



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 19th January 2018

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

Volume 7, No. 3

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

Miss M.M.E. Pullum, QC, 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,
M. K. Le Clerc, 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

The West

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

The South-East

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

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

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (H.M. Deputy Greffier) (a.m.) ; C. Foster (H.M. Deputy Greffier) (p.m.)

Absent at the Evocation

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller); Deputy L. C. Queripel (*relevé à 10h 38*);
Deputy M. P. Leadbeater (*relevé à 10h 38*); Deputy J. P. Le Tocq (*indisposé*)

Business transacted

Evocation	173
In Memoriam	173
Tribute to former Deputy Laurie Morgan	173
Billet d'État II	175
III. The Future of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick – Debate continued.....	175
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 1.11 p.m. and resumed at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>220</i>
The Future of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick – Debate continued – Propositions carried as amended.....	220
Procedural – To continue to debate Motion to Withdraw – Proposition not carried.....	276
Schedule for Future States Business – Approved as amended	276
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 6.28 p.m.</i>	<i>277</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

IN MEMORIAM

Tribute to former Deputy Laurie Morgan

The Bailiff: Members of the States of Deliberation, before we start the third day of this education debate, I wish to pay tribute to former Conseiller and Deputy Laurie Morgan, who passed away quietly yesterday afternoon. I am sure that you, like me, will have been saddened and shocked to hear the news. I say shocked, because it was only yesterday morning that his wife,
5 Wendy was sitting in the public gallery, along with two other former female vice-presidents of Education, as Deputy Trott observed when opening his speech to the Assembly.

Laurence Charles Morgan was born in London on 17th December 1930. He had a business background, including working for Shell and working locally in the motor trade, before he joined the local office of Ansbacher, a merchant bank. I recall him as a spokesman on behalf of the
10 financial services industry. He served as President of the Guernsey Chamber of Commerce from 1977 to 1979 and as Vice-Chairman of the Association of Guernsey Banks from 1987-1988.

We often hear calls for more businessmen to stand for the States and to bring in to the Government of this Island their commercial and professional skills and expertise. Well, he is one businessman who did exactly that. He joined the Post Office Board as a non-States member in
15 1982, before being elected as a People's Deputy for St Peter Port in June 1988.

In 1991, he was elected a Conseiller by the States of Election and then re-elected in 1994 in the first Island-wide election. His knowledge of the financial services industry and his own business acumen was quickly appreciated, and he served on a number of Committees, including the Police Committee and later the Committee for Home Affairs, the Insurance Authority, subsequently the
20 Social Security Authority, for nine years, including six years as its President. He also served on the Appointments Board, the Island Reception Committee and the Rules of Procedure Committee.

But he will be best remembered for his service on the senior political committee of the day. He was elected a member of the Advisory and Finance Committee in 1991, serving with the late Peter Morgan, to whom we paid tribute only last month. Despite having the same surname, the two
25 were not related and it is by pure coincidence that two men with the same Welsh surname, neither of whom was born in Guernsey, came to serve in the States at the same time and to hold the Island's senior political office in succession.

Laurie was elected President of A&F in 1997 and *ex officio* became the Chairman of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission, until the Law was changed in 2003. Laurie was at the
30 helm, so to speak, when the changes to the machinery of Government were introduced and implemented in 2004. The last ever President of Advisory & Finance became the Island's first

Chief Minister, following the 2004 election, in which he was elected a Deputy for St Peter Port South and Wendy was elected a Deputy for St Peter Port North.

Laurie had firm views as to how the role of Chief Minister should establish itself. I have little doubt in my mind that there was much more that he hoped to achieve than he was able to do before the Policy Council resigned, in early 2007, some 11 years ago. How time passes. Following the election of Mike Torode as Chief Minister, Laurie returned to the so-called back benches, where he joined Wendy, one of the husband and wife teams who have served together in the States from time to time.

Laurie continued to contribute to States' debates from those benches, even though he was by then of an age when he could not have been blamed if he had said he wanted to spend more time pursuing his own pastimes and enjoying their second home in the warm sun. That commitment was typical of him and of the passion with which he threw himself into the political life of the Island.

Wendy, too, was passionate and although I was never privy to what went on in the marital home, I have no doubt that they enjoyed many lively political debates over the dinner table and no doubt over the occasional glass of something or other. The two of them retired from politics after the general election in 2008.

Laurie's interests were not confined to banking and politics. I first met him in about the 1980's, when we were both members of the Committee of the Royal Channel Islands Yacht Club in Guernsey. We worked together again when I became Deputy Bailiff in 2005 and when he was Chief Minister. He was a great support to me, on the first occasions when I sat nervously, as Deputy Presiding Officer, and he was seated immediately to my left.

My abiding memories of him as a person will be of his calm, gentlemanly temperament, his sense of humour and, above all, the kindness and courtesy he always showed me wherever and whenever we met. I am sure that others who knew him will share similar memories of him.

