed across the Bailiwick and beyond;*
- where it is not possible to deliver particular health and care courses locally, mechanisms are in place to support islanders' off-island studies and to encourage their return to the Bailiwick on qualification;*
- there are close working relationships with education providers across the Bailiwick to ensure opportunities exist and are promoted for learners, from both academic or vocational pathways, to*

realise their potential for a health and care career and access appropriate professional qualifications;

- opportunities are in place for those wishing to enter health and care professions at a mature age or wishing to return after a career break.

1135 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, this is the first of two amendments I am laying on behalf of the Committee for Health & Social Care, which are intended to be constructive additions to the Propositions we are debating. We have already circulated the views of the Committee in relation to the two models insofar as they impact on the mandate of the Committee, and I do not want to repeat that information here. However, I will make a few points.

1140 As Members will recall, one of the Propositions approved in our policy letter on our Partnership of Purpose transforming Bailiwick health and care was to direct both HSC and ESC to review the training provision and education provided by the Institute to ensure that it continues to meet the health and care needs, and to explore a wide range of off- and on-Island training opportunities.

1145 Just to clarify a point made by the President of ESC earlier, the Health & Social Care is not one of the largest customers of the Institute, it is by far *the* largest customer of the Institute and if HSC does not use the services of the Institute the Institute would not exist.

1150 The reason for this amendment is to build on that Proposition. I think it is fair to say that the Committee is concerned that the original Proposition may well get lost in all the changes that are likely to be needed, whatever model is chosen. In addition, it only covered the Institute and not the provision of health and social care studies more generally with no time set. Our belief is that this matter cannot be allowed to drift.

1155 According to the World Health Organisation, there will be a shortage of 12.9 million health care workers by 2035. It is already estimated there is a shortage of just over 7 million. In the document 'A Universal Truth No Health Without A Workforce' it identifies several key causes. They include an ageing health workforce with staff retiring or leaving for better paid jobs without being replaced. While inversely not enough young people are entering the profession, or being adequately trained. Increasing demands are also being put on the sector from, as we know, a growing world population with risks of non-communicable diseases, such as cancer, heart disease, stroke. Increasing internal and international migration of health workers is also exacerbating regional imbalances, and that is a stark reality of the situation we face. Now, whilst we have sought to address these issues in our policy letter, we are concerned that in the whole lead up to this debate little attention has been given to the Institute, other than in its reporting line.

1160 There is a crisis in the UK, and beyond, in terms of the numbers of qualified health and care professionals at all levels. We are already impacted by short-sighted decisions by the UK Government to take away bursaries for nursing trainees, and the Brexit decision has sought to reduce the number of foreign nationals moving to the UK. Today we have heard the number of nurses leaving the NHS exceeded joiners and leavers last year for the first time by 3,000 workers. What is clear is we cannot just rely on the NHS to provide us with our workforce, as we have done in the past; we need to grow our own and consider attracting people to train here.

1170 ESC has a really important part to play, and not just through the Institute, the College of Further Education plays a crucial role as a provider of health and care training. Currently there are 23 year two level three students, around half of whom we expect to go direct to HSC or other care providers, and others going on to take a degree in a related subject. In addition, there have been 1175 35 adult learners on part-time course in the last two years who have been employed by HSC or other health and care providers on Island.

But frankly we need more. We have really got to up our game, and I hope that the new T-levels will provide that opportunity with distinct health and social care pathways.

1180 Now, as this is a Committee amendment, I will not say where I believe these are best delivered, but in any event this amendment is relevant whatever model is chosen. But we need to understand what the requirement is and how it will be delivered now.

The Committee looks forward to working with the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, to develop a coherent system for education and training of the health and care workforce that meets the needs of Guernsey and which is the purpose of this amendment and which I ask Members to support.

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

Deputy Prow: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Le Pelley, do you wish to speak on it at this stage?

Deputy le Pelley: I will yes, sir.

The Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture is fully supportive of this amendment. We ask all Members to support it.

Personally, if I may make a personal statement, I agree with practically everything the President of HSC has said about the situation.

Please support it.

The Bailiff: I see no one else rising. Oh sorry, Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: Thank you.

Just very briefly, sir. As Vice-President of the Committee for Health & Social Care, I would normally have seconded any amendment that was laid on behalf of the Committee. I just want to ensure the fact that on this occasion these amendments are seconded by Deputy Prow is not misinterpreted to create an assumption that I am not supportive of them. The truth is that as I have been so intimately involved in the preparation of the alternative model, I sat out any discussion which the Committee held around the future structure of education. I would have been more than happy to support these amendments by seconding them, and I will be supporting them in the vote.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, do you wish to reply at all?

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, no, I have nothing else to add other than I welcome the support from the President of ESC.

The Bailiff: We vote then on amendment 5, proposed by Deputy Soulsby, seconded by Deputy Prow. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

Next, amendment 6, with the same proposer and seconder.

Again, would you like it to be read?

Deputy Soulsby: Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: In fact we need to amend it slightly because, having just approved the last amendment, we have now inserted a Proposition 16, so I think the next one needs to be amended to say '*to insert after Proposition 16 the following Proposition*' and then begin it with 17 rather than 16.

Subject to that, could you please read it?

The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment

1235 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Amendment 6.

To insert after Proposition 16 the following Proposition:

'17. To direct the Committee for Education, Sport and Culture to embed an "environment for health" ethos across all aspects of education provision in the Bailiwick (including educational outcomes, the learning environment, curriculum, policies and procedures and partnership working) and to make use of any opportunities to meet the mental, emotional, social and physical wellbeing needs of all learners.'

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, I will be briefer than I was in my last statement, you will be pleased to hear. The second amendment again reflects the necessity of a close working relationship between HSC and ESC to meet the objectives of the Policy & Resource Plan, the Partnership of Purpose and to enable our children and young people to have the best start in life.

1240 I will not go into great detail again because of the information already provided to Deputies prior to this debate, but the Committee did think it was important that amongst all the talk about what education should be provided where a key point had been largely missed, and that was the importance of the mental, emotional, social and physical wellbeing needs of all learners.

1245 Again, like our first amendment, this amendment seeks to reinforce the message of our approved Proposition in the policy letter approved last month, just to affirm that the States, in all its policy decisions, should consider the impact of those decisions on health and wellbeing and make use of any opportunities to improve health, or reduce health inequalities, across all Government policies. The importance of this is set out in the Children and Young People's Plan which has recently been refreshed and which represents an example of joint working between
1250 officers at HSC and ESC.

However, we believe that given the fundamental importance of the subject matter we are debating, and whichever model is chosen, this should not be forgotten and be an integral part of the transformation of secondary education.

1255 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Prow, do you second it?

Deputy Prow: Yes, I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy le Pelley, do you wish to say anything?

1260

Deputy Le Pelley: Yes, sir.

More or less what I said last time. We are happy to support this amendment and hope everybody else is too.

Thank you.

1265

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

1270 **Deputy Gollop:** I want to support the amendment because it works towards a dream where every student, both now and in the future, eats healthily; does not go for junk food; takes exercise; sees the benefit of a mile a day; and keeps on track of their work, and if I have not always practiced what I preach, well, maybe I can be an evangelist for the next generation.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stephens.

Deputy Stephens: Thank, you, sir.

1275 This amendment reminds me that many years ago when speech and language therapists were
very few on-Island, a solution to providing that service was that teachers should undertake some
of the speech and language therapy duties with pupils while they were in school during the school
day. It was soon discovered that teachers did not have the competencies; after all they were
1280 trained teachers, they were not trained speech and language therapists. Accountability lines for
quality of service became blurred, and paying for additional training and reporting on the service
within schools became an issue.

So whilst I am sure that teachers and staff in schools will always do as much as they can to
protect the welfare and health of pupils, I, as a Member of this Assembly, have a difficulty in
making a commitment to ensure that an environment for health exists in schools without some
1285 assurances that this amendment has been discussed with teachers, with teachers' unions, with
school management teams, and in addition, I need to understand how the partnership
arrangements will work to ensure quality of service; how third sector groups are to be involved,
and who will pay for training and monitoring reports on the health environment activities
undertaken in schools. So, therefore, who accepts accountability for quality of that environment of
1290 health in schools, and I need that information, I think, sir, before I can vote positively on this
amendment.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby will reply.

1295

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, yes.

Basically, and in answer to Deputy Stephens, this amendment is a progression of our previous
Proposition, as I said, and it should be of no surprise that Health & Social Care should submit this
amendment which follows very much along our Partnership of Purpose. We have not gone out to
1300 consultation, quite frankly, but what I can say is I have personally received very positive feedback
from teachers involved actually in the mental health sphere within schools on the Island.

In terms of taking responsibility, well, the whole States of Guernsey should take responsibility,
and I think that is something we need to learn within this Chamber, that we are one States of
Guernsey, and as much as it is Education, Sport & Culture who have the workforce that are
1305 responsible for teaching children in schools, other Committees, in particular Health & Social Care,
have a very huge impact and influence on the whole area of environment for health.

The Bailiff: We vote now on amendment 6, proposed by Deputy Soulsby, seconded by Deputy
Prow. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

1310 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

Now, I had proposed that we take amendment 2 next, but I believe that Deputy Fallaize feels
he would rather not open now as he would be pressed to finish before lunch.

Deputy Fallaize, what is the position?

1315 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, and I was going to ask the Greffier to read the amendment out, for
clarity, and by the time that has happened I would not be able to finish by 12.30 p.m.

The Bailiff: You would not be able to finish by 12.30 p.m.

1320 The only thing I wonder – there is an amendment that has not yet been circulated. I have not
seen it; is it going to be likely to be controversial? *(Laughter)* I know it is proposed by Deputy
Ferbrache, but –

Deputy Ferbrache: And seconded by Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Sir, I am able to present it now but of course Members have not seen a copy of it yet.

1325

The Bailiff: It is just if we could deal with it before lunch it seemed to me we could slot it in now, but I do not know. Has the Committee seen it? ... So the Committee has not seen it. So no. In that case I think we will not interpose it at this point.

1330

Deputy Roffey: I am just going to suggest, sir, maybe if we are going to take an early lunch we could come back for 2 o'clock because I think it is vital we get to the end of this debate. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Yes.

1335

Deputy Tindall: Sir, can I suggest the reading of the actual amendment 2 before we go to lunch?

Deputy Roffey: Yes, good idea.

1340

The Bailiff: Well, we have got two choices, we either carry on until 1 o'clock, or whenever it would be when Deputy Fallaize would finish his speech, or we rise now and come back at 2 p.m.

I will put to you – even if we read the amendment it is only going to take five minutes it is not going to make much difference. So I am going to put to you that we continue now and rise after Deputy Fallaize has completed his speech. Those in favour; those against.

1345

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I think that *Contre* carried on that occasion. I put to you then that we rise now and return at 2 p.m. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: Right, we will do that. We will read the amendment at 2 o'clock.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.07 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2 p.m.*

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

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

The Deputy Greffier: Debate continues on the Committee *for* Education, Sport and Culture's policy letter, the Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick.

1350

Amendment 2 is proposed by Deputy M J Fallaize and seconded by Deputy R H Graham:

Amendment 2.

To delete Propositions 1 to 13 and substitute therefor:

1. To agree that the proposals set out in the report entitled The Alternative Model – A Proposal for Opportunity & Excellence, which was published by Deputies M.J. Fallaize, R.H. Graham, M.H. Dorey and R.H. Tooley in December 2017, are preferable to the proposals set out in the Policy

Letter submitted by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and provide a stronger basis upon which to reform secondary and post-16 education in the Bailiwick, and therefore:

2. To agree that from the earliest date practicable secondary and post-16 education shall be organised as follows:

- An 11 to 18 School in Guernsey operating as one organisation comprising two constituent colleges or campuses on different sites, both of which shall include sixth forms;*
- The College of Further Education operating as one organisation providing vocational, professional and technical education for full-time and part-time students, including apprentices;*
- St. Anne's School in Alderney; and*
- le Murier School and les Voies School operating as Special Schools for students with special educational needs.*

3. To agree that the Education (Guernsey) Law, 1970, as amended, must be repealed and replaced with legislation setting out, inter alia, the educational aims and aspirations of a modern democratic society, educational policies adopted by the States in recent years and the powers and duties expected of a government in relation to education as it approaches the third decade of the 21st century.

4. To agree that the replacement legislation must provide for genuine devolution of governance and leadership from the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture (and by extension from the 'Education Office') to the 11 to 18 School and the College of Further Education; and further to agree that it must provide for the CfESC (supported by the 'Education Office') to focus on 'central government' functions – for example, education law, strategy and substantial policy, curriculum, funding arrangements and the accountability of performance and standards in schools and colleges.

5. To agree that the development of the replacement legislation provides an ideal opportunity to consider the most appropriate long-term relationships and governance arrangements between all providers of secondary and post-16 education, including in relation to provision for students with special educational needs; and further to agree that in any event there must be a firm requirement for the strongest possible collaboration between all providers of secondary and post-16 education, including strengthening collaboration between the 11 to 18 School and the College of Further Education for the benefit of students of all abilities and interests.

6. To agree that the 11 to 18 School, operating as one organisation comprising two constituent colleges or campuses, shall have a single board of governors and a single executive leadership team, but the constituent colleges or campuses shall each have a principal and the freedom to develop aspects of their own identity and make their own day-to-day decisions.

7. To agree that the College of Further Education shall have a single board of governors and a single executive leadership team; and further to agree that it shall be an objective of the College to integrate with the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and the GTA University Centre as soon as practicable, most probably to operate as discrete faculties within the same College; and further to agree that it shall be an ambition of the College of Further Education to form a partnership with a UK university, ultimately to replace the title College of Further Education with the title University College Guernsey.

8. To agree that in relation to the admission of students to secondary schools there shall be a two-phase approach to transition: in the first phase the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture shall publish the secondary school catchment areas (or feeder primary schools) for those students who will move to secondary schools in the earliest years which follow the abolition of selection at 11; and in the second phase, once the States have agreed the two sites to be used for the 11 to 18 School, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture shall publish the permanent secondary school catchment areas (or feeder primary schools) which would apply in the long term.

9. To agree that teachers and others working in the education service must be advised of the staff structure for the 11 to 18 School well in advance of the necessary changes to the estate and the inevitable relocation of some staff.

10. To agree that the creation of the 11 to 18 School, operating as one organisation in two constituent colleges or campuses, must be a collaborative endeavour between the four existing secondary schools.

11. To agree that as soon as practicable all students in secondary and post-16 education must have access to the best facilities the Island can afford in a purpose-built 11 to 18 School, operating as one organisation in two constituent colleges or campuses, and in a purpose-built College of Further Education.

12. To note that the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture commissioned architects to assess each of the four existing secondary school sites for use as part of one 11 to 18 School, operating as one organisation in two constituent colleges or campuses; and further to note that the existing secondary school estate is capable of accommodating this model of education; and further to note that the feasibility studies advise that more detailed work is necessary to determine the two most appropriate sites for use; and further to agree that this more detailed work shall be undertaken to allow the States as expeditiously as possible to determine the two most appropriate sites for use.

13. To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to submit to the States all Propositions (and Policy Letters) necessary to enable:

- the organisation of secondary and post-16 education, and
- the preparation of the detailed legislation necessary to implement the legislative changes, as set out above.

The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

1355

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir, and I am sorry for putting the Deputy Greffier through that.

I would like to start by thanking the States for permitting this debate to proceed in January, without which, we would not have been able to lay this amendment.

1360 I would also like to thank all of those people – and there are many dozens of them – who have sent their views to Deputies, whichever side of the argument they sit, in advance of this debate. Whether they are parents or teachers, all of their views are valued and respected and will have been read and gratefully received.

1365 Inevitably, I, in this speech, will dwell on the differences between the Committee's proposals and the alternative model. But, it has to be acknowledged that there are some features, which are common to both models. In particular, at the beginning, at the point of inception of these models. It is common to both models that, in 2019, there will be the first non-selective Year 7 group entering secondary education. That is the same in the alternative model as it is in the Committee's model. For the first few years of our new comprehensive system, there will be four secondary schools. That is common to both models.

1370 It will take some years, in transition, to reduce the number of schools, before either model is established in its final form. For example, in the Committee's model, 11-16-year-olds will be divided across four schools, until the summer of 2023. This is not a criticism, it is just a fact. Whichever model is approved, comprehensive education will start in four schools and we will be entering a period of several years of change and transition, before the model is established in its final form.

1375

But there the similarities between the two models more or less end. The Committee for Education, Sport & Culture is proposing a model which includes schools of vastly different size. One is 60% larger than another. I know there is an amendment that has been submitted, which

may or may not be laid, or debated, later this week; if it is this week. But their original Propositions do include schools of vastly different size.

Their original Propositions ask the States to insert a policy on school size, which is totally unsupported by relevant evidence. Their proposals would mean no 11-18 offer in the state sector. This would be left to the grant-aided colleges only. The Committee's proposals deny teachers the chance to work across the key stages in secondary education. They also divide vocational and technical studies into different colleges, which denies lecturers the chance to practise across all phases of their discipline.

The Committee's proposals for post-16 education are highly unorthodox and have almost no professional support in the post-16 sector. There is no genuine commitment to devolve governance and leadership away from the education centre to schools and colleges, and there is certainly no commitment to replace the outdated 1970 Education Law any time soon.

On the other hand, the alternative model proposes the widest possible range of curriculum opportunities for students, but the same class sizes as in the Committee's proposals. It allows teachers to work across all key phases of secondary education. It proposes schools of a size in line with the highest attaining comprehensive nationally, which are supported by relevant evidence.

The alternative model retains the 11-18 offer in the state sector. It retains vocational and technical education in a single, integrated College of Further Education and is, therefore, more consistent with national developments which are imminent in technical education. It also contains a genuine commitment to devolve governance and leadership away from the education centre, that is both politicians and officers, to schools and colleges, and to replace the outdated 1970 Education Law. States' Members know all of these things, because they have heard them from enough education professionals in the run up to this debate. I will develop some of those thoughts in a moment.

First of all, I want to say something about previous States' Resolutions. Because if the States today, or whenever the decision is going to be made on the amendment, are gathered to arbitrate between the two models, based on which is more consistent with previous States' Resolutions, I might as well sit down now – that would please some people – and we could end the debate, because we would concede entirely.

The Committee's proposals are not fully consistent with previous States' Resolutions. There was nothing in previous States' Resolutions about dividing the College of Further Education. There was nothing in previous States' Resolutions about taking the States out of the 11-18 sector. But it is undeniable that the Committee's package of proposals is more consistent with previous States' Resolutions, than the alternative model.

But I do not think the States are here to arbitrate on which model is more consistent with States' Resolutions. I think the States are here to judge the best possible model to provide for the highest possible educational outcomes in the years ahead. The alternative model proposes larger schools, but not larger class sizes. The 11-16 phase, the pupil-teacher ratios are exactly the same in the Committee's model and in the alternative model. In the post-16 phase, they are slightly favourable to the alternative model.

I do not put that forward, necessarily, as an advantage to the alternative model, it is just a fact. But in the 11-16 phase, in terms of pupil-teacher ratios and class sizes, the two models cannot be separated. If anything, larger schools would provide more flexibility for smaller classes, where they are considered better for some students in some subjects.

The larger schools in the alternative model certainly provide more opportunities for setting. Now, of course, it is up to school leaders and subject leaders to decide how to arrange their curriculum and how to arrange their classes. But there is more opportunity in a nine or 10-form entry school than there is in a five or six-form entry school for setting.

I know that matters to some Members of the States, particularly in a comprehensive system which caters for all, or nearly all, abilities. It was so important in the last debate that it was inserted as a States' Resolution that there had to be provision for subject setting, where relevant. Clearly, there is more opportunity for that in the alternative model.

The schools in the alternative model could provide students with the widest possible range of opportunities, more subject choice, more clubs. We received a very interesting email from somebody, an education professional, involved in mental health and wellbeing of students, only a few days ago, talking in favour of the larger schools and in favour of the alternative model, which advised States' Members to think about larger schools providing:

... more young people to involve in our community of finding each other. Many of us feel found when someone speaks to that part of us that we feel passionate about. In bigger schools there will be greater potential for ukulele clubs, for board game clubs, for autism workshops, for body image workshops, for peer mentoring programmes. There are more likely to be groups of students who can be placed with other students who are like them. Making a school smaller does not make it better and it certainly does not make lost children feel found. There will be lost children in schools which are poorly managed or where staff are not empowered.

This is a point made in a letter States' Members have received from Denis Mulkerrin, which I will refer to in a moment.

There is much less reliance, in larger schools, on single-teacher subjects or single-teacher departments. There is much less chance of having only one music teacher, only one drama teacher, only one teacher of modern foreign languages. Because the greater number of students obviously requires a greater number of teachers per subject.

Therefore, there is greater staff resilience. If you have single staff departments and the member of staff is off ill, or the member of staff is absent for another reason, or leaves – and we know how long it takes, regrettably, to recruit staff very often into schools in Guernsey, which is something I might touch on in a moment – this causes very serious disruption to a student's learning. So it is better for students if there are fewer single-teacher departments and there are greater opportunities for staff collaboration where there are more teachers per subject or per department.

Smaller schools have more non-specialist teachers. This may not be too much of a problem lower down the school, but higher up the school it is a serious problem, and it is happening today in some of our smaller schools and it would continue under some of the schools in the Committee's proposals.

Now, I am not saying any of this for the sake of the teachers. Some teachers would find it more interesting in smaller schools; some might find it more interesting in larger schools. The fact is that the additional staff resilience, the greater resources, the opportunities for staff collaboration and the additional specialist teachers would ultimately be to the benefit of the student. It is the students who matter most in this debate.

Will Morgan, who visited the Island – he is the principal, or head teacher, I think he calls himself, from the Cotswold School – to speak at a public meeting about 11-18 schools, which was hosted by the Deputies behind the alternative model, said in his presentation:

I was a teacher in The Cotswold School when it was just over 600 pupils. I can honestly say that the opportunities in all areas, curriculum, sport, music, drama, competition, teaching, facilities etc. are far better now than they ever were. As a school of 1,350, we are big enough and financially viable enough to provide pupils with what they need. But, we are also small enough to ensure pastoral and support systems are in place to provide the individual care and attention needed by some. In fact, our larger size has allowed us to have counsellors on site; to have a strong SEN department, with an SEN co-ordinator and an assistant SEN co-ordinator; to have an inclusion unit to support behaviour across the school. These are the kinds of things which can happen in larger schools, which generally are denied smaller schools.

Yes, it is true that some small, private, independent schools can replicate that kind of provision, but that is because of their financial resources and they cannot be compared with States' comprehensives.

The important point about size is not that every single teacher should know the name, address and favourite football team of every single child. I, and other Deputies who have been involved in developing the alternative model, have sat in staff rooms with teachers in relatively small schools in recent weeks who have said to us: 'We do not know the names of all the children in our school.' The important point is that every child must be well-known and understood and supported by a

team of staff and everything we know of successful schools tells us that they will do this well, irrespective of size.

Some perspective, in relation to size of schools and size of year groups. The new La Mare de Carteret, proposed and presumably endorsed by the Committee, is an eight-form entry school. Eight classes per year. The schools in the alternative model would be nine or 10-form entry. Nine or 10 classes per year, obviously, with a sixth form. The point is, in terms of year group size, the largest school proposed to the States by the Committee would have eight forms or classes per year, and in the alternative model nine or 10 classes or forms per year. That is the difference between the two models.

So I do not accept that only the alternative model has to provide answers to how students are looked after and developed in larger schools. If the Committee's proposal, as submitted, is accepted, La Mare de Carteret will increase in size, I think I worked out, by 130%. The jump from that to what we are proposing is smaller.

So we are going to larger schools as a result of the previous States' decisions to consolidate the number of schools. The task we face is how to provide high levels of attainment and pastoral support in larger schools. In terms of total numbers, in the schools in the alternative model, there would be just under 1,200 at the low point, and just under 1,400 at the high point. The average over the next 25 years would be 1,286. Almost inevitably, 1,286 would never actually exist as a school roll number because that is just a mathematical equation. But that gives the States some idea of size.

Interestingly, the Grammar School, in the first decade of the 21st Century, had very nearly 1,100 students. I was in the States then and I do not remember receiving multiple complaints that it was terribly oversized and impersonal.

I should say at this point that the proposals in the alternative model are driven not so much by adherence to any particular size of school, although we do think there are advantages in slightly larger schools. But they are driven by the advantages of 11-18 schools. It happens to be the case that if we want 11-year-olds in Guernsey to enter 11-18 schools and we want that to be the basis for our new comprehensive system, simply as a factor of the number of students in Guernsey, the only practical number of schools to have is two.

I am explaining and defending the size of schools in the alternative model, but we are not trying to set a policy on school size, unlike the Committee, which is trying to set a rigid policy that secondary schools must have been 600 and 1,000 students. Indeed, this policy underpins the whole of the secondary education structure proposed by the Committee and it is totally unsupported by relevant evidence.

It claims that this proposal is made as a result of independent research. In fact, this independent research was commissioned by the Committee's predecessors. Previous debates, in fairness to the present Committee, placed quite a lot of weight on this independent research. But I think that during those debates Members were probably ignorant of the true picture of the evidence.

Because that research, produced by the previous Committee – not the present Committee, but the previous Committee – suggesting this optimal school size between 600 and 1,000, was based mainly on research from US high schools, which have only four Year-groups and not five Year-groups or seven Year-groups, as we are familiar with.

In fact, the research on British schools tends to show that attainment increases in schools over 1,000. The European research tends to show that there is only a weak correlation between school size and attainment.

The fact is, there is simply no evidential basis whatsoever, for Proposition 2 in the Committee's policy letter. There is no reason why the States should set an optimal school size between 600 and 1,000. The Committee says that it is based on a wealth of research. It is not. There is no evidence to support it.

Sir, I recall that when the States voted to remove selection at 11 they pledged to capture the very best of comprehensive education. So perhaps it is instructive to look at the 100 leading state

comprehensives nationally measured by GCSE attainment. Ninety per cent of them have more than 800 students. Eighty per cent of them have more than 1,000 students. All of these schemes, 80 of the 100 leading comprehensive schools nationally, would fall outside of the school size policy proposed by the Committee.

1525 These are, presumably, not the type of schools that we wish to see in Guernsey. Well, I can say they are the type of schools I wish to see. The majority of these 100 leading schools have between 1,000 and 1,400 students and the average has 1,200. With the exception of one or two, these leading comprehensives all have sixth forms and a third of them have sixth forms with fewer than 250 students.

1530 So developing this theme of 11-18 schools further, when Deputy Graham and I mentioned these 100 leading schools, as we have once or twice, some people have said, 'You are looking at the wrong schools, because you have got some free schools and you have got voluntary aided schools and you have got faith-based schools, or you have got single-sex schools and some of these schools take boarders.'

1535 So I wish to present to the States a slightly different analysis, today, looking at the leading 11-16 schools in the UK, by GCSE attainment, and the leading 11-18 schools, by GCSE attainment, having removed free schools, voluntary aided schools, faith schools, all schools with borders.

These are state comprehensives, directly comparable to the kind of schools that we are looking to establish in Guernsey. Incidentally, each of these schools in the top 100 has a GCSE attainment rate which is, at least, 10% higher than the Bailiwick average over the last three years, which perhaps gives us some indication of where we should be and where we could get to, if we embrace the opportunities, genuinely, to transform secondary education along comprehensive lines.

1545 Now, I do not know if Members can see this, these are the top 25 of these 100 schools. The important point is the 11-16 schools are in blue and the 11-18 schools are in yellow. Of the leading 25 state comprehensives, three are 11-16 schools and 22 are 11-18 schools. Of the top 50, 40 of them are 11-18 schools. This must be a factor, when we determine the shape of schools that we wish to base our comprehensive system upon.

1550 Moving on to teachers, it is often said that the quality of an education system, or the quality of a school, cannot exceed the quality of its teachers. This must be true. There are many great teachers in 11-16 schools. That is not disputed. Anybody who says all the best teachers are in 11-18 schools is simply being either ignorant or offensive, or probably both.

1555 There are many great teachers in 11-16 schools, but there are many great teachers who want to work only in 11-18 schools. We know this, because Education has repeatedly told us this. The previous Education department, proposing its preferred model at the time, spoke of teachers being able 'to work across all key stages in secondary education, including post-16, thus enhancing their career opportunities and their progression'.

1560 We know it from head teachers. All the secondary head teachers in Guernsey wrote to States' Members, in January last year, advising that they recognised the benefits of 11-18 secondary schools and saying that there were currently teachers working within the high schools, contributing to teaching in the sixth form.

Further development of this will undoubtedly support continued recruitment and retention of high quality staff.

1565 We do have difficulty recruiting teachers. Some of it is our own fault, because of the extraordinary depth of treacle which seems to exist within the recruitment system. The last thing we need to do is to put further barriers in the way of recruiting great teachers. Only the alternative model allows teachers to teach across all key stages of secondary education. We will be putting unnecessary barriers in the way if we vote for the Committee's proposals.

1570 As I have said, the Committee wants to take the States out of the 11-18 sector altogether, leaving this to the grant-aided colleges alone. We believe this would be utterly self-defeating, especially at a time when we are trying to establish and develop our new comprehensive schools. The issues around 11-18 schools are burned deep in the psyche of our culture. They cannot be

removed simply because Deputy Le Pelley's Committee might flick a switch and want them to be removed.

It would be completely self-defeating for us, particularly at this time; I do not want us to enter the new comprehensive era tying one hand behind its back. That is what we would be doing if we come out of the 11-18 sector and leave it completely for the grant-aided colleges. What we have to remember is that we are at the beginning of a journey of comprehensive education. We can learn from the mistakes that were made elsewhere. We do not need to, and we must not, repeat those mistakes. But, sadly, they feature prominently in the Committee's proposals.

A couple of days ago, Denis Mulkerrin wrote to States' Members and his letter was published in the *Press*, and I make no apologies for quoting from it, given the role that he has played in education, both nationally and in Guernsey:

I write this letter based on 40 years' teaching in comprehensive schools in England, including 22 years as head teacher in three different schools, and as a Guernseyman who did the review of the Island's schools in 2011-12. Guernsey must note the key factor in the above development of comprehensive schools, which England took a long time to learn. Your starting point is to get the size and structure of the school right. Today, it is accepted that by far the best model is an 11-18 comprehensive. This is a somewhat larger 11-16 school, with a sixth form attached. This provides much better continuity for pupils, plus economy of scale. It is easier to recruit staff in 11-18 schools, as teachers are able to teach their subject at A-level for part of the week. It is infinitely easier to very accurately set pupils for subjects, according to their ability. There is a wider choice of subjects at GCSE. The positive impact of the sixth form on the school, and particularly the younger pupils. An additional advantage for Guernsey is that 11-18 schools would put pupils on the same footing as pupils attending the 11-18 colleges. In terms of the way pupils see education locally, this is important. All the evidence based on Ofsted inspections, exam results, value added scores, behaviour etc., shows that 11-18 schools deliver the best outcomes for pupils. For years over 90% of the schools in the top 100 comprehensive tables in England have been 11-18. At the same time, the evidence shows that small, 11-16 comprehensives have the poorest outcomes, particularly those in seaside towns.

He goes on:

So, why on earth then, does the Committee recommend 11-16 comprehensive for Guernsey?

Well, I will let Members of the Committee answer that question. I want to go onto governance and the Law. Members know what is being proposed in the new number three and number four, which we are trying to insert. In terms of governance and leadership, it is absolutely essential that there should be a substantial transfer of power from the Education Committee and the Education office, down to the level of schools and colleges.

Politicians and civil servants basically need to get out of the way and allow what are highly paid and professional school leaders to run their institutions. Devolution of governance and leadership would allow more decisions to be made by schools closer to the student, for whose benefit the education system is meant to exist. It places more decision-making where the expertise is most likely to be.

School leavers at secondary level generally want and expect devolution. Many of them have become immensely frustrated by the current, highly centralised regime. Good leaders have been lost because of this frustration. The devolution of governance, leadership and responsibility would inevitably lead to a material reduction in the size of the Education office. Some resources would be reallocated to schools and colleges and some would be saved altogether.

The Committee's policy letter completely fails to grasp the importance of the devolving governance and leadership away from the centre. Yes, following the publication of the alternative model, there was an amendment submitted by the Committee, which has just been debated and approved. Essentially, I agree, I think, with what Deputy Ferbrache was saying when he spoke on that amendment. We have agreed to set up a talking shop.

The previous States agreed to an idea from the previous Committee to set up an advisory panel to look at local management of schools. I can tell you now, whichever model is approved, whatever Resolutions are made by the States, it will not happen unless there is political insistence and political will to drive it through.

The reason I say the Committee has failed to grasp the importance of it is because it is not matched by any urgency to repeal and replace the outdated 1970 Education Law. Let me tell you what happens if you do not deal with the Law at the same time as you deal with governance. Deputy Ferbrache says, why cannot we just devolve governance tomorrow? He did not say 'tomorrow', but he means very quickly. The reason is because the Education Law makes the Committee the governing body. It is all well saying: 'We will set up an advisory panel and we will look at transferring some powers down to the level of schools and colleges.' But they will all be at the discretion of the Committee and the discretion of the Education office.

In Law, the Committee will remain the governing body. These governing bodies will effectively be subcommittees of the Education Committee. That is what happens if you try and devolve without amending the Law. All the Education Committee ever says about the Law, including very recently, in the last few weeks, is: 'We know that parts of it are a bit clumsily worded and some of the language is a bit out of date, but it is permissive, it is flexible, it is as relevant today as it was on the day it was established.' That is the typical phrase – I have read that for years from Education committees.

That completely misses the point. It is the Law which vests so much power unhealthily in the centre. As was identified by Denis Mulkerrin, when he reviewed education services in 2011-12, there is an unusual and unhealthy imbalance in the power relationship in education in Guernsey. Too much is held at the centre and not enough is held by schools and colleges.

So there needs to be a very clear, unambiguous, firm commitment to replace the 1970 Education Law and to drive power in a very sustained way out of the Education office and down to the level of schools and colleges; and, in my view, it will not happen, it will not come close to happening, if the Committee's proposals are accepted.

I want to talk just very briefly about Alderney. Education is a Bailiwick-wide responsibility. There are some paragraphs about Alderney in our report. Certainly, the Alderney Representatives and the people of Alderney should be involved in shaping the new Education Law. The new Law needs to set out the aspirations and the expectations of a modern education system in the 21st Century. That cannot be done unless it is done in conjunction with all stakeholders and providers.