As an Island we can be grateful that someone with his professional expertise, his passion for politics and his desire to improve the politics and the economy of his adopted Island, devoted 20 years of his life to working for us all. Anyone who saw him in recent years will have noticed that he was becoming increasingly frail. Everyone who saw him will have been moved to see the love and devotion with which Wendy cared for him and looked after him. Fortunately, she did not stay too long with us yesterday and she was with him at his bedside in the nursing home when he took his last few breaths yesterday afternoon.

To Wendy and his wider family, we extend our sincere condolences. Please now rise in tribute to former Conseiller and Deputy Laurie Morgan.

Members stood in silence.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

Billet d'État II

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

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

Amendment 2 (continued)

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: Billet d'État II, the continuation of the debate.

The Bailiff: Who wishes to speak next?

Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

My speech will not be as eloquent as others, because I do not write it in advance. I prefer to do as I have done in this debate and hang out until the end and then speak to some of the major points that have been raised by other speakers.

I would like to start off by talking about professional input into the process. A lot has been made of various teaching professionals that have opined on the best form for our new education system, but the Members seem to have overlooked that our own officers in the Education Department are, almost to a man and a woman, teaching professionals with many years of experience – teaching professionals who benefit from the fact that they have an oversight of the whole system. They do not work as primary teachers or secondary teachers or post-16 teachers. They have a view over the whole system.

They have worked with the Committee to design the plans that have been put before the States. They did not disagree with us. It has been a co-operative effort. Some might say, have they
85 unduly influenced the Committee? My answer would be no. I think everybody is aware that I had my differences of opinions with officers when we first came into office at Education, Sport & Culture and that there were strong disagreements. Everything that has been presented to the Committee has been very strongly challenged and reviewed and gone backwards and forwards in the development process. All our teaching professionals have been approached and consulted. All
90 of the secondary institutions have been involved in the discussion.

So when our proposals come to the States they do not come as either the Committee's blind view on education without professional input; nor do they come to the Assembly as the view of the officers within the Education office and system. They are a broad-based, principled offering which we look to present, or the ESC Committee presents, as a way forward.

95 There has also been criticism that, in some way, the ESC proposal is not inspirational, is not different. I would say quite the opposite. If anything, ESC can be accused of going too far in its proposals, of trying to implement too much change, potentially, and potentially causing pushback for that reason.

I would say that the two-school model lacks inspiration, lacks vision. It is basically more of the same. We have got an 11-18 school, let us have two. We have got a further education college, let
100 us leave it alone and let it stand as it is. I do not see the differences. I do not see where the inspirational change comes.

If I refer back to Deputy Richard Graham's speech on the 11-plus debate, he went on at length about the deplorable lack of performance of the UK education system in the PISA scales. Yet, he
105 then comes forward and starts showing glowing examples of UK schools that we should be emulating. I would say that the UK education system is, if not dysfunctional, damaged, and something that we should be looking as a unique jurisdiction to move further away from, not emulate.

Also, I would like to address some of the comments that Deputy Richard Graham made yesterday. I should have stood up and done a correction, but luckily my speech comes second, so
110 I can do a rebuttal. Deputy Richard Graham mentioned about the T-levels and, I must admit, through you sir, I do not think he fully understands how the T-levels are going to function and certainly misrepresented comments that myself and Deputy Dudley-Owen made at the recent presentation.

115 The T-levels are a major issue for this Island. The UK government is looking to dispose of the BTEchs and all the other various industry-related qualifications that are currently on offer and replace it with a standard offering. That, in itself, is an issue, because will all industries recognise it? Will they adopt it? Also it has issues for us specifically, because under the T-level qualifications, there is a requirement for 45 to 60 days of work experience to acquire the certificate – in the
120 industry in which one is qualifying.

Guernsey does not have a lot of industries. Where we do have companies in certain areas, they are often small companies. They are not necessarily going to be able to allow, effectively, apprentices to come in for three full months of work experience, on premises, to be able to acquire those certificates. We may end up in a situation in the future where we cannot deliver
125 some T-levels and that is what prompted Deputy Dudley-Owen's question about whether we could do a customised T-level in Guernsey that maybe omitted some of that practical experience. We were informed no, if you do not have up to 800 hours of experience in a specific, recognised company and a recognised industry you cannot get that T-level.

Also Deputy Graham said that the T-levels would be taught only at the College of Further
130 Education. That is also incorrect. The T-levels have 15 different pathways, have both vocational and more academic T-levels. For instance, a T-level in legal, finance and accounting would be taught at a college, not necessarily a college of further education, but a sixth-form college. Several of the other T-levels, where it is applied T-levels rather than vocational T-levels, would actually be taught, such as engineering, there would be T-levels that would apply as a replacement for the

135 engineering A-level and would be taught at the sixth-form college, not necessarily at the College of Further Education.

When we talk about T-levels, we have got to be cognisant of the fact that this is coming down the road at us, being imposed by the UK. We may not be able to replicate that directly in our system. Any future system has to be designed to take that into account. Hence my curveball question to the speaker and that was: do we have to follow the UK system? We do not.

140 As a jurisdiction, can we adopt an external provider? I specifically asked about the International Baccalaureate, whether we can adopt that, because they offer courses at primary and secondary school, as well as post-16 qualifications. Could we adopt that throughout our system? For Deputy Graham's information, yes they are delivered in English.

145 We were looking at that. At a Committee level we have discussed that on numerous occasions and toyed with the idea that, in the future, Guernsey might actually move away from the UK education system *per se*. Imagine the impact. We would have a qualification in the Island that would be recognised worldwide; that is recognised by the vast majority of universities in the UK, so we would still have inter-operability with the UK, but we would have a system that would be global. So our students could go off and apply for jobs, or universities and higher learning institutions worldwide.

Also look at the hiring of teachers. Currently we hire teachers from the UK. Teaching professionals tend to be inherently conservative and one of our problems is trying to identify teachers who are willing to move to a different country, effectively, in Guernsey, and come under our immigration laws where they may be required to leave after five or eight years, because of our licensing requirements.

155 If you were hiring teachers from an IB background, you would be hiring from a global resource. The IB is delivered in all the offshore centres: Dubai, Hong Kong, Singapore, through the Americas, you name it. We would be hiring people who are used to travelling internationally, doing a three to five-year stint in a country then moving on. We would be bringing teachers to the Island with an international perspective, with international experience and helping to broaden the experience of our own students.

160 There are bigger issues and more visionary things that the Committee have been looking at to develop our system to in the future. I think those quotes yesterday, when they drew a laugh, I think it was inappropriate and it was misrepresenting what was actually discussed at that meeting.

165 Also there was much ado made of the 1970 Guernsey Education Law and whether it should be changed. This has been considered at the Committee level and at the Committee level it was decided, under the advice from our officers, we do not have the resources to do it right now. It was part of the Policy & Resource Plan phase two plan put forward and it was said that it was considered but was deferred because of lack of resources.

170 Redrawing a whole Law is a significant effort. It requires all kinds of hoops to be gone through and processes. It will take years to do and to implement. The fact is, the Law as it is at the moment does not restrict us from doing what we want to do. Deputy Fallaize, he mentioned that, 'Ah, well, we were talking about governance and LMS.' We can transfer the mantle to the schools, quickly if necessary, to governing bodies.

175 But Deputy Fallaize commented, 'Ah, but you can withdraw it again.' Under our current Rules and regulations ultimate responsibility lies with the Committee and if you delegate management of a section of the education system to a third party, ultimately responsibility still lies with the Committee and the Committee, if it wanted to, could withdraw that delegated authority.

180 What I am reading into Deputy Fallaize, and I will be very happy if he clarifies when he sums up at the end, is that he was envisaging a change to the Law, where you would irrevocably delegate responsibility for part of the management of our education system to a third party. Really? What happens if it does not work? What happens if that group you have delegated responsibility ... *(Interjection by Deputy Merrett)* Sorry, you would change the Law?

185 Deputy Merrett suggests we change the Law. As I have just said, that takes several years. You have delegated authority for secondary education to a board of governors. That board of

governors does things that either do not work and the system starts failing, does things that the populace of Guernsey does not like and therefore wants changed, or this Assembly wants change. Sorry, you have delegated authority and legally you have changed the Law, so you cannot get it back. Then we have to go and change the Law. That might take several years. What damage can be done during that period?

Corporate governance has been a very big part of what we have been looking at. Again, whilst we have been looking at a trial period of transferring governance to the College of Further Education, to the waiting board of governors, actually starting in January under the Committee, it would still take time to put in place the proper governance structure to make sure that ultimately the Committee and this Assembly could re-take control if necessary, under the Law. We are hearing, and I am hearing mutterings from this Chamber, from Deputy Roffey, exactly, 'We want to delegate complete responsibility.' I almost feel like, in the alternative model, what they would like to do is set up a board of governors next week, delegate authority to them and let them get on with it. Let them build the education system.

What is the guarantee that that governing body will develop an education system that this Island wants? That actually works and delivers what this Island needs? There is no guarantee and if you have delegated that authority irrevocably you cannot retrieve it.

I yield to Deputy Inder.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: I thank Deputy Meerveld for giving way, but he does mention local management and I think in the letter of comment from Policy & Resources there is a misunderstanding about what it may or may not be, and that seems to have been played out in the last couple of days.

Can I ask Deputy Meerveld, who sat on the Committee longer than I did, and I went through an induction period when I joined the Committee, and one of the phrases he used to me about the College of FE ... and this is where fiscal responsibility comes in; it is all very well getting excited about the word LMS, but there is actually a financial responsibility to this. The College of FE was described to me as a 'financial basket case' – those were the words that were used to me.

I wonder if Deputy Meerveld, who sat in some of the same meetings as me, is there anything that he has seen that over the last year that has dispelled those fears at all?

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, Deputy Inder, for putting me on the spot! There are issues definitely in the College of Further Education. The estimates are, and this has been supported by the PWC Report, that they are spending probably in the region of £2 million more than they should be to deliver the courses they do.

There have been efforts to try and address that, but it is an ongoing process. Again, under the Committee's plans, there absolutely was the intention to potentially ... I am sorry, I am not giving way.

There were plans to delegate responsibility eventually to governing bodies. We spoke about potentially setting up a governing body to cover all the secondary, to cover the consolidated post-16, and there was discussion on whether the sixth-form college that was envisaged by the Committee would fall under the secondary governance model, or the post-16 governance model, and that could be decided later.