We also think that there needs to be a recognition of a very sensitive issue, which is included in our report, paragraph 3.11.2, because there is a unique concern in Alderney about the removal of selection at 11, which does not apply in Guernsey. As Alderney Representative Jean explained when we had that debate, the 11-plus has been a way – indeed the only way – for students from Alderney to access our education system at that age.

Now, I know this is a very sensitive issue. If you offer students from Alderney an opportunity to come into the Guernsey education system without the 11-plus, there is the danger of the effect it would have on St Anne's. But there are also, of course, the wishes of the parents and the wishes of the students to take into account. I do not think that that issue can be ignored, and, in the drafting of a new Education Law, there is going to have to be close collaboration with Alderney on that very point, to ensure that St Anne's is resilient and viable and sustainable and to ensure that we are providing the best that we possibly can for the students of Alderney.

At post-16, Alderney students would effectively have the same choice that they have now, under the alternative model. They would go, if they wanted to go, to sixth form, to whichever sixth form best catered for their subject choice. If they wanted to go to the College of Further Education, they would go there, which of course in the alternative model remains a single integrated organisation.

Quite how Alderney youngsters would fit into this very strange creature, the rump of the College of Further Education, which the Committee is trying to create for part-time students only, I am not sure. If they wanted to be apprentices, for example. But that is an overview of the kind of role that Alderney would play.

The alternative model has been referred to as the two-school model and really it should not be, because that does not give due regard to St Anne's and Alderney, or to Le Murier or to Les

Voies. For clarification, those schools would remain in the alternative model. Yes, there would be a need, as there would be in the Committee's model, to review their governance in the future.

1660 It is clear, for example, that additional needs provision and special educational needs provision needs to be reviewed, because there is such a disparity of view in that community about how it is provided and how it should be provided in the future. That needs to be incorporated in the new Education Law. But, essentially, there will still be a need for special schools and, obviously, for St Anne's, and therefore it is not properly correct to call it a two-school model.

1665 The alternative model provides very clear proposals for the post-16 sector. A single, integrated FE college, which maintains all vocational and technical studies in one obviously viable organisation, working towards uniting with the GTA University Centre and the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies on a faculty basis and, ultimately, partnering with a UK university to become University College Guernsey.

1670 And a sixth form operating on both school sites. Now it would be a united sixth form but, even if you want to consider them separately, their size would be between 200 and 225, which is in line with the national average. The average sixth form in a local education authority school is 205. Ours would be larger than the grant-maintained colleges' sixth forms and, as I said earlier, a third of sixth forms in the 100 leading comprehensives have fewer than 250 students.

1675 What is required is a new era of collaboration between the post-16 providers. Once governance and leadership have been devolved to the school and the college, those boards – and they must not be shadow boards or subcommittees, they must be properly constituted, with their own legal powers – must be mandated and required to strengthen collaboration between the two organisations. The enrichment opportunities between the two should not be wildly different and there should be equal promotion of post-16 pathways. Again, these things can be enshrined in the Education Law.

1680 We have worked with professionals at the Sixth Form Centre and the College of Further Education, to identify combined pathways, which effectively means A-level and B-Tech, or other level three courses, which could be offered between the sixth form and the College of Further Education, and they are set out at page 44 of our report. It would be possible to have an engineering pathway, a finance pathway, a health and social care pathway and a performing arts pathway.

1685 Now, the Committee would say this is no good, because it will not provide parity of esteem. Unless all the learners are thrown together in one organisation, there will not be parity of esteem. In a way, this is a noble objective. But it is misguided nonsense. For 35 years, the UK has been trying to bring together post-16 learners and it has not come remotely close to establishing parity of esteem.

1690 In Europe, there is much more delineation between what would have traditionally been seen as academic and technical subjects and yet there is much less disparity of esteem. They are much more equal societies. The Nordic countries, Germany, much more delineation. Students make very firm choices at 16, much firmer than we are suggesting, between technical and academic pathways. But much more parity of esteem between them.

1695 Splitting the College of Further Education in two will do nothing to establish parity of esteem for technical studies. It will do the exact opposite. The Committee imagines that by putting the students together in one institution automatically like that, you flick a switch and there is parity of esteem. It is a cultural issue, it is not a structural issue or an issue of buildings.

1700 The Committee's post-16 proposals are highly unorthodox. States' Members know this because they have heard, from the post-16 experts, including the two gentlemen who came over. One was brought over by the four Deputies and one was brought over by the Committee. The message is very clear that, as soon as level three provision in a sixth form college drops below 85% or 90%, level three outcomes are negatively affected. Our level three provision, in what is proposed by the Committee, would be lower – potentially considerably lower – than 85% to 90%. If the Committee's model is approved, we can expect poorer level three outcomes. That means B-Techs, Advanced B-Techs and A-levels.

1710 We know that there are staffing issues. We had circulated to us, by the very individual who Education contracted to study the post-16 curriculum and staffing model, that more than half of the subjects offered at A-level require fewer than two teachers. In fact, nearly half of them require fewer than one teacher. This is the type of experience which can be expected at the post-16 college proposed by the Committee. There would be very many vulnerable subjects.

1715 The Committee says do not worry about that, because the post-16 college will be run along faculty lines. As if it does not matter if the 1.1 physics teacher is not in today, because there is a chemist lying around somewhere, who can come from the science faculty and teach the lesson. That may be okay at Year 7; it may even be okay at GCSE, for a short period; it is not okay at A-level. We need subject specialists.

1720 The synergy we get in teaching, in our education system at secondary and post-16 level, is that the A-level and IB teachers teach in the 11-16 phase as well – 90% of them or so. The lecturers in full-time studies also lecture apprentices and other part-time courses. They are the two sets of synergy that we achieve. The Committee's proposals split them both right down the middle. Full-time lecturers cannot do part-time courses any more; A-level teachers cannot teach 11-16 any more. It completely splits the current teaching arrangement upon which our system is based.

1725 We do not have enough sixth formers or level three students to make a conventional sixth form college work well. If we had 3,000 students, we could have school-based sixth forms, we could have a sixth form college, we could have a general FE college. That is what you would find, nationally. But we do not have that. The generally accepted advice is that sixth form colleges find it very hard, once their level three students drop below 1,000. We would have many fewer than 1,000 level three students.

1730 The training college which is being proposed by the Committee, the rump of the College of Further Education, once all their full time learners have been removed, just absurdly divides vocational and technical studies. No one is doing this. Nowhere in the world is this done. You can run tertiary colleges, where all the post-16 learners come together. You can have general FE colleges and school-based sixth forms. You can have level three sixth form colleges. Nobody is dividing technical and vocational studies.

1735 This is an unorthodox model in the extreme. It would stop lecturers from practising across the full range of their discipline and what happens if you cannot recruit and retain the best staff, who want to work across their full professional range? The students will suffer.

1740 We also know that technical education is changing. T-levels, which are the most significant reform in decades, are being introduced imminently. They are mentioned in two sentences in the Committee's policy letter. That is all the acknowledgement that is given to them and they are the most significant reform in technical education in decades.

1745 The basic thrust is that T-levels are not going to be delivered in sixth form colleges, which are concentrating on level three provision, but T-levels marry the need for college-based technical studies and employment-based technical studies. That means classroom learning or workshop learning and apprenticeships in one place. We can achieve that if we keep the College of Further Education together, but the Committee's proposals divide apprentices and full-time vocational learners between two different institutions.

1750 Only the alternative model is well-placed to allow Guernsey to adapt to T-levels and to take advantage of them, because we want to maintain all technical studies in a single, integrated college. That would also provide a stronger basis, a stronger, larger, more resilient organisation to partner with the GTA University Centre and the Institute and, ultimately, with a UK university, to form University College Guernsey.

1755 The Committee claims that the rump of the College of Further Education could quite quickly evolve into the Guernsey University College. This is highly unlikely. It may not even be an attractive partner. In the post-16 sector, generally, the training college that is proposed is regarded as an unviable organisation.

1760 Quickly, I will say something about sixth form curriculum modelling, because the Committee has suggested that there would be a reduction in the curriculum offer in the sixth forms in the

alternative model. Members have received the advice of the very person who Education contracted to model the two sixth forms in the alternative model.

He says:

I want to make it absolutely clear as regards the curriculum which will be available in two school sixth forms. There has been a significant amount of scaremongering in this regard, with claims that students would have limited choice of subjects, or would need to travel *en masse* between sites, to access their chosen subjects. This is simply not true. It is correct that the IB would be available on one site and that a small number of minority subjects would be available on the other. However, with this level of provision, 95% of students would be able to access their first choice of subjects, exactly the same as is the case currently in the Sixth Form Centre attached to the Grammar School. There would be a small number of students, fewer than 10%, who may need to move from their 11-16 school to the other sixth form on a full-time basis, in order to access their preferred subjects. This affects just 20 students in the modelling I constructed. This modelling was scrutinised by Education officers and members of the Committee's project team and was verified as accurate and realistic.

1765 So it is quite clear, there is no narrowing of the curriculum offer at the sixth form level in the alternative model.

Very briefly, I cannot gloss over this, because if I do, Deputy Ferbrache will say I have missed out the key part. Practical considerations, because Deputy Ferbrache wants me to stand here and say that if he votes in favour of our model, a week on Friday we will be able to say to him: 'That is where the two schools are going to be. That is how much it is going to cost. This is how many traffic movements there will be, etc.'

1770 I do understand the uncertainty and the questions which arise as a result of that. Traffic studies were carried out by the Committee and I think the phrase used in their consultants' report is that there were no showstoppers. So we know from a traffic perspective, that the schools in the alternative model can work. The architects who were commissioned by the Committee advised that two of the four existing sites can accommodate the schools in the alternative model and that one could, with the purchase of additional land.

1775 We now know, for reasons which States' Members know about and have been played out through email exchanges, which we do not need to go into, enough about the fourth site to know that it requires further analysis. The architects' advice. Not our architects, these are the architects commissioned by the Committee. They say: 'You need more information, you need more detailed studies, before you can make a decision about which are the two optimal sites.' That is their advice. I do not think we have any choice but to accept their advice.

1780 In terms of costs, there is no question that the alternative model is likely to be more expensive in terms of capital costs, because at the school level we would have to extend two schools and the Committee's model just rebuilds one school. Although, there might be some changes at Beaucamps, as a result of a later amendment. But it is likely to be more expensive in terms of capital costs.

1785 In terms of revenue costs, at the moment there is a difference of £400,000 showing in the Committee's favour. This is on total annual expenditure of around £25 million in the secondary and post-16 sector. But that figure came down. The Committee circulated something to States' Members saying that our model would be over £1 million a year more expensive. A couple of weeks later, it was down to £400,000. I was quite optimistic that, if we could have managed to get on about another week, we would have probably gone into positive territory.

1790 The fact is that we are proposing two organisations on three sites. The Committee is proposing five organisations on five sites. The idea that our model is going to be more expensive is nonsensical and you can hold me to that. In terms of transition, I think one of the proposals we are trying to insert explains the approach that one would have to take to transition if the alternative model is approved.

1800 You would have to do it in two phases. You would have to provide certainty, say, at least for the students currently in Years 5 and 4, so they knew very quickly where they were going to secondary school. Then, once you had identified your two sites and you had moved towards the

implementation phase, you could then announce the catchment areas or the feeder primary schools for those two secondary schools in the long term.

1805 I understand the concerns about what happens in the next few years, but are we going to sacrifice the quality of education for the next 20 or 30 years just so that today we can have more certainty for the period of the next three or four years? I do not think we should. I think we have got to look at least into the medium, if not the long term, and determine the best education model. I think Deputy Le Pelley said this was about determining the best education model.

1810 We need a secondary and post-16 culture which is founded on aspiration and support, which equally values students' attainment and progress and their wellbeing. It should create an environment for learning where students of all abilities are respected and able to fulfil their potential.

1815 A broad, rigorous and engaging curriculum should develop both knowledge and skills. These are the hallmarks of the best comprehensive schools. They are not created simply by flicking a switch and turning off selection at 11. That is how much went wrong in the early days of comprehensives in England and yet this approach runs through the Committee's proposals like the lettering in a stick of rock.

1820 The Committee's proposals, in the view of the authors of the alternative model, are lacking in aspiration, are lacking in ambition. There could not be a bigger gap between the words of Deputy Le Pelley this morning, 'a world-class education system', and the actual proposals that the Committee is putting before the States.

1825 What the States are being presented with, in the Committee's proposals, is a recipe for mediocrity. What is required is genuine transformation, not just flicking a switch and turning schools which used to be grammar schools, or used to be secondary moderns or high schools, into comprehensives.

1830 The removal of selection at 11 means that secondary and post-16 education is about to undergo a period of substantial transformation. This transformation should be based not on convenient management of the existing estate, but on educational policy and educational outcomes. It is the alternative model which would put the Bailiwick in the best position to realise the twin objectives of comprehensive education: excellence and opportunity. I urge Members to support it.

1835 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Graham, do you formally second the amendment?

Deputy Graham: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley, do you wish to speak at this point in the debate?

1840 **Deputy Le Pelley:** Not at this point.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, Members.

1845 Deputy Fallaize, I have got to congratulate you on your speech, but I am going to pull bits of it apart, I am afraid. Through you, sir, obviously. When I put myself forward as a candidate into politics, I came to this Assembly, eyes wide open. I came in as a selectionist, with a manifesto to promise to fight hard for the retention of selection and the highly successful Grammar School.

1850 In November 2016, we came to debate, and the decision of the previous Assembly was reaffirmed. Shortly after that there was a motion of no confidence on the Committee. This was defeated. At the end of the actual vote of no confidence, I was contacted by Deputy Le Pelley – trust me, no one was more surprised than me, I can assure this Assembly – asking if I would assist him on his Committee, delivering the States' Resolutions that we have in front of us.

I think, back then, as four of the Committee had voted to retain the 11-plus, the expectancy in some quarters, the feeling possibly, was that selectionists could not deliver a mixed ability system. The expectancy, I believe, was delay. The expectancy was shenanigans. Some thought they would bring selection back through the back door, by some other means. Maybe middle schools. Or maybe we would try some form of stalling.

We did not frustrate. We worked extremely hard, along with our incredible staff, and we have delivered the Resolutions of the States. We have delivered in the time specified and we have done what was asked of us. Trust me, this is not me asking for any pity. I do not give any quarter, I do not take any quarter. I am just going through how we got here today.

In the summer, we went through an extensive consultation process. We spoke to staff, we addressed their concerns. We have accepted that the post-16 governance needs work and I think the amendment has addressed that. We moved the HR and recruitment back a year and the feedback from the parents, who ultimately are the most important in this, those that want certainty were, by and large, asking us one single question: where is my child going? That was their primary concern in this process.

Yes, of course, there were oddities in the grammar transition. How could there not be? You do not delete selective schools and create a non-selecting system overnight. We are obliged to ensure that the selected children stay in a selected cohort and, with the delivery of the third 11-16, the new – what I am calling – La Mare de Carteret School, we were actually quite lucky that the transition worked as well as it did. Having a green field, maybe part marsh, at least, helped the transition hugely. Not perfect by any means, but we delivered exactly what was asked of us, with little or no resistance.

I accept Deputy Fallaize's general thoughts on some of the post-16 – we could have done better, but we are trying to address that. Right now, the parents are comfortable. They know exactly where they are going. Everything is in place to push forward with the three 11-16 schools as directed. Through the summer, we started hearing mutterings. Deputies started to say to us what about the educational outcomes, where are the benefits post 11-plus? Our consultation was not to the policy letter.

Now, that struck me as odd, because some of this was coming from the people who voted to remove selection. I remember the outcomes as soft rather than hard. So I took it upon myself to go right back in time to 8th March 2016, to understand exactly what was being asked and to see if there was something that I have missed. If you will bear with me, Members, and through you, sir, I am starting at the debate of 8th March 2016.

I do not need to remind Members that were there, this debate was led by Deputy Sillars, as head of the then Education Department, where multiple amendments were laid, a sursis and, I think the most important amendment was the Deputy St Pier amendment where we got down to our four to three schools. That was the debate whether to remove selection. The Education Department at the time wanted a federated four-school model, which eventually, after quite a few days, it looked like three or four days, became three schools at 11-16.

To concentrate on the educational outcomes, for a moment, what I am noticing through this debate, we are all trying to out educationally outcome each other. I am not entirely sure the basis of this or even the substance of some of this, to be perfectly frank with you. Some think it is soft, some people think it is hard. Anyway, Deputy Sillars opened debate with impassioned plea to remove the Island of selection and deliver future education in an all-ability system, under that federated model.

In his opening speech, he reminded the Assembly about the aspirations of his then board for young learners. I will not go through the whole of it, but I will quote:

The board has been at pains to explain our core values being key to developing our current proposals and our core values clearly outline enjoyment of learning, collaborative working, inclusive and personalised learning, breadth and depth of opportunities, enhanced participation.

I will not do any more of that portion of the speech, but you get the idea where the President of the time was heading. Those were the first two statements of the 8th March selection debate, where the values of the Committee – not necessarily educational outcomes, but heading in that direction – set out the scene for the rest of debate.