Being pragmatic, practical people, particularly the business people on that Committee who have an understanding of governance, like myself and Deputy Dudley-Owen, we sat there and looked at it and said what you do first is you build the system first. You put it in place, you make sure it works. Then you bring in a board of governors to take over responsibility for taking it forward.

By doing that, you have ensured that it is being built in the way and structured in the way you wanted, that budgetary controls are put in place. That the whole thing is functioning before you hand it to a third party. What you do not do is invite a third party in with potentially no track record in running and education system and hand it over something that is broken and say, 'Please fix it for me.'

That brings me onto an interesting idea. Actually, before we go on to that: Finance and HR. The States of Guernsey has just consolidated Finance and HR to the centre. The number of full-time equivalent employees at the Education department, I think, has gone down from 86 to 58, because we have moved communications, HR, finance – maybe not coms – a lot of the other divisions into the centre. Effectively we have a business partner allocated to us to help us.

LMS of schools would see a delegation not down to a committee, but actually down to individual schools. Potentially each school would have to have a bursar and HR manager. Look at that for the budgetary and organisation implications. So LMS is not as easy as you think. When you look at what exactly is your authority. Are you going to give those schools authority to compete with each other, to outbid each other for salaries to hire the best teachers? Are you going to give them the ability to be able to set their own curriculum, so they can compete with each other?

At what point do we say, actually we want your management to go so far but not any further? We want to give you discretionary autonomy to do so much but not necessarily everything. I agree that certainly the HR and the hiring process is abysmally bad and needs to be addressed, but it is not necessarily by putting an HR person in an individual school or even in a super-school, consolidated, federated school.

When we look at the two-school model, look at what they are saying. We want to develop two 11-18 schools, we want to get an independent board of governors and we want to give them control and we want them to go out and manage our education system for them. Fine, leave it to the professionals.

Okay, where are we going to get these professionals from? Where are we going to get the board of governors from? Where are we going to get the administration staff who understand the HR issues relating to hiring teachers, because they serve on specific contracts and have specific pay scales etc.?

Hold on a second! We already have it, don't we? The colleges: we know, because we pay their fees, actually cost less per student than we do in our secondary system. We could subcontract the management of our schools to institutions on the Island that have independent boards of governors, they have all the administration set up already, they have the economies of scale, they have a proven track record. So I am hoping that when the two-school model is put forward and addressed, if it does get voted through, that a comparison and the pros and cons of subcontracting management of our education system to the colleges will be considered.

Then we would not have a two-tier system. We would have a one-tier system, run by the colleges, who everybody seems to aspire to.

A Member: Where is an amendment? (*Laughter*)

Deputy Meerveld: I will consider putting in an amendment! But you would have a system there with exactly the management structure that is being proposed. Independent governance, separate HR, separate finance facilities, well-proven track record. You have got everything. So again, as a businessman, I would say, fine, you want to subcontract education let us do it to the colleges. They are there, they are set up, they are working and they have got a track record.

Much has been made of quality teachers. Whilst many Deputies have stood and said we have got wonderful teachers in our 11-16 schools, and they are absolutely right, apparently 11-18 teachers are just that much better, because apparently we cannot hire good teachers in 11-16 schools. I am sorry, we have been hiring teachers, very good teachers, excellent teachers, into 11-

16 schools for decades before we ever hired into 11-18 schools. The fact is 11-16 education has been in existence longer. In fact, 11-14, if we go back far enough.

So the two-school model says, 'Well, we can hire better teachers if we hire 11-18.' The fact is there are teachers out there who prefer to teach 11-16. The two-school model, whilst you might say the three-school model prevents us hiring 11-18 school teachers who want to focus in that area, you all have to look at the flip side. The two-school model prevents us hiring teachers who want to specialise in the 11-16 range and there are teachers out there who prefer to teach that age range.

Other disadvantages with the two-school model: size of school – much has been made of the size of school. In fact, there is an amendment from the ESC that looks to equalise the schools, because for some reason a five-and-a-half-form entry school cannot sit next to an eight-form entry school. To me, the size is totally irrelevant. It comes down to the curriculum delivered and the size of the classes. In the three-school model, all the classes are exactly the same and the curriculum across the three schools is identical.

That is something we currently do not have. Because La Mare de Carteret is small in its cohort number, it cannot offer the full curriculum, so that school is disadvantaged by size. Under our model, whether the La Mare de Carteret School stays at five-and-a-half-form entry or we spend £4 million or £5 million just to have an extra half form, to make it a six-form entry, it will have exactly the same curriculum and exactly the same class size as La Mare de Carteret or St Sampson's, regardless of whether La Mare de Carteret is seven-form entry or eight-form entry.

But size does become an issue when we start talking about taking our existing schools, St Sampson's, from 720 students to potentially a capacity of 1,450 students. Now, that would not mean that we necessarily have 1,450 students there. But you cannot fully occupy all classrooms at all times. That is why La Mare de Carteret was designed for a 960 capacity, although we would never envisage it having 960 students there, because you cannot fill every classroom to full capacity all the time.

Some classes run on smaller sizes, smaller groups. You have got to have break-out rooms, etc. So you would be building St Sampson's from 720 to a minimum of 1,450 design capacity. In England that is not an issue. We have acres and acres of land. We can build a new motorway going to the school, for access, etc. In a Guernsey context, this becomes a real issue. It is not just a case of the populace is not used to large schools. It is not the case that large schools cannot produce better results. They can. It is not the issue that discipline may be an issue in a bigger school. It may be, it may not.

It is the physical, practical implementation. The three-school model as proposed by the Committee, we went to great lengths to keep the cost as low as possible. Fully utilise the estate. Yes, some of it was about buildings. But also the delivery of that curriculum. That same curriculum across all schools. Equal opportunity for everybody, a parity of esteem for everybody, has been used as a phrase very often. But it is a crucial part of what was designed.

Also in the two-school model, we have all these comments about the potentially combined sixth form being sub-optimal. Sorry, you are taking a 450-student sixth form, roughly now, 400 to 450, and you split it in half. Then you are splitting lessons across two sites. You are going to end up with a significant number of classes with only three to five students in them. How could that be efficient? How could it be conducive to learning?

We heard from UK speaker –

Deputy Fallaize: Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, Deputy Meerveld knows that is not true. The curricular modelling carried out by the people recruited by the Committee's own officers shows that the number of subjects in which that would happen is two: chemistry and English literature.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: That is – let me just read this – okay, I have just got an email from the officers to confirm the facts. Based on the current modelling, 33 classes would have fewer than 10 students and nine classes would have five or fewer. That is what has just come from the officers by email.

Let me get back to where I was. Let us talk about the sixth form generally. In our model, you aggregate full-time learners. You end up with a sixth-form college, under our model, with 850 to 1,000 students, of which only 15% are level 1 and level 2. All the rest are level 3. You end up with an aggregated, full-time teaching force on that site delivering both academic and vocational courses. You have those economies of scale that everybody is desiring, but you also have that breadth of offering and that parity of esteem and a quality of offering, and opportunity to all the students.

Under the two-school model, you take that 400-450 and split it into two sixth forms of 200 to 225. First of all, you have got teachers and pupils moving backwards and forwards under a federated model, which we have been told numerous times does not work; has not worked. And, what happens if our student numbers drop? What happens if we go below 200 students per sixth form?

Last year, 37 students left the colleges and went to our sixth form because of its broader offering. This year, 51 students left the colleges. What happens when you split those things? You cannot offer the breadth of courses or the quality of the classes. You end up in a situation whereby you are falling below 200. You can end up with two or three students in some classes.

You would have to start at looking cutting courses. Your costs go through the roof. We are not talking about the split sixth form being a panacea by any means. There is a whole load of issues related to it. Also we talk about this wonderful role model situation where those 18-year-olds become the role models for all other students – great. We currently have those role models in three out of four of our secondary schools. They are 16 years old. They are the prefects, they are the head boy and the head girl. You are disenfranchising them when you start moving to 11-18.

You are also setting an interesting precedent. As Deputy Mark Leadbeater referred to yesterday, effectively the two-school model is de-selection at 16. If you go to a secondary school, under the two-school model, at 16 you want to go on a vocational pathway? 'Bye! Go somewhere else. But, oh, you are academic, you can stay on. You can be a role model for everybody else in the school. But, no, if you are 16 and you want to go vocational, we don't get to see you any more.'

That was one of the things we were trying to break down, to create this parity of esteem between vocational and academic. Break a societal perception that has pervaded the English education system for the last 70 years or more. We want to break that down by putting everybody in one institution and allowing them equal access and it does not matter whether you are vocational or academic, you are having lunch together, you are doing enrichment together, you are doing sports together. There is a levelling of the society and the perception.

Also there was talk about the fact that 15% more students will stay on to A-levels if it has a sixth form attached. Well, if the sixth form was not attached, would that 15% have gone on to vocational, because 96% of our students currently stay on for some form of higher education? Ninety-six per cent.

What you do is you are changing that emphasis in the school. If the school is looking to retain people for sixth form, they are emphasising and prioritising, potentially, the academic students. That is the preferred route. They are the ones who become head boy. They are the ones who become mentors. They are the ones who are retained and given a place in school up to 18.

Therefore, are you indirectly influencing people who might have wanted to take a vocational route, but because of the perceptions of society of the Grammar School's current sixth form, there is a perception of some people that it is somehow a better route than going to the College of Further Education? Are you perpetuating that? Are you pushing some young people to pursue an

academic route that may not be in their best interest or may not suit their best abilities, but it is perceived to be the better route? Again, in the Education Committee, we were trying to break down that perception by having one institution which all the 16-year-olds go to.

Also, there is a natural break at 16. We transfer children from primary to secondary at 11 years old. Why shouldn't we transfer all of our students, at 16, to one institution focused on taking their education forward?

There is a natural break. We have a Law the fact that every child has to attend school to 16. They have to be there. No choice. And, to a large extent, the curriculum is prescribed up to 16. They have set subjects they have to study, with relatively little choice. After 16, everything changes. After 16, they are there by choice, not because they are compelled to be. They are there studying the courses they have chosen, not the ones that are mandated.