1905 In Deputy St Pier's response – and this is actually quite interesting – he seemed to be critical of the board, as its policy letter contained no measurable outcomes. Now, Deputy St Pier's words at the time were:

The policy letter of March 2016, contains no measures of improved educational outcomes. What are they to be and how will we know if they have improved?

1910 Now, I have looked through the whole of the *Hansard* and, if Deputy St Pier was expecting measurable outcomes, as I would understand – like having more widgets or less widgets – I think he was going to be disappointed. They were basically soft outcomes more than necessarily an improvement at a grade or an extra A-level. There was no promise of that through any of this debate. None whatsoever.

1915 So I am not even too sure, when we talk about outcomes, if everyone has got the same understanding. It reminds me, when we talk about local management, I think the comment from the Policy & Resource Plan about local management, even that says, 'I am not entirely sure that everyone understands what local management is.' But, anyway, I will move on.

1920 I want to make it clear, this is definitely not me having a side-swipe at those who removed selection. It is mainly for me to paint a picture of what has gone before, to demonstrate there appears to be no hard educational outcomes. Not me, as a practical person, would understand. They were more societal. It was the 'better person', the 'whole child'. That was what it was. There was no hard educational outcome. Not as I understood it. They all seem fairly soft: wellbeing of the child, community, fairness, that kind of stuff.

1925 I will give you some more examples from that time, many of which you will recognise, as they were used again in the same debate only 12 or so months ago, when we had selection: the sequel. They were about passing or failing, 'non-separation of children at 11', 'separation of siblings', 'a bad predictor of ability or potential'. These are quotes, by the way. 'Evidence states the 11-plus is discredited', 'educational advice is to remove 11-plus', 'educating children together improves the general standard of achievement' – that was from the NUT – 'unanimity from heads', I cannot even say it, you know what I am saying. And, from the most recent debate, Deputy Fallaize's quote, which I like, and I am probably misquoting, 'We are separating goats from goats.'

1930 Having read the whole of the March 2016 and November 2016 debates, there was never any promise of an educational outcome beyond that which I have described. I will caveat that by saying that soft outcomes in school are the hard outcomes that we pour out of the system. The rounded individual, the work-ready individual. What you pour into the mixing bowl of education, how you need, how you have the various ingredients, how you prove it, will determine the quality of the resulting cake. I think, ultimately, that is what this outcome is about. It is what you pour out at the end of the system, rather than what you have necessarily poured in.

1935 Now, I knew I was not imagining things and consultation would be conducted in respect of where our children were going, what size the estate was; the tactical nitty gritty of how we extract one school out of a selective system and deliver the Resolutions of this Assembly were sound. It was a tactical consultation.

1940 The slow, but important introduction to a public getting used to a world without the Grammar School. A sensible and pragmatic process to an uncertain public, and I cannot repeat this any more, their main concern, which surprised me – I almost thought it would be a nigh-on rebellion when we went to the public meeting at the Grammar School and actually rebellion came from the teachers; there were very few Grammar School teachers there ... In the main, the people of this Island, over the summer period, had understood that selection was gone and their main pushback and the main concern for their children was: where is my child going?

1950 Now, it is true that we had and still have some issues with our post-16 and we are seeking to amend that with the full explanatory. But it now seems a little bit opportunistic for some Deputies to start building a picture of educational outcomes-lite, where two of them were in the last two selection debates and agreed the steer of our Committee.

1955 You would have thought so, but the March 2016 debate got progressively more surreal, as I dug a little deeper. Where it gets particularly surreal, Deputy Fallaize, Deputy Dorey are certainly saying different things than they were saying two years ago. Deputy Graham is saying something different than he was saying a year ago. Let us remind ourselves how evidence seems to be changing – whenever I say, ‘I was going to say ...’ I end up saying it and wishing I had not, but I will say – depending on the political whims of whoever decides to build a picture around whatever they want to achieve.

1960 Now I am going to turn to part of the debate where we moved from the four to three schools solution. I will touch on the size of the schools, federation and the evidence that was used at the time. It was not all Education reports. A lot of it came from senior leadership. Now, the names were not used, but I assume that same leadership is still in place now.

1965 The evidence of only two years ago, the evidence of the UCL, the various quotes from educational leads, have been dismissed or conveniently forgotten maybe. I will run through some of them for you. I am going to start with the 10th January debate, where Deputy St Pier made powerful arguments to move from the four- to the three-school model. I remember listening at the time, through you sir, to Deputy St Pier. I thought that was fairly brave. We had just got rid of the 11-plus and then the cheeky chappie carried on and decided to move it from four to three schools.

1970 It was a sound argument. An all-ability system could not work with schools that were sub-optimal and some of our schools were under 500 and, if I can remind Members, the optimal size was between 600 and 1,000. I will share with some of the Members the evidence and reasoning that got us here today, and these are excerpts from *Hansard*. For the purpose of clarity, there is nothing, I hope Deputy St Pier will agree, that has been taken out of context. I am more than happy to give way if he believes I am in any way misrepresenting him. Now this is the evidence of only two years ago that gave us the size of our schools. Only two years ago.

1975 On federation, Deputy St Pier evidenced from a school leader. This is not a UCL report, this is from a school leader. This is the evidence that was being used two years ago and it will be different evidence today. These are probably excerpts from emails, letters that were going into the paper, all this kind of stuff that gets built up around any particular educational policy and this is from a school leader:

Having worked on the federation curriculum offer from the day that the secondary schools were told that they must operate such an offer, I have had serious reservations about the practicalities, effectiveness in terms of educational outcomes and value for money at this way of working. To commit to the expansion of such a way of working and to actually rely on this as a pre-requisite for the new structure, before there has been any evaluation of the effectiveness of the current federational vision is, in my opinion, very high risk. Federation does not work.

1985 And the Assembly agreed with that only two years ago. The same school leader said the following about the size of schools. Now, this is not an English comprehensive leader, this is a local school leader, steeped in local knowledge and experience who, only two years ago, was part of the evidence that gave us our school sizes today. Her or she was quoted as, this was used in the speech:

In order to provide the best possible curriculum provision, differentiated learning and additional support for the comprehensive intake, I believe we would need an absolute minimum school size of 600 and the ideal size of 720 to 840.

1990 No mention of schools of 1,200, no mention of schools of 1,400. So this is the evidence of only two years ago. Now, the consultation at the time, which I believe was the public consultation, oh no, I think this was the one where the teachers had a say – was used within a speech from Deputy

St Pier. Do not worry, Deputy St Pier, I am not trying to pick on you, I just want to go through some of the excerpts of the speeches.

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

1995 And on school sizes, and obviously what that does, when you start dividing our amount of children by the schools, you start coming to the 600-1,000, where we were. From Deputy St Pier himself on school sizes:

Multiple sources of evidence, including the Institute of Education, quoted in the policy letter, tell us that the ideal size for a secondary school is between 600 and 1,000.

And on federation, Deputy St Pier backed up. He said multiple sources of evidence including ... no, we have just done that. And as Deputy St Pier summed up. This is from four to three, they need to be amended by the adoption of the three-school solution.

The very same solution the Education department recommended to themselves in 2011.

2000 Well, that is exactly what we delivered. A three-school model, as amended, as argued, as directed from the last term. As I read through the *Hansard* report, I came across another mention of a Mr Nicholls. He was referenced fairly heavily through the first debate and Deputy St Pier has previously sent me a copy of the report. Even Mr Nicholls wanted three schools. I think I am running out of the amount of evidence for three schools now but I will persevere because it gets better. To be fair, Mr Nicholls is not presenting a two-school model, so I can cut him some slack.

2005 I think there was an element of jest in the final part of Deputy St Pier's opening speech. I think he was being dismissive of the consultation, but it is pertinent. He says:

But the public do not want three schools, do they? They told us so in the consultation. Well, they certainly do not want one school of 2,100. They were not even asked about that. Neither in question 14 of the consultation, where they asked their views on the 720-840.

2010 In jest, there is a serious note to this. Deputy Sillars, in defence of the four schools mainly, which he eventually lost, made mention of, in his words, 'bearing the scars of school closures'. Whatever the perceived benefits of the two-school amendment, we are all going to vote on this policy. But within a year we will be asked, I suspect, to identify which schools are going to close. That is when, probably, reality will kick in to a degree.

2015 I do hope, as we get to the end of the debate, we are not all dancing on pin-heads. There have to be, between our model and the alternative model ... I hope we are not going to close schools, because we are just repeating outcome and outcome. When I spoke to Deputy Fallaize through email exchanges, for someone who has moved from selection to the delivery of an all-ability system, it would be possible for me to move from three schools to two schools, if I saw a killer argument. At the moment I genuinely cannot see the killer argument. I wish I could. I cannot see it. If anyone can move, who has moved so far, I can move another step.

2020 Now, none of you will have seen this, through the summer periods, none of you will have had the same conversation we have had about the loss of the Grammar School. It has been difficult for us to argue with the continued public's concern expressed about the loss of this institution. I have got a real fear about us losing even more schools.

2025 Ultimately, we can sit here in our little bubble and talk about outcomes, but reality is we have a public out there – a certain percentage of the public – who are quite terrified of what we may or may not be doing over the next two days. I pray that we have got this right. You have to be so sure that you are going to get this right today. This is possibly one of the biggest decisions of any of your political lives.

Now we can dress up how this is like, we can claim that they are not the schools they were, we can backslap ourselves on Twitter and convince ourselves that we have done the right thing by

2030 the people. But it does not mean a jot in the court of public opinion, I can tell you that. If I have learned anything in life, sir, do not ask the three Fs anything. Those are the friends, the fools and the family. They all think you are great. Well, mine do not, actually! (*Laughter*) But the exception does not disprove the rule. Just try and avoid the three Fs. Certainly my family!

2035 There is no corporate responsibility in an island of this size. We are not a party system. Your vote is your vote and that, for better or worse, is how you will be judged. Let us move on to other statements and evidence of those who supported this sensible move from four to three schools. Now, Deputy Dorey, through you, sir, here is another quote:

The excellent UCL report, which I referred to in a number of other speeches during this week, on page 1702, tells us the optimal size of schools which would be in the range of 600-1,000.

Okay. In fact, he likes the UCL report so much he says it again later:

The school size point is covered in the UCL report and there are a number of different research papers, there cannot just be the UCL report, which are done, which they summarise ...

This is from *Hansard*. In short:

... this is very clear and I will read it out, it is on page 1703.

2040 This is his quote from the UCL report, plus another report that he had looked over at the time:

Research evidence strongly suggests that secondary school size has an optimal level of 600-1,000, with smaller schools in this range being better for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds.

'Better for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds.' 'Smaller schools ... being better for children from disadvantaged backgrounds.' This is really important, because in the whole of this debate there is an imbalance here. We are listening to the Grammar School teachers. We are listening to those that talk the loudest.

2045 We are not hearing so much from the high schools, which are where the majority of our children are educated. We have to listen to both sides of the story. We are listening to the names that have been around for a few years. The names that we all understand. But we are not necessarily listening to the people that are more voiceless in society. It is just not happening. I will not bother going through everything. You know what I am getting at. You have to put balance
2050 into what you are trying to read. Just try and listen to some of the quieter voices, because they are not saying the same thing.

Wedded to the UCL report, Deputy Dorey even mentions it in his manifesto:

Also research conducted that the optimal size of age 11-16 schools is between 600 to 1,000 pupils.

Now, on federation, Deputy Dorey goes on to say:

I would like to comment on the hard federation. I spoke to a secondary school teacher who does not work in the state school sector, soon after the proposals were published. He could not believe the proposals. He said the schools worked so hard to create a community, you cannot achieve that sense of community when pupils and teachers have to travel to other sites.

2055 More quotes, these are from other teachers that Deputy Dorey evidenced for hard federation not being appropriate. We cannot just keep changing our speeches to drop in the excerpts from emails that we are getting from teachers to suit our current political desire, because what was being said two years ago is not what is being said today. I will go on:

Both the students and staff involved in these courses have expressed concern about the lack of access to support and guidance between their weekly lessons.

Another quote:

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

Which counters, utterly, some portions of Deputy Fallaize's opening speech:

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

2060 That is on federation. But today federation is fantastic. Well, it was not two years ago.

Good teachers will not like the concept.

Okay. Because you want to move something from four to three schools, you find some quotes and say, 'Good teachers will not like the concept.' Now you want to move from three to two, you find some quotes from teachers that do not like the concept. At this rate, it will be one school in two years' time and we will all be in Skype in four years' time. There will not be any schools.

2065

Deputy Fallaize: Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

2070 **Deputy Inder:** Go on then.

Deputy Fallaize: I just need to point out that the comments that were being made in that debate were about federation at key stage four, that is 14-year-olds and 15-year-olds. That was the proposal that was put forward by the previous Committee, which was opposed by many professions and was opposed by this States and the Deputy he is referring to. There is no federalional movement. No movement of students at key stage four, proposed in the alternative model. None whatsoever.

2075

Deputy Inder: Okay, thank you for that point of correction, sir.

2080 But we are hearing the same thing. If we go back and look at our emails, there are still concerns over federation, as proposed by the alternative models. Through you, sir, you know what, I still have not called them the gang of four yet. I am doing really well.

Also, Deputy Fallaize quoted another senior leader:

I do believe the removal of selection is simply incompatible with ...

Okay, and then this:

I believe we would need an absolute minimum school size of 600. An ideal size of 720 or 840.

2085 So that was a quote from a senior leader. This is not from a report or a dodgy document that there are claims. This is from people probably still in post. Two years ago, they were quoted as saying we are still in this 600-1,000 range. Today it is something different. With that in mind, it is fairly clear Deputy Fallaize's alternative model is completely wrong-headed and he should vote against his own amendment, but good luck with that, Inder!

2090 If he needs any more help, further on in his speech he talks about evidence again. Here he is referencing the 2001 EDU report, that recommended three schools should replace four. He says:

I find it hard to believe that the advice has changed so dramatically in the intervening years.

And this is where they are marking the argument for three schools. Apparently, back in 2001, three schools were the preferred estate and Deputy Fallaize makes the argument only two years ... Well, he is not as surprised as me, sir. Deputy Fallaize was struggling to understand how advice given 15 years earlier could have changed significantly. I am in the same boat. I am struggling to understand how Deputies who, only two years ago were arguing against federation, the optimal

2095

size of schools being between 600-1,000, had concerns about the capital restraint, are now arguing *for* federation, large schools and money being no option.

There is more:

There is a range of options available under a three-school model. I share the Education department's vision of a top-class education system. I fear that they are going to undermine the objective if they try to spread our students over too few sites. It is for that educational reason primarily, not economic reasons, that I support a three-school model.

2100 Through you, sir, that is exactly what we did. I then move onto the 2016 debate. The last debate. I hope it is the last debate on selection. I fear, to a degree, that it might not be. But it is a basic rehash of the March 2016 debate, with very little new information. You either wanted to retain selection or you did not, and that was the day that Deputy Graham and I were on the same team. But no one gets out alive from this speech.

2105 Deputy Graham made an impassioned speech, a very detailed one, on selection. But I cannot let that go without making some comment. This is what he said about the comprehensive system in the UK. On the subject of the comprehensive system, Deputy Graham made mention of the PISA and OECD ranking, where the UK came out 23rd. On the odd occasion that I have glanced at them, the UK kids seem to top the polls on teenage pregnancies and drinking. He directly
2110 connected this to the UK comprehensive system.

We have had 50 years of comprehensive education in the United Kingdom. Ninety per cent of our children there are educated through the comprehensive system.

Further on he says:

So, if there is glory or dishonour, it belongs to the comprehensive system and we will have to judge it on its achievements,

And more on the comprehensive system, the UK social mobility commission:

... but for what it is worth their recent report reveals that social mobility in the UK has gone backwards over the decades of comprehensive education. I think there is a connection there. It is not the grammars' fault, it is the fault of the education system.

So what does this bring me to, sir? A number of things. We have got two Deputies making arguments for school sizes they did not believe in two years ago. The same two Deputies making
2115 arguments for a federation and I mildly take Deputy Fallaize's point, they did not believe in two years ago. Supported by a Deputy that is now making arguments for a comprehensive system he did not believe in 12 months ago. It is not me. It really is not me.

I hope this paints a picture of why we should be here today, only discussing our policy letter, rather than defending an amendment that seeks to replace the Resolutions of the previous
2120 Assembly and re-verified last year. Possibly, an amendment could have been laid about the post-16. What I do not really think we should be doing is debating two 11-18 schools. There was really no evidence for it. If there is, it is new evidence.

It is nothing that we knew when we started this process. There has been no amendment, there has been no requête on it, there has been nothing at all. It has just turned up, effectively, out of
2125 the blue, through possibly some misconceptions. Everyone has gathered around this, 'educational outcomes, educational outcomes'. It is almost like Scientology. They have just started repeating things and it has almost become a truth. It is very common in Guernsey, you keep saying things, you repeat and repeat and it becomes truth.

'Educational outcomes. Educational outcomes. They have not done it. They have not done it.'
2130 *(Laughter)* And then suddenly we are sitting here, we are discussing two schools. You could not write this stuff. You are going to have to. It is happening.

There were another two pages of this speech that were going to trawl over the initial 8th August meeting, where the alternative model started. I have written a piece on the £93,000 allocation by Policy & Resources. But, in the interest of focussing on the future delivery of

2135 education for thousands of our children ... and I have got genuine concerns about them, especially on timelines, because I do not see a massive difference between the two models I really do not.