So there is a natural break. You can allow those young people to choose where they want to go at post-16 and provide it. You can also change the nature of the environment. Do we want to preserve our 16-19-year-olds as children at school, or do we want to start transitioning them to a work or university style of life and actually prepare them for future life?

If you keep them in their school environment, okay they might not be required to wear the school uniform, but they are still in that ringing a bell at half-time, that prefect-type environment. They are still in that structured school environment and you are keeping them as school children, literally, until they are 18.

In our vision model, your sixth-form college would be more of a university-style environment. There would not be uniforms. There would be a broad range of activities. There would be more self-directed learning. People would be encouraged to become independent learners and more self-motivated. There would be, obviously, a lot more flexible schedule of different classes and different times.

You are trying to create a university-style environment, which is preparing these young people to be more independent, to start directing their own lives, getting them ready for either university or a work environment. That again was part of the sixth-form college proposal, to try and design that kind of model.

At the end of the day, the ESC's sixth form model has ended up being probably a step too far and it has been roundly criticised by all the institutions providing sixth-form education now; having said which, it has not been discredited. We have made a proposal and when we went out for consultation in June/July of last year, we had exactly the same feedback, that people did not like it, and we were told, 'It cannot work. You cannot curriculum that. You cannot provide the curriculum for that system.'

So our officers went away and modelled the full curriculum for both the sixth-form college and the College of Further Education. Then the same people came back and said, 'No, you cannot staff that. You cannot have full-time staff. You are going to have staff whizzing backwards and forwards, etc.'

So the officers went away and did up an entire staffing model for the College of Further Education and the sixth-form college and came back and said, 'We can. We can fully staff it. There might be one or two teachers in it, out of a faculty of 70, that might have to do some classes in the 11-16 as well as the post-16, but we can fully staff that institution and the College of Further Education.'

The College of Further Education, if amalgamated with the GTA and the Institute of Health, would have 2,000-something students, part-time. It would be a significant institution. But eventually what they said was, 'You know what? We just do not like it. It is not what we have got now, we do not like it, for one reason or another.'

I accept that. I accept that there was pushback, there was concern, there are issues with it. That is why you have the Meerveld/Fallaize (*Laughter*) ... the Meerveld/Ferbrache amendment which says exactly that. That amendment was placed specifically because I proposed to the Committee several months ago that we split our policy letter, because post-16 still needed more work. Why did it need more work? Well, we were pushing all of the various providers, the GTA, the Institute

of Health, College of Further Education, etc., to come together and talk about merging and amalgamating and consolidating, because it is crazy for an Island this size to have so many disparate institutions. Again, if you look at the financing of it, that is a massive waste of resources and increased cost and does not necessarily service all the people's needs.

On 8th October, the GTA had a board meeting where they finally agreed to come to the table and talk about co-operating with the other institutions. On 18th October, this is a very important date, we had a joint meeting between Education, Sport & Culture, and HSC, where Health agreed to transfer control of the Institute of Health fully to –

Deputy Soulsby: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: I am glad Deputy Meerveld has brought this matter up, because I have been wanting to correct him ever since I have heard about him talk about it in the media.

The fact about the Institute is that the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture had operational control from the start of this term. The only element that was held by Health & Social Care was internal training and that certainly was not anything that was decided or required by the previous board.

In fact, it is the one thing that the whole board at that time were unanimous on, that it should all go to Education, Sport & Culture. All I can say is Education, Sport & Culture had operational control of the Institute from day one.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you for that correction. Yes, the educational part of the Institute of Health was held by Health, the training division. It was only then that we had consolidated control there; that we could then say we are now in a position where can instruct that division, that provider, to come to the table.

The 18th October is so important, because that is the date we originally were going to publish our policy letter. It had been predominantly written by then. The only reason we published the policy letter late was because of the two-school model coming up and our officers and time and resources being drawn away to compile that. We would have been publishing on that date.

I said to the Committee we should use that couple of weeks before we actually publish to split the policy letter. There was resistance from officers and I lost that vote. It is an ironic, slight indictment of our political system that once I left the Committee, I could actually lay an amendment to do what I could not achieve as a member of the Committee.

The logical thing of saying let us break the policy letter ... A lot of the criticism over the last two days has been laid at Education about its post-16 plans. Accepted. Put the post-16 plans on hold for the moment. That is what the amendment says. Consider it later. Get all the providers to get together and co-design the post-16 provision, where they can all come together and they will have to all make compromises and design something that is fit for this Committee. Fit to bring back to this Assembly for approval with broad-based support.

That amendment is designed to work within the implementation schedule as laid down by ESC. So it does not delay the implementation, because under the implementation schedule they would be hiring posts in September 2019, when they would be looking to appoint people to new positions in both the sixth-form college and the post-16, hopefully, university college, Guernsey.

If the decision is made by March 2015 on the structure of post-16 then you can carry on with that implementation schedule exactly as designed. So that amendment allows this Assembly to recognise that there are issues with the post-16. There are lots of voices out there complaining about it. Let us get everybody around the table to co-design it, not to simply say, 'The College of Further Education wants to be left alone, let us build them a separate institution.' Because that institution is not necessarily functioning as well as it should. Just simply building them a nice new

building is not necessarily going to fix some of the issues up there. There are other things that have to be done.