Today is not about us, today is about our community, our children and their futures. I have not finished. Are you asking me to give way? Um, no. (*Laughter*). I hope, however, there is enough
2140 within the quotes from the *Hansard* reports to give us an idea of the quality of the evidence that will permeate speeches through the rest of the debate.

There will be copy and pastes from various emails, based on our own particular bias, and we are all guilty of it. They will become evidence, they will become proof. They will become the truth. All I ask you is that when you are written to by the most eloquent in society you just, every now
2145 and then, listen to some of these quieter voices.

So what are the outcomes that were missing from our initial consultation? There are not any. They are all within the policy letter. You would have to read pages four and five of our document but, as a reminder, I will lay them out for the Assembly. The move to an all-ability system and the move to a more inclusive system, the nurturing of our children, promoting positive behaviour,
2150 improvements in delivery, our post-16 learners will benefit from the parity of esteem.

To a degree, I accept some of the elements of former Deputy – no he's not a former Deputy, sorry, I just thought the alternative model was the longest resignation letter in history – I accept elements of the parity of esteem argument. I was never overly comfortable with that, but I understood the objectives of it.

2155 And one I will add, no de-selection at 16. Under the alternative model, children will be de-selected at 16 and told to go 'over there', while their academic equivalents will carry on in their current school. We have rid ourselves of selection and the alternative model is introducing de-selection.

Same transition at 16 as our contemporaries. They are all fairly soft. Ultimately, they are
2160 nothing particularly hard. We have educational outcomes. They are within our documents, they are within our values. They are peppered through the whole of the consultation and they are there if you want to see them. No one owns educational outcomes. Certainly not so.

At officer level, an initiative that came from officers in Easter 2016, this is what happens at a tactical level, this is what is happening anyway, without sitting in here talking about, officers are
2165 measuring success across all areas identified using qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection. By doing this we can measure the actions of all of our children and young people. They are making good progress and attainment, showing positive attitudes to learning, demonstrating their high aspirations, making healthy lifestyle choices, participation in the community and having respect for themselves and others.

2170 Nothing particularly hard there. All fairly soft. But I certainly assert the alternative model does not own educational outcomes by any stretch of the imagination. Also, can I add my own comments on the proposal about providing better value for money? Committees have a cost and phase one is currently £74 million. So when we moved from four to three, there was an element of getting value for money as well. The Committee calculate it is something in the range of
2175 £74 million.

On the 18 variations provided by the alternative model, the cheapest is £90 million and the most expensive is £135 million. The first four cheapest options are a variation of the extension of St Sampson's High and the building out of the Grammar School site. Those are the cheapest. If
2180 either of those are chosen, it would mean that Beaucamps School, which is a purpose-built 11-16, something we completed only six years ago, would close.

I just cannot even understand that I am standing here saying that. Something that we spent £40 million on only six years ago, I am actually saying this in this Assembly, it is in the realms of possibly being closed.

2185 You cannot turn it into a primary school, I do not think, without spending millions and millions of pounds on it, and you are not going to certainly flick a switch and turn it into a college of FE. It is currently an 11-16 and, if you are going for the cheapest model – and whatever happens after

this debate I will be arguing for the cheapest model, I certainly will not be arguing for the £135 million at the other end of the site – it looks to me, on the four cheapest models, that Beaucamps is in range of closure. Now, you go and explain that to your parishioners. Good luck with that.

I move onto the amendment we have in front of us today. When I first heard about the concept of two 11-18s, I asked the officers if an 11-18 could work in Guernsey. Now, none of them said it could not. So I will not claim that they cannot. If you throw enough resources at anything, you can make anything work. That is a fact of life.

I think Deputy Fallaize made reference to it in his opening speech, I think you were referencing, through you, sir, the letter that was sent in January of, was it last year? The one that was a commentary on the six options. On all of the options, with the exception of, I think there were, some differences between the head of the College of FE, in the main of our six options that we presented to the public, all of the heads effectively said any variation can work. We as a Committee cannot claim that it cannot work.

I have been to La Mare and I have been to St Sampson's. I do not just go to the Grammar School and listen to Grammar School teachers. I met the heads and their senior management team and asked them all the same thing about two 11-18s. To distil response from the senior leadership team. It is fair to say their general response was – I am not laying claim to speak for every single teacher in every single school, I just would not do that – 11-18s can work, but not in the Guernsey context.

So we know that 11-18s can work. You throw enough money at anything it will work. But what is the Guernsey context? I kept pursuing this and pursuing this. The not in the Guernsey context – and I had this from one of our education officers – mostly strongly applies to the fact that within an 11-18 setting, the sixth form split across two sites is ineffective, not efficient and would undoubtedly narrow the offer available, would be expensive to deliver, as they would be individually too small.

I thought there might be a bit of bias in that response. When I am talking to a high school senior leadership team, they will not know the intricacies of a sixth form centre. So I pursued this. I kept asking people what is 'not in the Guernsey context'. Remember, through you, sir, to Deputy Dorey, the disadvantaged children. We hear claims children would be lost in larger schools. I think some of the poorer in society will be, I genuinely believe that that will happen. We get over the email, 'It will not happen.'

I am sorry, from my experience and what I know of some of the high schools and some of the behaviours, some of the bullying that happens there, I genuinely think doubling the size of them is going to cause some of us ... I will not go into too much detail, but basically, through some of the emails that I have had, it just does not feel right. I will move on to some of the other comments. I have got to be careful what I say, because I keep forgetting that sometimes we are told stuff in privilege.

Other comments from an educational leader, I am posing the same question. This is about 'not in the Guernsey context'.

Head teachers in Guernsey pride themselves on knowing each pupil individually and by name. The schools in Guernsey are like family, community units. It is about the identity of the school. A tangible sense of belonging and being proud of a school where you feel safe and nurtured.

It keeps re-occurring. Disadvantage, vulnerability.

Easier for vulnerable children to be overlooked.

Okay, this is a very basic one.

The Guernsey population are used to personalised service and it is easier in smaller schools. Out of scale for the size of the Island. Fine for a city, but too big for the Island. Big difference for the youngsters, who are in small primary schools. Big jump from 150 or 300 to 1,300.

2230 Then there is a re-mention of the sixth forms. There is an uncomfortable feeling about the size of the school. They may work in Wales, but this is not Wales. They may work in the Cotswolds, but this is not the Cotswolds. This is Guernsey. Everything feels slightly smaller scale and I genuinely do not think there is ultimately going to be a public acceptance over this.

A last point about breadth of recruitment – another word I probably should not use, so I will not. I do wonder now, when we first heard about two 11-18 schools this was what we all understood, we thought there were going to be two 11-18 schools. What has turned out of it is one school of 11-18 on two 11-18 sites. It looks to me like two 11-18 schools. You can call them what you will, it is two 11-18 schools with, basically, a federation.

I do wonder. The terms of model that have been advised, told that splitting a sixth form over two sites will not work. They disagree with that and I wonder if part of this is to make it look like one school because they know the sixth form cannot work properly. It does seem a bit odd. You have got your core A-levels on one site and your A-levels and IB attached on one other site. That looks different to me. That looks like separation. That looks like you are building in.

I can almost predict that we are 10 years down the line, maybe there is a change in the way we educate our children, something becomes different. I can almost guarantee, I could put a tenner on it today and I will win, that in 10 years' time we are going to end up with going down this route, one 11-18 and one 11-16, because it will be so inefficient that we will end up putting a sixth form centre attached to an 11-16 school. I can almost see that happening.

I sat at a recent presentation of the sixth form and it was great. Students were getting their prizes, they were getting certificates, they were getting their trophies. They had come back to their school to get their trophies. They were making little mentions of how they were getting on, telling their stories. I listened to the head speak eloquently of the sixth form performance. The pride in her students, the success of her Sixth Form Centre.

I sat next to Mrs Godley, she is the head of La Mare. They had the names of all the children and she was proudly knocking off all the children who had come from La Mare and transferred into the Sixth Form Centre and onto new horizons. I listened to the speeches and I was just shaking my head and asking myself, why on earth do these Grammar School teachers want to rip their sixth form in half? It does not make any sense at all.

Surely, if the Sixth Form Centre is the final remnant of the Grammar School, and we know it has worked fantastically, why on earth would you be cutting this in half and spreading it over sites which could be up to two or three miles apart? It just does not make any sense at all.

If that is the final remnant of the system, why would you want to do it? I am sorry. It makes no sense at all. None. The *[inaudible]* makes a big play about educational outcomes. When I received the documents, I did 'control F' and searched for 'outcome'. There were 13 results. In the main they were critical of our outcomes and presented none of their own. Not in terms of what I call educational, as in benefit to children. There was paragraph 1.1 from their document:

Nevertheless, despite a wealth of evidence to the contrary, CfEESC continues to claim that evidence strongly suggests that secondary school size has an optimal level between 600 and 1,000 learners and that, in larger schools, educational outcomes will be lower.

– their words.

This is conjecture dressed up as fact.

It is not. Deputy Dorey, Deputy Fallaize, through you, sir, these are your facts from two years ago.

2270 **Deputy Fallaize:** Point of correction.

Deputy Inder: Their facts from two years ago.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

2275

Deputy Fallaize: After he has pirouetted ...

That report, which was relied upon by the States in the March 2016 debate, was produced by his Committee's predecessors. It was relied upon two years ago. I am saying that, upon –

2280

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder, there is only one person standing at once.

Deputy Inder: I will sit down.

2285

Deputy Fallaize: Part of it was bogus and, if you look through the underlying evidence that was taken into account, the weight that was placed upon it two years ago should not have been. If Deputy Inder reads on his *Hansard* a bit, he will find Deputy Lowe very kindly outing me as a supporter of two 11-18 schools, I think at least three times during that same debate.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

2290

Deputy Inder: Yes, well thanks for that. Through you, sir, I think, with respect, Deputy Fallaize is doing it again. He is talking about a UCL report that he says is dodgy, but he forgets the fact that he actually had emails from educational leads in Guernsey. Senior leads, we roll them out every time there is an education debate, and they were saying exactly the same thing as the report that he is dismissing. You cannot have your bum on two seats. *(Laughter)* Some of us can, maybe!

2295

There does not appear to be any other mention of educational outcomes, to be honest with you. They have spent the last four months bleating on about educational outcomes, tell us in their report that the school size is conjecture dressed up as fact, but it is not our conjecture, it is their own evidence, backed up by senior leadership teams, even though they did not like the document. This is what they were saying only two years ago.

2300

The document says little or nothing about practical educational outcomes. To be perfectly frank with you, sir, it is a bit of a charade. If it is the fact that this Island just wants two 11-18 schools, then say it. Do not spend thousands of tax pay and dollars dismissing the educational report when you just want two 11-18 schools. You would be far more honest saying that. They would be, through you, sir.

2305

It would be just easier to say, 'We actually quite like two 11-18 schools, we think it is good to keep a Sixth Form Centre'. That would be a far more sensible and honest approach. But there is no point spending hundreds of thousands of hours of our time trying to make up outcomes and facts that may or may not exist, because it does not suit today's debate.

2310

They made quite a big deal about recruitment and retention issues and I must admit when I saw that, I thought, oh we are in trouble. Until, of course, we got the letter of comment from Policy & Resources and this is their response to recruitment and retention of teachers:

The Alternative Model report sets out the belief that 11-18 schools will assist with the recruitment and retention of good quality teachers. Human Resources report that there is currently no discernible issue with recruitment or retention, with very low numbers of agency staff required generally, only when unplanned extended absences occur outside the usual recruitment cycle.

2315

So, we have got a problem with recruitment and retention. According to Policy & Resources, we do not. I have not made that up. I have not found anyone to say it. I did not phone anyone up to get it into Twitter, Facebook or gee up a load of people to write some letters to the *Press*. That is actually a bit of a ... I actually find it quite strange, to be honest with you, because I believed we had a problem with HR retention. The actual evidence says that we do not.

2320

With the greatest respect, to whoever is behind me saying, 'we do', the evidence from HR Department, the people who employ these people, say that we do not. I cannot do any more than that.

I am drawing to a close now, but I do have something for our staff, actually, who got us to this point and have worked so hard and been through – and I do feel sorry for them – iterations and iterations of education debate. For the past few months you have all strived extremely hard to guide us as politicians through some extremely detailed and tricky waters. You have all been under fire by innuendo, some implied and some explicit. On social media, from people who to be perfectly frank with you should know better, and you have all acted with dignity.

To our officers, you fielded public presentations, our comms team, our PR officers, P&R officers and especially our SEN lead; I certainly thank him for his time. All of their diligence and their knowledge and the experience they have given me. I have actually, weirdly enough, become a lifelong learner. I have always thought I was going backwards a bit.

As someone who has a genuine, in-built distrust of bureaucracy, I salute all of them. I think they have been treated appallingly over the past three or four months. I can take it. I can take bullets all day long. But some of the innuendo, some of the implied accusations that we have had from people who should know better, has been absolutely disgusting and they have had no right to reply. Those people should be ashamed of themselves.

A final word on the March 2016 debate and they echo over the years, somewhat, from Deputy Sillars. This is what he says:

Under our proposals, all children will know exactly which secondary schools they will be attending, from the moment they start at primary school, as specific primary schools will feed into named secondary schools.

Oh my God! Two years ago. It really is Groundhog Day for Education. Certainty or do you want policy direction? I hope you all vote well. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stephens.

Deputy Stephens: Thank you, sir.

I am hoping that if I speak in a quiet voice, I might claim Deputy Inder's attention. I also suggest that the proposers of the alternative model have a sharp pencil handy, because there are going to be some questions. They might look on this as something of a test. But before I begin I wish to declare my particular interest in the person of a small close relative, who I hope has spent a happy day in a state primary school, and a larger close relative who is employed in education in the Island. In addition, I have a long-standing interest in the quality of education provision in general and some well-established views on what works and what works less well in the education world.

As many other Members have done, I have tested the alternative model in various ways to attempt to tease out the benefits and risks it presents and to attempt to identify if it is better or less good than the ESC proposal. I have often expressed the view that the potential of some learners is impacted negatively by the rigidity of our education structure and so, in particular, I am interested in whether the alternative model offers flexibility in both structure and in adaptability to meet the challenges of the future and flexibility in meeting the learning interests of our students.

I am also of the view that devolving powers to schools will bring essential flexibility to aid the success of all-ability schools at the secondary phase. I am also very interested in the level of equality of opportunity the alternative model will provide. I am talking about different routes to success in learning and qualification, but with equality of access to whatever is appropriate for the individual. For me, equality of opportunity provides best value for educational investment and so the model that gives the best value for whatever sums are allocated to Education is the one that assists the largest number of students to reach optimum levels of achievement in what is right for them, as ultimately that will prove to be what is right for the Island.

To be clear, I do not wholeheartedly favour either proposal. I do not think we have enough pupils in the 11-16 range to support three schools. I do not like the alternative model post-16 suggestion of a sixth form split over two sites. But I am prepared to compromise to get this next

stage moving, because as the implementation progresses there will be other issues to be addressed, not yet thought of and they need to be identified earlier, rather than later.

2375 What I found in the alternative model were many general aspirations that are shared by the ESC. Both models give weight, to a great extent, to an outline of what happens now and not what future developments might bring. Then there are some aspirations in the alternative model that are workable in either model, if the will is there to promote them.

2380 Intentions listed in the alternative model need not belong exclusively to the alternative model and vice versa. Of course, the focus of development through policy prioritisation relies heavily on who does the prioritising and that debate, about confidence in future delivery, is something that is different from what we are talking about in this amendment.

2385 So, to flexibility and the alternative model proposition 2. I am absolutely convinced by the argument that larger year groups in the alternative model would give more opportunity for more students to have their learning requirements met. There would be more subject teachers per department, to offer greater in-depth knowledge on different parts of the syllabus and more opportunity for students struggling with emotional or behavioural difficulties, or who are gifted and talented, or all of these things, to receive appropriate teaching.

2390 As the alternative model suggests, larger year groups make setting more tuned to the students in the set. And the proposition does not mean larger classes. In our context a larger school has definite advantages over the smaller school. In the smaller school, with a smaller number of teachers, more responsibility for day-to-day management and organisation falls to a smaller number of staff. A smaller number of students means that redesigning class groups to accommodate students' preferences is far more difficult.

2395 In small schools the same students work with the same peers for more of the time and more variety and interaction is important for students and staff. Small schools, working within a *per capita* allocation, struggle to provide what the larger school can provide, as potential for economies of scale are less.

2400 Then there is huge potential for increased flexibility in devolved governance and a new Education Law. Progress on these things has not been made as quickly as I would like. It seems that these things, although included in the ESC model, the ESC Committee seem rather unexcited by these really important developments. But what the supporters of the alternative model need to do is underline convincingly for me why the alternative model will deliver them better – and when.

2405 For me, the alternative model delivers on flexibility until we get to the post-16 suggestion and there I have concerns. A member of the public suggested to me that the split sixth form, within the 11-18 model, is an attempt to establish two grammar-type schools and that the all-ability intention crumbles at that point. Maybe one of the proposers of the alternative model would like to respond to that suggestion, later?

2410 I wonder if the greater flexibility and opportunities offered in a one-site post-16 option is preferable. But then the ESC model will not provide that either. I think, at post-16, on flexibility and equal opportunity, neither model has the edge on the other.