500 Right, let us talk about resilience of the system. Deputy Matt Fallaize made big issues of how their system will be so much more resilient by having bigger schools; by having these two huge schools with extra teachers on site. You would have redundancies. If a sixth form A-level teacher in physics was off sick, you would have another teacher you could draw off within the system.

505 He does not look at the whole picture. What about business continuity? Imagine this. We have three schools of roughly 700 pupils. One of them burns down or gets flooded. You can take 300 students – it might require temporary classrooms and some other facilities – but you have got 700 displaced students you need to facilitate within the system. If a school of 1,400 students burns down and you have only got one other school, where are you going to put them?

510 Also, what about if student numbers go up? In the three-school system, because you have to have head room, as I mentioned earlier, you designed a school for 960 students at La Mare not because 960 students will go to it but because you have got to have capacity for break-out rooms of smaller classes on some subjects.

515 In our system you would have three schools with a certain amount of excess capacity, flexibility in their numbers, to enable them to function. If you had an increase in our population in Guernsey, you would have that flexibility across the three schools to increase. If you built three schools to an exact size as required now, minimising the CapEx cost, you could end up being in a situation in the future where, if we change our immigration policy, if we allow more people to reside in Guernsey, then we have got an issue. We do not have the schools for the children.

520 What about if there is a change in its current demographics? At the present moment, our population is pretty much neutral, but we have more older people coming to the Island and younger people with children moving off the Island. What happens if that reverses? We definitely would like it to reverse, because it would help our demographic bubble that we are building at the moment, that is going to be an issue in the future. If we could get more young people coming with children, we may end up with the same population but more children to educate. Therefore does that system give you enough resilience to be able to cope with that?

525 We talk about the two-school model and there have been very dismissive remarks about the research that was conducted for the £72,000 that was eventually spent – luckily the Committee managed to save about £20,000 – but of that money, a lot of research was done. I do not think many Members have read it, because whilst Deputy Fallaize asserts it is possible to build, he does not mention the numerous issues involved in that research. All of that research has major hurdles that are set up for the two-school model.

530 They talk about, of the four sites we have currently, only two are actually anywhere near big enough to build on. If you build on the Baubigny school, St Sampson's, you are talking about having to put in new roads, new pedestrian pathways, though people's gardens and private land, as far away as the Hautes Capelles junction next to the shop; as the Route Carre junction; as far away as Oatlands, changing the road network.

535 Now I agree, anything is possible. You can go in and you can parachute one school in the centre of Guernsey with 2,700 students and you can build a motorway going east and west and north and south to access it. You can. It is physically possible. You can do it. Of course you have got to have (a) the money to do it and (b) the political will. Unfortunately, as we are not living in a dictatorship – because in China or somewhere like that you could do this – there is no way the public will support that. I suspect that when this two-school proposal comes back to the States, that is what you are going to have. You are going to have a public backlash like you have never seen before and it will end up being thrown out yet again.

540 Again, no consultation has been done with the electorate on the two-school model. This States is looking at throwing out a detailed plan with the costings done down to the penny, with the transition model telling every student, every parent, exactly where they are going and how it is going to work. Yet we are going to throw that out and go on to something where none of that

has been specified and the electorate have not been asked about this. I suspect there will be an interesting pushback on that alone.

550 Nothing has been made of the fact, to make this work, almost certainly, you are going to end up with purchases of private land. If that purchase of private land has to be done under compulsory purchase, because people do not want their gardens being turned into a new roundabout, then we have been advised by the Law Officers, you can expect at least two years for that to be done.

555 You cannot start drawing up plans for construction on land without the permission of the landowner. Therefore you may be in a situation whereby we want to build two schools, we have got the will to compulsorily purchase land to acquire the land we need to do it, but we cannot actually start submitting the plans to the DPA, or going through all the other processes, until such time as we have actually bought the land and therefore, as the landowner, can give permission for that to happen.

560 The States as a whole, we face a massive issue here. In the past, Deputy Yerby in her speech said we do not want flip-flop Government. This is a classic flip-flop Government. This is the waste debate all over again: let's build an incinerator; let's not build an incinerator; let's build an incinerator; let's not build an incinerator.

565 We are looking at throwing out a plan that was voted on twice, once in this Assembly, once in the previous Assembly. It was ratified. It is brought back to the States in detail and they say, 'No, we do not like that incinerator. Let's go for something different' – without specifying what the different is. No proposal has been put forward on what schools it is going to be, how much it is going to cost, when it is going to be done.

570 We are in danger of causing serious umbrage to our electorate by, again, flip-flopping on a major issue and pushing it down the line. We are looking at an economic impact. Our construction industry desperately needs support. You do that through large scale Government contracts. They want this to happen. We need to get on with doing things on this Island, not simply sitting back and twiddling our thumbs and thinking about another way to avoid making a decision.

575 Reputation risk to this Island. This States is in danger of becoming the 'worst States ever': a moniker that has been applied to previous States, but we are in danger of earning it, by avoiding the difficult decisions, pushing down the line, by vacillating, by not getting on with it. Most people in Guernsey want us to just get on with it.