I do think that the alternative model with two sixth forms will be expensive to run, because the numbers in each sixth form will be so small and many of the students will move to other sites, other than their 11-16 school, to access their preferred courses.

2415 Now, both models give consideration to the future of the College of FE, either in similar form as now, or as something new in structure. Both include some of the educational satellite activity across the Island. The alternative model is keen to see the College of FE develop in status. Fundamentally, the issue of perceptions of worth as applied to academic and vocational courses, is really about value judgements made on the outcomes of the vocational courses and how dignity is accredited to different types of labour in the world outside education. Greater investment in vocational education will not, in itself, equalise the perception of status of different courses, but it may help as people tend to value what they spend their money on.

2420 The real test of flexibility and equality of opportunity for me will always be the special education test. If these things are evident in special education then, in my experience, there is a

2425 good chance it will be generic. Whilst the alternative model, in discussing the transition of Le Murier students to further education is correct in the assessment of the less favourable projected provision in the ESC model, neither model is entirely satisfactory in outlining the future of special education and co-located schools.

2430 ESC suggests parents might be given more choice concerning where their children are educated, but without the foundation of Law behind that policy I guess the intention will collapse once the challenge of resourcing is factored in. The alternative model offers a review and that, I suggest to the proposers, is an easy way out and an outline of what will happen immediately, in waiting for a review, is really what I would like to read about.

2435 There is a lesson for this Assembly in educational change management, as illustrated in the development Le Murier. The building was custom-built and purposely co-located. The plan was clearly articulated, yet the co-located working was criticised in the last self-evaluation report. It was meant to be more than sharing physical resources.

2440 There has been, in my view in the recent past, a mismatch of intention and practice, as illustrated at Le Murier. It is worth considering why that happened. My guess, it has a lot to do with a lack of flexibility and unequal access to learning. Not physical access to buildings, but the way teaching is presented to give all abilities equal opportunity to learn. I would really value the proposers of the alternative model's comment on what I am about to say next.

2445 The practice of special education relies, if anything, more heavily than mainstream education on a revision of the existing Education Law. The descriptions of category of need have changed. Students from disadvantaged background and with poor attainment levels are now included in that category. Giving parents more opportunity to argue over school placement does not recognise the students' right to an appropriate education, or the States of Guernsey's responsibility to provide it.

2450 Although I am repeating my earlier remarks, for the sake of all our students a revision of the Law has to be dealt with immediately, whichever model is taken forward. Whilst, until now, it has been a development in Government practice to align policy with the Disability and Inclusion Strategy, I hope very soon full equalities impact assessment will be adopted by the States and of course applied to education.

2455 Clearly for me there are attractions in the alternative model in Propositions 3, 4, and 5. Apart from the larger size school attracting my attention, along with the firmer commitment to a revision of the Law and devolution of powers to schools, what more do the proposers of the alternative model need to comment on to get my vote?

2460 Firstly, I am looking for more information on how the changes will be managed. Not just the mechanics of transition, but what the future benefits to the community will be. Whichever proposal goes forward I think this is something that needs more and determined attention. Linked to this, I am looking for a clear description of the new normal, for the students transferring for the first time in the new system, from year six in a primary, to year seven in the all-ability secondary, what greets them there will for them be business as usual. They will have not experienced anything else. What is there in the alternative model that will safeguard the education and wellbeing of those year sevens in their over-sized blazers and shiny new shoes, as they begin their all-ability school careers?

2465 Members may think that this debate is an important and whilst crediting this debate and decision with all status and seriousness, I think there must be strong evidence of flexibility in the proposal of choice, which allows for future adjustment. I do not think for a moment that the decisions made in this debate are the last word on educational change. Because that continues on a daily basis. So I am looking for room for later compromise and adjustment to meet the needs of the Island. But if the change processes are halted, or considered completed, then flexibility disappears.

2470 In amongst the temptations of the alternative model there are some disappointments. There is a lot of aspirational statement but not much that I found on the standards of teaching or learning.

2475 The assumption being, I guess, that getting the structure as good as it can be will deliver equal or better standards than now.

The supporters of the alternative model need to explain the relationship between those two things. But then the same criticism could be made of the ESC model, where the current arrangements for quality control are discussed, not the future standards that the model should deliver. So that challenge goes out to both sides of the debate.

2480 There is rather a lot of use of the word 'should' in the Alternative Model document. There should be further development of joint marketing and various pathways. Students should be able to combine qualifications. Much better to confidently write the word 'will' and add 'because this or that will be in place'. I worry about the word 'should'. In summing up, if there can be some reference to elevating the word 'should' into something more definite, then that will be helpful to me.

Deputy Fallaize will, I anticipate, I am sure, that I will say that the basis of Proposition 8 is absolutely nonsensical. I do not think catchment areas – 'feeder schools' softens it a bit – are relevant now, let alone when operating one school. I am looking forward to his justification of Proposition 8.

2490 Then, a further disappointment is that the financial modelling is imprecise. But then all of the financial modelling is imprecise, until specifications are detailed and decisions are made about the future structures and buildings. I do not want to maintain the *status quo* and pop this agenda for change at any risk.

2495 So the alternative model is a long way from perfect. My challenge to the proposers of it is can they convince me that their model not only delivers all the good non-structural intentions listed in the ESC report and all the peripherals and tempting things in the alternative model, along with a core structural change?

2500 Does the alternative model offer ongoing value for money? Are the economies of running two schools, rather than three, dissipated by the two sixth forms arrangement? The all-ability school will offer more flexibility and opportunity for students than now. The alternative model will do that only if all the loose ends are tied off. Then, maybe, the alternative model will better proof the future than the ESC proposal.

2505 I do commend all who worked on both models. I do regret the tone of some of the exchanges that I believe have polarised some Members. I do think that the changes that are made should not be too big a leap from what we know now, because that would be more acceptable to our community and easier to manage. After all, it is a beginning and not a final position.

Now, I anticipate someone will suggest that this debate on this amendment should be about the high-level intentions and that the fine detail is for another day. So I will respond in anticipation and say I think that the fine-level considerations of the transfer of St Peter Port secondary students to La Mare de Carteret School were lost in the excitement of building shiny new buildings elsewhere and the dazzle of a masterplan. That must not happen again. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

2515 One aid to managing a secure transition to what comes next with high standards for all is attention to the fine detail, the embracing of the challenge of change and willingness to compromise. I am not saying that the process of change should halt in anyway, but that these considerations should be building blocks for the process.

After very careful comparison of the alternative against the ESC model, I will vote for the alternative model if the proposers can give me assurance on the matters that concern us.

2520 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

2525 I will just wait for everyone to settle down. Even the professionals are divided on this. Some teachers favour a three-school model, some teachers favour a two-school model. So once again it

is up to us, the elected representatives, to make a judgement call. We will be making that judgement call in the knowledge that neither model is perfect. Both models have advantages and disadvantages.

2530 I think it is important for us all to bear in mind, despite what some people might say, we are not only talking about educational outcomes here. We also have to consider the impact on the rest of the community in the long-term. I think we need to consider additional issues such as economic, social and environmental. Presumably there are more, but those three spring to mind. Surely, we need to take all of those into consideration as well?

2535 What I am saying is surely we need to consider this holistically and not in isolation? I appreciate some of my colleagues and some members of the community might not want to hear that, but that is my view. I feel the two-school model harbours more disadvantages than the three-school model. In my view it does not tick as many boxes as the three-school model does, because it does not appear to be looking at this whole issue holistically.

2540 Just to elaborate on that point, the States does not have a very good record of looking at issues holistically. I will give an example of that. A previous States decided to build St Sampson's High School at Baubigny and it was only after the school had been built did they realise that they had not given sufficient thought to the infrastructure. So they then realised they had to spend more money and more time drastically improving the drainage in the area and then they had to
2545 look into making the road in the area one-way. Then they decided to build a prison next to the new school. That makes no sense at all to me and it seems to me they had not looked at the whole issue holistically and that is what they should have done.

If this two-school model amendment succeeds it could result in the Beaucamps School being closed. Deputy Inder has already referred to this. It cost well over £30 million to build, just three or
2550 four years ago. It does not make any sense to close it. I will leave that with my colleagues to consider because again that is a prime example of a previous States not looking at an issue holistically and not looking at an issue that would benefit the whole community in the long-term.

I ask my colleagues to please look at this issue holistically and in the long-term. Just as an aside, surely La Mare should have been rebuilt, instead of the Beaucamps?

2555 For example, if the two-school model is put into place, the resulting traffic increase on certain roads, because traffic will be funnelled and condensed onto those roads, will have a negative impact on a transport strategy. I would like to hear in debate the views of somebody from Environment & Infrastructure about that, because surely, we cannot support and defend any strategy in one debate and then simply ignore it in the next? In other words, cherry pick when it
2560 suits. That is not beneficial to our community.

In relation to the social aspect, I am of the view that the larger the school, the greater the risk of alienation for children. Some of my colleagues will completely disagree with me, but that is my view and I am entitled to it. I believe smaller schools tick more boxes than larger schools. Actually, it is not only my view, it is also the view of some of the teachers I have spoken to. I say some
2565 because, as I have already said, even the professionals are divided on this.

Of course, there are several other social issues to consider. I will not go into all of those. Colleagues can think those out for themselves, but housing comes into mind. It would be completely unrealistic for any member of our community to expect a Deputy to vote in such a way that they please all the people all the time. We have to accept, whichever way we vote, we are
2570 going to upset a considerable amount of people out in our community who disagree with the way we vote and we will possibly face ridicule.

But I am sure that every Member of the Assembly will vote in the way vote on this amendment with the utmost sincerity and belief that that is the best way forward for our children and the best way forward for our community. It is my sincere belief that we should support the three-school
2575 model and reject this well-intentioned amendment.

In closing, sir, I ask colleagues to respect that view and also to respect the views of all our other colleagues. There is never any need whatsoever to discredit, demean, or ridicule a colleague because they dare to have an opposing viewpoint. There is never any need whatsoever to be

disrespectful and discourteous to a colleague during debate. That is akin to the sort of behaviour that one would find in a kindergarten or school playground, if you will pardon the pun. I will finish with a plea to colleagues to please be courteous and respectful at all times during debate.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I rise to speak to amendment 2, which asks to agree the proposals set out in the report entitled The Alternative Model, which was published some eight weeks ago. The Propositions also ask the deletion of the Education, Sports & Culture Committee Propositions 1-13. Therefore, in addressing this amendment, I will need to refer in some detail to the Committee's policy letter, dated 10th November 2017.

First, sir, may I convey my thanks to Deputy Fallaize for his clear and well-articulated opening. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Through you, sir, please could I also thank Deputy Inder for his very enthusiastic and very entertaining speech. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Before I go into any detail regarding either the alternative or the substantive Propositions in the Committee policy letter, I need to make some over-arching comment, which derives from this amendment.

In my view we must put context into this debate. My comment is based upon my own views, which have been consistent from the time I was canvassing prior to the May 2016 election, up to the present time, and which has been reinforced by public representations made to me. Just for the record, I have refrained from joining with the education email debate, mainly between Deputies and some teachers, and rather have spent my time doing research, attending presentations and workshops and with one-to-one conversations with key people involved in education, who I both thank and hold with great respect.

It is my view that this States and the previous one have made very heavy weather in developing and improving the education offering. Parents and, importantly, students are desperate to know there is certainty for the future, both in practical and in terms of opportunity and vision. In my view, they are deeply frustrated by the eleventh-hour adversarial tennis match between Deputies, which has led to more uncertainty and a lack of thorough public engagement on the alternative choice.

I am not into individual criticism of colleagues who have clearly researched their views and come to firm positions on education and I thank them for that. My concern is in the processes of this Assembly and in particular our curious system of Committee Government, adopted this term, which has underpinned what is in my view bad Government.

The previous States was high on vision and, at Education Committee level, were determined to remove selection. Unfortunately, energy to remove selection, the selection evil as they saw it, dominated without real consideration of what system would replace the practical and strategical consequences.

At the election it was clear to all that, whilst the 11-plus papers had no credibility, there was a real, sizeable public appetite to save the Grammar School concept in some form. After all, it was arguably the best-performing school in the Channel Islands, with some influential business representatives pointing out that it was an asset, incentivising key professionals with families to come and work in the Island.

The new Assembly had to pick up the unresolved, knotty issue of sorting out the future of education. This was, of course, not just about the Grammar School provision, but the whole of secondary, post-16 education. At that time, La Mare de Carteret School was part of the education conversation. Not because it was an under-performing school; the contrary is true. But that it was in a shocking state as a result of the procrastination of the previous States.

We should recall that in the first meeting of the States, following the normal processes of speeches and challenges from the floor, an Education, Sport & Culture President and Committee was elected. I saw no real alternative visions emerging from any other Deputies, including the four

very able Members behind this amendment. Following the selection debate, which the Committee was seeking clear direction regarding the previous States' decisions already made, a vote of no confidence in the Committee was laid. This was rejected.

2635 Again, no real viable education alternative emerged, or a champion of a different vision, at this crucial political opportunity. Apart from those elected by this Assembly to the Committee, who did set out their stall accordingly and according to their brief, the opposition was based upon what some Deputies clearly did not like, but not really concentrating on a viable cost-effective, post-election vision.

2640 The Grammar School concept was now history. This States, back in November 2016, after debate and consideration of a letter from P&R, dated 16th November 2016, ratified the decision of the previous States, Billet d'État VII, 2016, with the exception of modifying Proposition 1. This clearly mandated ESC to submit a policy letter under the clear instructions contained in sections 1-4 of appendix 1 of the policy letter before us.

2645 I will not read them out, but suffice to say, in my view, ESC followed their brief from this Assembly. However, I shall read an extract from the P&R letter to which I have referred. It says:

The Committee has become concerned about the uncertainty which has been created in our community as a result of prolonged discussion and debate on this subject.

It goes on, P&R are ...

... unanimous in supporting the need for the Assembly to make a decision on the matter and then stand by it. Having clarity around this important policy decision will then enable consequential strategies and plans to be developed, resourced, allocated and families to plan with certainty.

2650 I therefore share the frustration of ESC, who set about the task holding workshops, public engagement initiatives, culminating in the policy letter and the 13 Propositions this amendment seeks to set aside. I shall refer to this in more detail in a minute.

2655 There were also opportunities for the two Deputies who proposed this amendment, and the two others who are signatories to the alternative model, to have used the democratic process to highlight their vision and join the Committee, following the resignation of the very able Deputy Leadbeater and the very active vice-president, Deputy Meerveld. But no.

I briefly want to make a point about political leadership. May I ask Members to take these comments in the context that I make them? What has happened, is that P&R have financially sponsored an unelected opposition committee to emerge, who have produced, at this late stage, a 103-page critique of the ESC proposals. As said, this is in my view not good Government.

2660 To the credit of the authors, they themselves indicate the proposals are an effective vision and require more work with costs and practical implications, such as which buildings require development or closure and that more consultation and financial scoping is required. This has led to a hasty and sometimes acrimonious, adversarial debate outside of this Chamber, between the elected Committee and the shadow committee. This was always going to be the case with a document which justifies itself by throwing down the gauntlet and saying, 'because our students deserve better'.

2670 The Committee in turn has presumably felt unsupported and ambushed and felt it needed to robustly justify its position. Most commentators, students and parents believe this has in the main been unhelpful. This is not the sort of politics this Bailiwick is used to. Students and parents are desperate for certainty in education and need to understand exactly what the future looks, post-election.

It is my impression that many are most unhappy that our system of Government has produced public confusion. The mechanisms of debate and challenge are in place without the need for Government-funded opposition factions.

2675 Turning to detail, I am the first to confess that I am not an educationalist and I have had great difficulty in trying to unpick this. I am very grateful for Deputy Stephens, in posing the questions

she has to those leading the amendment. I find the alternative paper is well written. There are some things that I both like and understand and I certainly respect all the Deputies involved, two of whom I work closely with on Committees.

2680 Please may I now again refer to the ESC policy letter on page 63, appendix 1, entitled Previous States' Resolutions? As says, this clearly prescribes the tasks set by this Assembly to Education. The Propositions which this amendment seeks to throw out were worked up on this basis. Of course, the policy letter is open to democratic challenge and this is welcome, presumably also by ESC, who responded by laying amendments, in particular amendment 3. However, the unelected
2685 shadow committee have at a late stage, unfettered by the constraints of States' direction, come in with a very different option.

This vision is, in my view, wedded to one particular system of large school, UK comprehensive education. Remember the UK still provides grammar schools and other different systems, providing choice to students. But we are looking at the Bailiwick's need, economies of scale,
2690 affordability, our struggling road infrastructure and the very important public opinion. Add to this the challenges of removing the Grammar School, our unique not-for-profit colleges who education some 30% of students. In addition, we must, as an Assembly, acknowledge our lack of previous investment in infrastructure, particularly at La Mare de Carteret and the current College of Further Education.

2695 On balance, I see more direction and consideration in the ESC proposals, which are to a greater extent ready to go, than the alternative, where I do see some validity and valuable challenge. However, importantly, I am not convinced that the ESC model cannot be developed to cater for that. I support in particular section 3.5.8 on page 23 of the Alternative Model document. This touches upon the devolution of governance. At a one-to-one presentation given by three head
2700 teachers, their passion for teaching, together with their professional backgrounds, made a very compelling argument regarding devolution of responsibility.

The visiting head teacher from The Cotswold majored on this in his very recent visit. However, I do not understand how this high-level and fundamental transformation could not be achieved under the ESC proposals. In fact, ESC are clearly trying to achieve such a devolution through their
2705 amendment to Proposition 8 and have, in statements to the media, explained exactly how they would try and achieve this.

Whichever route is taken, ESC is in my view not the obstacle. Policy & Resources embarked on a robust policy of centralisation, staff, IT and finance are all now controlled by the centre, under the chief executive, through the P&R Business Partner concept. We are very fortunate to have
2710 such dedication and skills at head teacher level and within the schools and this process has reinforced how much talent we have. The point has been well made to attract and retain this talent they require to have much more decision-making powers.

This is absolutely, in my view, not a one, two or three-school issue and can and should be achieved. The challenge is how to properly wrestle these responsibilities away from Sir Charles
2715 Frossard House to develop protocols to achieve the devolved governance both options seem to want.

Furthermore, the alternative has helpfully teased out some relevant questions, with regard to the challenges of the provision of technical and vocational studies, including the economies of scale and the best use of teacher specialisms. However, the criticism is based upon highlighting
2720 the thinking in the UK. Frankly those issues seem to apply, albeit in different guises, to both models. ESC appear to have studied the options available and have provided costed proposals and, perhaps most importantly, very detailed timetabling analysis around their proposed curriculum.

Whilst some of the issues raised in the alternative proposals regarding the use of teaching staff
2725 may well have some validity they do not at all, in my view, make the ESC Propositions fatally flawed. However, the alternative assertion that ESC is proposing a bespoke, untested Bailiwick model does not cause me concern. Guernsey always has had a unique model for education, which

has in the main served us well. The needs of our students and our employment opportunities are also unique.

2730 The bottom line for me is I am not convinced by the *Animal Farm* dogma, based on obedience to a pure comprehensive one-school, two sites model and that it stacks up locally. Or that excellence for our students is somehow impossible to achieve utilising existing schools. The alternative lacks the detailed costing, removes the existing concept of community schools and clones one particular UK education ideology, crucially without the choice options enjoyed there.

2735 The alternative is a vision.

One point ringing in my ears after the presentation by The Cotswold head teacher was in answer to a question about transforming his school from one of around 400 to 1,300 pupils, which apparently took place over many years. He said not to underestimate the challenges, which are enormous. The challenges to completely transform our education system, most importantly to

2740 manage the transition, will in my view be an even bigger challenge.

I think something needs, also, to be reinforced around the transition arrangements. I think they are a very vital element. I had an email last night from a parent, who asked me to remind everybody in this Assembly that currently, I think it was yesterday and today, students are going through 11-plus exams. Those students will be embarking on an education system that exists

2745 today and that is something that must be taken into account.

As I have repeatedly said, I have great faith in many of our educationalists on the coal face. Visions and achieving their objectives need strong political leadership to achieve transformation. It is one thing to provide the challenge, but quite another to deliver a far-reaching and expensive programme of change. The proposers have to date shown no real appetite to step up to the plate,

2750 either by putting themselves forward at the democratic opportunities presented so far in this term of the States or to explain where the political leadership to enable the championing of complex delivery will come from.

Visions need substance and timelines and clear understanding of how they will be championed. All I can see is an assumption that, if this amendment is successful, the present

2755 Committee will resign and, to quote one Deputy involved, there would be a 'moral duty' for some of the four Deputies to put themselves forward.

This needs much more than fulfilling a duty. Opposition politics is much easier than delivery in Government. Whatever the outcome and once a decision is made, I implore this States and all those who have developed educational ideas, education professionals, to come together to

2760 achieve the goal that we want to develop and mould a unique system in a way that every student and parent craves for. For all the reasons given, I am unable to support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel.

2765 Perhaps you just pause while people resume their seats. When you are ready.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

Although I stood to speak after Deputy Inder, I am rather glad you called Deputy Stephens first, because it was rather like trying to follow the Lord Mayor's Show parade. I hope that

2770 Members actually took on the points that Deputy Stephens made because she clearly made some very insightful and very thoughtful points and raised some very good queries.

Some of what I wanted to say has already been said and I am sure that everybody is pleased to hear that. I agree with some of the things that Deputy Lester Queripel said. I think we all acknowledge that nothing in life is ever perfect and whatever solution the proposers put forward,

2775 regardless of the issue – it just so happens that today we are discussing the profoundly important subject of secondary education – there will always be advantages and disadvantages and strong points and weak points with any solution or any proposal.

It does come down to the considered judgement of the politicians and my judgement in regard to this amendment, as best as I can consider it, is I certainly see some merit in the one-

2780 school, two sites proposal. Now I know Deputy Fallaize when he spoke said actually it is about more than just one school and two sites, there are other schools to consider. Nonetheless, the report does speak about one school and two sites.

2785 Aside from, as Deputy Prow said, the Alternative Model report being well-written and it reads well, more importantly it references some very good evidence to support its ideas. Of course, the same could be said for the report and the model being put forward by Education, Sport & Culture. As Deputy Lester Queripel said, even expert opinion of educationalists is split on this issue. By way of example, we know that people have come out in support of the alternative model. I think the director of educational skills policy at the Association of Colleges, the head of The Cotswold School, a very high-performing all-ability school in the UK, and Mr Mulkerrin we have heard from.

2790 As opposed to that, in regard to Education, Sport & Culture's proposals, at least aspects of those proposals, the people that have come out in support of that, as an example, the UK chief executive of the Sixth Form Colleges Association, a former chief inspector of Education Scotland and of course we have had an email from a teacher who has direct experience of working within a system that is one-school, two sites, and that teacher did not recommend that model. Even that
2795 does not really help us very much, because there are so many split opinions on this issue.

I have had a chat with Deputy Fallaize about this and I think he understands my point, I was keenly awaiting the amendment to accompany, to complement the Alternative Model report, but it is not really in the form I was expecting or hoping for. I was hoping that it would accept that there are certain realities that have not been addressed. I was hoping it would be perhaps a touch
2800 more pragmatic than it is.

Upon my first reading of the Alternative Model report and it was before Members were really subject to the views and opinions of teachers and islanders and parents and before the *Press* pundits, the *Press* columnists really got going. I was aware that it was light and there was information and detail missing.

2805 I was really hoping the amendment would call for a couple of things in particular. Number one, a properly structured consultation exercise to be carried out. I know the group of four Deputies have very commendably embarked upon public presentations and public meetings, but that does not constitute a properly structured consultation process carried out over a period of weeks.

2810 The other thing I was hoping it would do would be to call for all the detail in regard to the implications for the estate, in other words which two sites would be used, what would happen to the other sites, all the figures and costings involved in that. I was hoping that it would call for that to be worked up and then the report be brought back to the States containing all those findings for further debate and decision.

2815 I know, actually, if you look at, I think it is 12 and 13, it does do that. But the really important number in this amendment, for me, sir, is number two. Number two says:

To agree that from the earliest date practicable, secondary and post-16 education should be organised as follows:

2820 Now that to me is asking us for a definitive answer today. It seems to me, once we put that into process, if we agree to two, it is not asking for a report to come back to the States for further consideration, it is asking us to make a definitive and definite decision today. I was really hoping that the wording of the amendment could be slightly differently phrased, so it would actually call for a report but not ask for a definitive and definite decision today. But it has not done that, so that is one of the weak points of the amendment, to me.

2825 I was hoping that the amendment would recognise the need for those things, that information to be gathered, presented, before a definitive decision was made. That is what we are being asked here today in two.

It is extremely difficult for me to give something unconditional, full steam ahead approval, when there are a number of unknowns, important elements that have not received proper attention, analysis and assessment. I realise, and it has been said many times today, that educational outcomes are the most important thing, that they have to be the number one priority,

2830 but both reports contend that educational outcomes are at the heart of their proposals. So that does not help very much, either.

In any case, the matters to do with the estate cannot be dismissed. They cannot be left until later if we are being asked to make a definitive, proper, full-on, go-ahead decision today. When you are talking about millions of pounds' worth of taxpayers' money; multiple millions. When you
2835 are talking about very costly and valuable public assets, that has to be a factor now. If you were looking for all-round good results, all-round value and the ability to measure that value, those issues have to be a factor in decision-making now.

I have to admit, not knowing how the estate will shape up is a problem for me. Not knowing the fate of two sites that will be surplus to requirements is a problem for me. Not knowing if they
2840 will stay in States' ownership and be put to good use is a problem for me. Not knowing whether they might be sold at a considerable loss is a problem for me.

Undoubtedly there are aspects of the alternative model that I find attractive and appealing, but of course that holds true once again for the Education, Sport & Culture proposals. But it is the lack of consultation and incomplete picture in regard to the estate that I am troubled by. The
2845 amendment does not cover those things to my satisfaction.

It is true to say that there are aspects of the Education, Sport & Culture model I am uncertain of, but I think the amendment that was passed this morning and the one we will be dealing with later will go some way to potentially addressing those concerns.

I just wanted to say a few words on local school management and devolution of management.
2850 Deputy Ferbrache spoke this morning and he said why cannot we do that now? Why cannot that be done in a very short space of time? I understand the point he was making, but I was happy to vote for the amendment and I accept that the work could be done before the date that was set out in the amendment.

My concern is this: when you are talking about something of vital strategic importance to the
2855 Island and ultimately to the economy, and there are social issues to consider as well, you cannot just jump into something and say, 'Let's do it now.' There has to be a properly structured process in place. You have to make sure there are proper lines of accountability. You have to make sure there is good oversight. You have to make sure that the overarching policy, strategy is agreed and clearly understood by everybody.

If you do not do that and you just jump straight to the end point, you could end up with, I
2860 know it is a much smaller scale for us, something that I am calling the Carillion effect. If we look at what happened in the UK, where all these services and all these projects and all these projects and all these contracts were outsourced, it seems to me that the cart was put before the horse there. A proper process was not gone through and now the UK are dealing with the implications, the
2865 consequences, the effect of an ill-thought-out process, which is going to cost them dearly in more ways than one. At the very least, financially.

I think there is a process to go through and I agree that certain steps need to be taken to get to that point, but I am for local school management. I am for the devolution of management. But there needs to be a proper process for this. You cannot just jump to it. We cannot just assume
2870 that people in the private sector can do things better than the public sector. We have seen many examples of the opposite actually over the years. I agree with it, but I think we should take time to sort it out properly and put a proper structure and strategy in place, so that there is proper accountability.

If the amendment was not calling for a definitive decision now, a full-on, let's go for it, without
2875 all the proper detail that we need to consider as scrutineers, as responsible Members of Guernsey's parliament, as people who are meant to question and to test, it is very problematic for me. Ideally I would have liked to have had two fully worked-up options before us today. That is what I would have liked. If the amendment was worded differently, that might be the case in the future, but that is the case at the moment. This is where I take on Deputy Prow's point; I have said
2880 all along I do not mind, in some respects, the alternative model coming before us late in the day.

It is better to have it now than not to have it at all, and some time down the line be told, 'You should have considered that.'

But ideally, bearing in mind the likes of Deputy Fallaize and other Members, even in the last term, they were very keen on the idea of a two-school model. They should have found an opportunity at some stage in earlier debates to place an amendment to say that a two-school model should be fully worked-up. Then, today, we would have that option of looking at a fully worked-up two-school model and a fully worked-up three-school model. But we have not got that.

I do find some merit in the two-school model, or the one-school, two sites model, but I find merit also in the Education, Sport & Culture's proposals. Based on what the amendment says and what it is calling for, I just do not feel that I can support that amendment, sir.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Paint.

Deputy Paint: Sir, I might have to jumble about a bit with the paperwork I have here, because I wrote two speeches. Please will you excuse me if I have to do that?

I have thought about this in many different ways. First of all, who will ultimately have to take the final responsibility for the system that is proposed, no matter what it is? I believe it will be the parents. At the end of the day the consequences of what we do will have to be taken by the parents. I know that there are very many varying views amongst the parents as to what we should do now. They, at the end, are who we are serving.

For me all was accommodated for in what we had before, in one form or another. Everything was there. It has worked for generations. We had a good system of education in this Island, in my opinion of course, that just needed adjustment, not revolutionary changes. The past results can verify that.

I have always supported all the schools in the Island, from the colleges, to the Grammar School, to the College of Further Education, which I had quite a lot to do with, previously, the high schools, the religious schools and the primary schools, in one way or another. I make no apology about that, I think everything went really well before, but it did need adjustment.

I will just move to the UK again, if I can. Education in the UK has opened, or extended at least, 11 grammar schools in 2017. We were informed last week of two extensions of grammar schools being made in the Cotswolds. It is clear from that there is a demand for grammar schools in the UK. We always say that we are open for business, yet this Assembly voted to close the Grammar School.

We need people of high calibre from overseas to assist us in running the Bailiwick and businesses. These people have children, or may have children, and want to have the best education if they were to come and run businesses here or work in the civil service. Dismantling our education system, which has served us well for generations, and without having a proven system in place, can only be thought of as an experiment.

By taking the Grammar School away, we have inadvertently disbarred the very people we need to put in these places. I say very well done, Guernsey, you have just shot yourself in the foot. All we actually needed to do was alter the 11-plus. I accept it was not fit for purpose as it is now, in this day and age, but that is all we had to do. We have had months of wrangling on views, wrangling going on backwards and forwards, and that is all we had to do, in my opinion

We listened to the head master of The Cotswold at what appears to have been a very successful all-ability school. But we were not given any evidence from the apparently many all-ability schools that have not been so successful or failed, for reach of balance. If we are starting something new, we do not know what is going to happen. We can assume it, but we do not know.

The four Deputies who have put this forward, as politicians, are trying to put something forward. He or she will only look at the positives of what they are proposing. The two-school model cannot be seen as a balanced view. I believe today we should take a step back and re-look

at the whole matter of education sensibly and make an attempt to satisfy the wants and needs of all the parents, which it is in our ability to do. We will no doubt only satisfy a few by what we are doing.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

We have got seven amendments but to me this one really is the core one, the big decision about which route we are going to go down. It is difficult to talk about it without making a few general comments about what our education system should be. If in doing that I transgress and you decide I have made a few general debates, I am quite happy for you to rule that I should not be able to speak when we get onto general debate. I would rather say it now, because I think this is when it counts.

In many ways, I think this is the second phase of a single, big education debate for this Assembly. I confess that in the first part of that debate, when we revisited the question of selection, I was something of a zealot. I was not completely close-minded, but I did approach that debate with really quite a settled view. Because for several decades I had strongly believed that a non-selective system of education, or secondary education, because we already have it at primary education, would greatly benefit all Island children.

Indeed when I stepped down from politics, I thought for the last time, in 2008, by far my biggest regret, amongst many regrets, was the failure to convince my colleagues of the benefits of this progressive step forward. So I was obviously delighted when this Assembly reconfirmed the wise decision of the last one to go comprehensive.

I know there are those who claim that decision was premature, without knowing the exact school structure going forward. I do understand where they are coming from, but respectfully I disagree. The decision to remove selection was a stand-alone decision. We already have a school structure and if we cannot agree any change to it this week then the comprehensive model will simply be rolled out within that existing structure. Even if we do agree this week to change the structure of secondary school provision in Guernsey, we know that for the first few years, the agreed comprehensive approach will be delivered within our existing school estate.

However, we also know that the current set-up is sub-optimal. It is sub-optimal even with our current selective system and it will probably be even more so with a comprehensive system. I think we do need to reform it. The big question is how? On this question I am far less of a zealot than I was over the question of selection.

I started this phase of the discussion and debate open-minded and determined to weigh up the evidence and to try to make an evidence-based decision. I say that, but in politics, as we all know, no matter how open-minded you try to be, it is really quite hard for any Deputy not to start with an initial view on any subject. It is just human nature.

I confess that I started with a very positive idea, a very positive view of the idea of tertiary education. There were several reasons for that. Firstly, I had been very impressed by the work done by the then Education Council on the subject, back in the late 1990's and early Noughties. Secondly, I was really keen, and it has been mentioned by Deputy Le Pelley already today, to facilitate those students wanting to mix and match academic and technical or artistic subjects.

Thirdly, I had seen good examples of tertiary colleges working elsewhere. Fourthly, I just had an innate feeling that 17 and 18-year-olds might benefit from being taught in a slightly more grown-up environment than alongside 11 and 12-year-olds. So my initial view was very much pro-tertiary. But initial views are there to be modified in the light of evidence.

I have listened to the evidence and I have reluctantly decided that I would be both wrong and irresponsible to push at this stage for a Guernsey tertiary college to provide a full range of post-16 and further education. Why so? Firstly, I think this is just too important a debate to follow your own predilection to the exclusion of professional advice. A really significant number of

2985 educationalists who I trust and respect have pretty much convinced me that such a system would not work very well in the Guernsey context.

That it would actually narrow choice and be sub-optimal, both in terms of the deployment of teaching staff and the outcomes for pupils. I was even more impressed by their arguments, because I knew that many of these educationalists making those points were themselves actually
2990 keen advocates of a tertiary system within the right setting.

So, I had no reason to doubt them. Even then, I am stubborn. I did not want to relinquish my ingrained views without really checking and double checking that a tertiary college would be so difficult in the Guernsey setting. So I wrote an open letter to the Education Committee, asking them to give consideration to the idea. Back came the answer that they would not. Not even an
2995 initial thought to it because, in their view, it would be the worst possible option for Guernsey.

Being stubborn, I still did not give up, but instead requested a meeting with the Education President. He told me that they were not willing to consider a tertiary college, but what they were proposing at page 16 could well evolve into a tertiary college over time. I have to say I did, with respect, find that odd. The idea of evolving towards a tertiary college by starting off by splitting in
3000 two the main current provider of post-16 education in Guernsey, I think must be a concept that would have Charles Darwin scratching his head.

Where did that leave me? It left my crusade for a full consideration of a tertiary alternative, frankly, dead in the water. Mainly because any further delay that would be required to investigate it in depth, I think we have reached the stage where that would just be unacceptable. The
3005 damaging uncertainty has gone on long enough. Indeed, far too long for many parents.

Secondly, because even if we were insensitive enough to delay yet further, to allow such an investigation to take place, it had become clear to me that the answer that would come back was very likely not going to be a positive one. So it would have been wasting time for the sake of it. So I had to accept that I was simply starting from the wrong place, that it was vital to listen to the
3010 professionals and not do what is so tempting for every politician to twist the facts to suit my own initial ideas.

With tertiary dead in the water and, as I say, not being a zealot on the question of school structures, what am I now left to decide between? Firstly, I can go with the Education Committee and, in many ways, I really want to do that. I do not want to pick at old scabs, but when they won
3015 the vote of no confidence in this Assembly, I actually did not agree with that outcome. There was nothing personal or malicious about that. I simply did not think, at that point, they were the right team to take this vital project forward. But I am a democrat. I respected that outcome and I made them a promise. I told them they could count on my full support in delivering the sort of non-selective system that this Assembly had approved in principle.

I meant it. So I would really like to vote with them today. But my goodness, they are making that difficult. Why? Well, firstly because their proposal for three very differently sized 11-16
3020 schools is, in my view, just wrong and completely at odds with the Resolution that I pledged to help them turn into reality.

I do not want equal sized schools because of some kind of ingrained love of symmetry, but
3025 because one of those schools, Les Beaucamps, would in my view just be far too small. Too small to provide the sort of education we need. Too small to provide the wide curriculum we need. Too small to facilitate the setting that I supported when we decided to get rid of selection by school at the age of 11.

I know we have an amendment from the Committee at the 59th minute of the eleventh hour to revisit that structure. Frankly, I do not trust it. I am sorry, but this amendment has none of the hallmarks of a true conversion, but all of the hallmarks of a defensive move put forward by those
3030 who do not really believe in it, but think it might be a necessary concession to make in order to secure victory.

My experience, and it goes back awhile, is that very little good ever comes of such proposals with that sort of motivation. Even if this desperate move succeeds, I have another significant
3035 problem with the Committee's proposals for 11-16 in schools and that is the proposed rebuild of

La Mare de Carteret. Whether one goes for two schools or three schools, to reduce from the current four-school model and to start that process by building a brand-new school on a site which requires hugely expensive flood defences just seems crackers to me.

3040 I am sorry if that upsets some connected with the school, for which I have the utmost respect. I am full of admiration for the amazing efforts of the teaching staff and the leadership team who have really turned that school around from the nadir of just a few years ago. When I remember how well it achieved under the headship of Jenny Tasker, it really was criminal the way in which we allowed it to decline so badly and, frankly, if it had not been for the tenacity of Deputy Stephens
3045 then those problems would have probably gone on far longer.

So I think it is vital to preserve that winning ethos which has been so impressively applied at La Mare and to retain as many of that winning team as we possibly can. But as a capital project I am afraid I do not think it makes any economic sense at all.

However to me, by far the biggest difficulty with the Committee's current proposals is what
3050 they suggest for post-16. When the policy letter was launched, back in November, I think it was, the then vice-president described those post-16 proposals effectively as being the jewel in the crown of this policy letter, the most exciting part of the Committee's proposals. They were not. They are not.

They are weird, experimental, off-piste, destructive and dangerous. Not my opinion, well it is
3055 my opinion, but not just my opinion but that of just about every expert in the field of post-16 education that I have spoken to over the last couple of months. For that reason alone, I find this package, and it is just that, a package from the Committee, frankly almost unsupportable.

I know we have just passed another late amendment which will allow them to look at the governance of post-16 over the next year or two. Sorry Deputy Ferbrache but that is what we have
3060 asked. In my view that is far too little too late. Yes, governance is important, but it is not the main issue. The main issue is the uniquely dysfunctional structure of the post-16 proposals that they are bringing forward. That is the real Achilles heel. Governance is second.

Mr Bailiff, in the next 20 years, further and adult education are going to be big growth areas and, what is more, they are going to be areas which will be vital to our economic success as an
3065 Island. We simply cannot, we simply must not, implement such a flawed system on post-16 education when it is going to be so important going forward for Guernsey.

What about the only other game in town, if we are actually going to move forward today? I hope we are. Two – I am going to call it that, I am sorry to Deputy Fallaize, through you, sir – the two 11-18 schools or, if he prefers, one 11-18 school on two sites. Actually, if I can just pick up *en*
3070 *passant* with Deputy Inder, who was utterly confused how people were against federation a year or so ago, now are not against it, I think it is because the F word is being totally differently applied this time to then.

With four small sites, in order for people to do the subjects they wanted, either them or their teachers were going to be bussed around Guernsey on a regular basis. With two large sites that
3075 would be utterly different. The need to move will be rare, it will be the exception. It will be to allow the minority subjects to be provided for people at both schools. Basically it would bear no relation to the sort of hard federation that was being talked about a couple of years ago.

Okay, so two 11-18 schools. There are two parts to that, aren't they? Let us start with the number two, before going to consider the 11-18 model. I know it is three bits of land, but I am
3080 afraid colloquially it is being called the two-school proposal, so I am going to stick with that for clarity. I have no problem with two school sites. Some people said they would be too big. I think Deputy Lester Queripel was worried they would be too big. But what is actually meant by that? Too big educationally or too big in terms of their local impact, in terms of, I do not know, traffic and other things like that?

3085 If it is the latter, then the objections are a nonsense. The La Mare site, under Education's proposals would be just as big. A 900-plus secondary school, a large primary school and a whole tranche of additional facilities as well. In terms of traffic impact and the like, no difference

whatsoever from a 1,250 or whatever 11-18 school. Indeed, as has been said, the old Grammar School when it was full combined with the Sixth Form Centre was almost as big.

3090 So we know there are no practical or logistic reasons not to have schools of *circa* 1,250. But what about the educational reasons? As has been said earlier, as this is the size typical of many of the best-performing comprehensive schools in the UK, there cannot be any objections on this basis. I do not get this, 'Oh, this is not Wales, or this is not wherever.'

3095 The educational outcomes of different styles of teaching – I know we like to think Guernsey is absolutely unique and maybe we will be teaching perhaps we are having a new curriculum and that – but by and large gravity is the same in Guernsey. Apples fall from the sky the same in Guernsey as elsewhere and so does the impact of different forms of teaching, resourcing of teaching, allowing the number of teachers in each subject area, in order to strengthen the way in which subjects are taught. If they work will elsewhere, they should work here.

3100 But I am also actually attracted to the two-school model for other reasons. I know it is almost regarded as some kind of dreadful thing to say, but revenue costs of running them are important to me. I know this area has been plagued by claim and counter-claim, but I am a simple fellow. It just beggars belief that the revenue costs for running two larger schools would not be lower than running more smaller schools. How can that not be the case? The capital costs to start off with
3105 may be higher but, to be honest, it is the revenue costs that really count, going forward.

Secondly, sorry to be so base about these things, but the pay structure for the two heads and the executive head would be higher with larger schools. That is the way it works, as I understand it. That would help to attract top talent to these key leadership positions. Just as we have seen in places like La Mare, leadership. That is the key to successful schools. We need to be able to attract
3110 top talent.

Thirdly, it would increase the ability to offer a broad curriculum. But, please, Members, through you sir, remember these will not be particularly big schools. Rather, they will be moderately sized schools. School size is a compromise, the competing advantages of smaller and bigger institutions. To my mind the evidence is clear. When it comes to school, big is not beautiful. But
3115 neither is small beautiful either. Rather, medium is marvellous.

The only major problem I can see, and it has been referred to by Deputy Lester Queripel, is the innate resistance to change and convincing the Guernsey public, who are used to very small schools indeed, that this would actually be a step forward and not a step backwards. I do think that is a real challenge but, Mr Bailiff, one of Government's responsibilities, old-fashioned though
3120 you may call me, is to lead, to actually take positive ideas and to sell them. Not always just to consult and not even have an idea of your own until you see whether 60% go this way or 40% go that way. We would probably still have capital punishment if that was our approach to politics. I am glad we do not. Sometimes, I think if we can see advantages, we have to lead.

So, I have no problem with having two secondary school sites, but what about making them
3125 11-18 institutions? As I said earlier on, to me this is slightly counter-intuitive. It certainly was not my starting point. I am not sure it is really my gut extinct, but I have got to put that aside and I do see the arguments in favour. Things like the better use of teaching staff. The geography A-level teacher being able to teach geography GCSEs as well. Crucially, making it easier to recruit good teachers in the first place.

3130 We heard via Deputy Inder, from the HR department, there is no problem recruiting teachers. There may not be any problem filling all of the holes that exist, but I am listening to head teachers and what they want is not just to fill the holes, but the best quality staff they can possibly get. They are telling me that that is easier to do with 11-18 schools. I cannot ignore that.

Nor can I ignore that the tsunami of advice that I have been getting from educationalists I
3135 cross, either by email or otherwise, over the last few days, saying that they prefer the two-school model. It is not just about recruiting new teachers, I do not want to lose any of the very good teachers we have now by embedding a sense of disillusionment in the direction that we are going.

I have to say that, despite that, I do retain the concern that Deputy Le Pelley referred to, about separating A-level and IB teaching from other post-16 provision. I really do want to be absolutely

3140 sure, if I go for this alternative, that I will be retaining the ability to mix and match subjects. I hate this term 'academic' and 'vocational' because if you are paid to be a doctor, you are vocational; if you are paid to be a lawyer you are vocational. But people know what I mean: those two that have been traditionally separate I do not want to be as separate as they have been in future.

I really want to be assured by the advocates of the alternative model that the sixth forms, or
3145 sixth form, depending on how you look at it, will work closely with the College of FE to make sure that people who legitimately want to mix and match can do so.

I suppose one of my other problems is that 11-18 schools are actually very traditional and I just tend to favour the innovative over the traditional. It is the way I am hard-wired. But we are not designing a system for ourselves here. This is a difficult argument for me to make, but I do not
3150 think I should shy away from it. I genuinely worry about the amount of change we can impose on our community at any one time.

Some might think that moving from four schools to two would be a much bigger and more radical change than moving from four schools to three. But no. When you actually consider the additional factor of where we deliver A-level and IB teaching, it is not. It is a more modest change
3155 and I am aware that just a few years ago, little Guernsey, very many Islanders, just assumed that the state sector would continue to provide for them and their families a selective system of secondary education and one where A-levels were taught in an 11-18 setting. Something very traditional.

Now, some of those will never be reconciled with our decision to end selection. A few might even choose to go private as a result. I actually think that most will come to accept that high-powered, high achieving comprehensive schools with a wide curriculum and setting by subject are a very good alternative.

What I really do not want to do is alienate still more of those traditional thinking parents by removing the option to take A-levels within a state secondary school, leaving the private colleges as the only way to access 11-18 basic education. Not because I feel that the alternative is worse. I
3165 am not much of a traditionalist myself. But I do understand that if we are too radical and a swathe of middle Guernsey opts out of our new all-ability system, then that will reduce its ability to thrive.

I stress, I really do not expect that to happen. But I have no doubt that retaining 11-18 schools will help to retain the confidence of quite a few people, quite a few parents, during a time of
3170 profound change.

Moving on, I am going to speculate slightly, because we have heard a lot about the closing of Les Beaucamps, as if it is an automatic consequence of this amendment. I do not believe it should be. Obviously, we need to have a proper site analysis before we determine where those two schools would be.

But, it seems obvious to me that one should be in the north, where the population is heaviest, and one should be either in the south or the centre, to serve the rest of the Island. St Sampson's is clearly the leading candidate for the north, because it is still newish and it has land the required in States' ownership. Les Beaucamps for the south or centre, I think, is also the other obvious candidate. Why waste a new school? I know land would have to be bought and the school might
3180 have to be a campus development rather than a single, large building. But so what?

The other option of Les Varendes, I think, is less positive. I would be really cautious about doing that. Not because I do not think it could work as an 11-18 school, I am sure it could. More because I doubt that the old St Peter Port School site alone is large enough to accommodate going forward this huge growth area of further and adult education.

The whole of the College of FE, the whole of the Institute of Health Studies, which would have to grow, particularly when we see the news coming out of the NHS on the national news over the last few days. The whole of the GTA and the new areas of further education that are going to emerge.

We are going to see huge increases in demand for in-work training, re-training, adult
3190 education, changing careers over the decades ahead. So I would really like the whole of the Grammar's St Peter Port campus retained for this purpose, to give maximum flexibility.

Whichever option we choose today, more work obviously needs to be done on the detail. It does not matter whether it is the two-school option or whether it is the proposals from the Education Committee themselves. Particularly with the two amendments that we see from them today, to be honest their claim that theirs is absolutely all the i's are dotted and the t's are crossed has gone out of the window with those two eleventh-hour amendments. Whichever option we go is going to need more work over the next few months.

While I may not be quite as impulsive as Deputy Ferbrache, I urge whichever option is approved, to really move forward with some despatch. Personally I come down, on balance, with the two-school model. But I do accept that in a way, having taken three steps forward, that is one step back and now, if we go with that, this Assembly needs to really move forward, commit itself. No more shilly-shallying and work it up.

Before sitting down, I just want to give you my thoughts on the so-called 'group of four'. I am sorry if that makes you uncomfortable, some of you. I steadfastly refused to indicate to them any sign of support for their ideas when they were semi-officially canvassing, where would I go if they brought forward this. I said to them I was not going to pin my colours to a mast I had not seen. I was not going to make any decision until I had seen their report and, indeed, in many ways, I was starting more from a similar place with the Education Committee than I was with them.

So I was not a natural fellow traveller. But I have to say that I really admire the gumption they have shown in getting off their backsides and delivering this piece of work. The role of Deputies should never just be about being the front man or the front woman for civil servants who they rely upon for the real policy formation. It is a politician's job to create policy. The clue is in the name.

Sometimes that requires hard work and the ability to tap into expertise, both within and without the public sector. There used to be quite a tradition of politician-led initiatives and some really good things came from them. But in recent years, sadly, they have been few and far between. So I take my hypothetical hat off to the four Deputies who have clearly worked so hard to produce what is a logical and clearly workable alternative.

Like Deputy Stephens, I have got some questions about it. But clearly the base of where they are coming from is logical and workable. With the greatest respect to both Deputies Fallaize and Tooley, my particular admiration actually goes for their two colleagues. Why? Because both of them were clearly hugely disappointed by this Assembly's decision to reaffirm the end of selection. It would have been so easy for them to just sulk over that and throw their toys out of the pram and actually not really contribute much to what happened going forward. They could have said, 'It is the wrong result, on your own head be it.'

They did not. They dusted themselves down and they threw themselves in to making the best of what they thought was the wrong decision. I really admire them for that. They have come up with a system based on the best achieving schools in the UK. But I think, if we adopt it, we could be quite a lot better than that.

For far too long, we have been complacent. For far too long the results in Guernsey have hovered around the national averages. Now it is slightly above, but one time it was slightly below. Progress has been made, I accept that. But we have been too complacent in accepting hovering around the national averages in terms of – sorry Deputy Inder – educational outcomes.

With the cash that we put in here and you compare it with the UK. With the relatively small numbers of people in extreme deprivation, and there certainly are some, but compared with areas of the UK it is nothing. Compared with the relatively small numbers of people in Guernsey with English as a second language, we should be, or we should have been, light years ahead of the UK.

We need a springboard to better performance. I do not about other Members, but if we pass this alternative model then I am going to leave this meeting feeling a genuine frisson of excitement for the prospects of education in Guernsey, for the prospects of being really way ahead of the UK as we should be.

Not just because of the two-school model, but just as much because of the change in governance, getting that clunky bureaucratic centre out of running schools. We run-down the UK, but I remember times when ILEA was running all the schools in London and every local education

3245 authority was running their schools. They have actually done something really good by getting their government out of that and letting people who really understand, who know, actually get on with delivering good results. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

3250 That is why the really bad results from comprehensive education that we saw in the early days have been turned around. That is why that is an old-fashioned view. That is why, in many ways, it is thriving now. We should be following that. Allowing timely decisions from timely actions as well as reducing central costs and yes, please, replacing our ludicrously archaic Education Law.

3255 When we have heard from Education over the years: it is enabling, it is a facilitator. It means it allows the bureaucracy in the middle to control absolutely everything in the way that they want to do it. They should not be able to. That is not the sort of education system we need. I think this is exciting. I think we should be doing so much better than we are now. I think let us go for it and embrace excellence as a benchmark. This was not my starting point, I have to say, but I am a true convert and I actually applaud these proposals.

The Bailiff: Members we will rise now and resume tomorrow morning, 9.30 a.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.33 p.m.