580 We also have issues with Locate Guernsey and businesses saying they are having trouble recruiting staff. The uncertainty in the education system, if you are asking particularly the middle management who cannot afford to buy out to the colleges, if they are coming to this Island, the first thing anybody looks at is what is the environment and what is the education system? That is what the wife of the husband, or the husband of the wife, who are coming to the Island will be looking at. They will be looking at the issues: 'what environment I am living in'; they will be looking at 'what education system our children are going through'. Families are going to look at that as a major concern in moving to this Island.

590 If you have got this situation where we vote for two schools, but we do not where they are, we do not know when they will be built, we do not know how much they will cost, so guess what, it is all up in the air – and the States does have somewhat of a history of flip-flopping on major issues – it is deferring it down the line. It is causing reputational damage, Locate Guernsey is going to struggle, businesses are going to struggle. This has an economic impact, not making this decision.

595 Let me do something I have never done before in politics: make predictions. On my manifesto, I talked about principles, but I did not make predictions or commit. So I am going to make some predictions right now. As was mentioned earlier in the debate, the two-school model in cost is £93 million to £135 million, depending on which school combinations are chosen. But is that the complete picture? No.

 The £110 headline number in the Education, Sport & Culture policy letter includes La Mare primary and the College of Further Education. Now because we do not know where these things are going to be built, we cannot put any accurate numbers on. But roughly, you need to add

£20 million for a rebuild of La Mare primary in the current location without a secondary attached. It is £19.6 million, I think, to be precise.

College of Further Education, Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Roffey have all promised there is going to be much more investment in this Cinderella institution. 'We are going to build you a big, brand-new school. We are going to do what the States has promised for years, consolidate from three campuses down to one.'

Right, well, we do not have any numbers to go on, because we do not know where it is going to be put. So that process will take years in itself. What we do have is the estimate put in the March 2016 Billet by the previous Education Committee, who estimated that rebuild of the College of Further Education, a complete rebuild, new building, would be £67 million.

So if you add the primary, £20 million, £67 million. That is £87 million. So take your £93 million, add £87 million and your cheapest two-school model comes out looking like £170 million. I think that obviously there will be ways to make that cheaper. We could close down Beaucamps School and turn it into half a College of Further Education. That has potential. You could build the workshops on where the swimming pool and the games areas are at the moment.

That is a potential thing you could do. But that will cost tens of millions of pounds. It is not easily done. You could try and find a new site, you could use Les Ozouets and try and build the campus there. But that is going to be a new build and that is going to come in near that £60 million number. Whichever way you look at it, this is my prediction, the two-school model when presented to the States will come in somewhere between £20 million and £40 million, in total, more than is proposed by the existing Committee.

And general revenue: there were jokes about the fact that the general revenue difference between the two-school and three-school was falling. Much has been made of, 'It is the future of our children, it does not matter how much capital it costs.' But we want to make some savings on general revenue. We are under direction. In fact, ESC is under special measures from P&R to make savings and I am hoping that they will continue, if there is a new Committee, to enforce those savings.

I will make a prediction. The general revenue cost of running the two-school model that has been presented today will end up being higher than ESC's three-school model. I might be proven wrong, but I will make that prediction on the record.

I will make another prediction. The general public of Guernsey are going to be up in arms if the two-school model is supported. The first massive kick-back will come in next week, when the populace wakes up, reads the *Press*, turns on the radio and says, 'They have done *what?*' I do not think the public want two big schools, under any terms. I think you will have a massive public pushback.

The next big public pushback will come in three or four months' time, when the new Committee, as I suspect it will be if the two-school model goes through, will announce which schools they are going to close. Then we will have a significant people getting very exercised about the fact that their schools are going to be closing and those teachers will now be displaced, and we will be wondering where their jobs are going to be within this new system.

The final pushback, which I think will be ballistic, is when this comes back to the States – and I predict 18 months at least, possibly longer – as a properly presented proposal, as ESC's today, that is fully costed, plans are drawn up and approved, it is ready to go, ready to put spades in the ground and start building in July, with a full transition model measured out that has the least possible impact on our earners. It will be a minimum of 18 months, you can take that as another prediction, and possibly two years-plus before that comes back to the States.

When it does, and it comes back with a massively higher price tag and all of the issues with the implementation, the disruption to the areas, there is going to be a huge public pushback. If you can get 336 people marching on Delancey Park because a few extra houses are going to be put on the Pointues Rocques, imagine what they are going to do when you tell them there are going to be 1,450 students at St Sampson's and we are going to be compulsorily purchasing some of your gardens to widen the roads!

So those are my predictions. Also, when that model comes back to the States, I will be asking a question. If the bill is £20 million to £40 million more, if the general revenue cost is the same or near to the same as the three-school model, then educational outcomes: would we get better educational outcomes if we took that £20 million or £40 million and invested it in our teachers, additional CPD, upskilling our workforce? Twenty million pounds. How much CPD can you buy for £40 million?

If we invested it in superfast broadband, ultra-modern science labs, computer equipment, if we gave every student at every secondary school, 11-16 right now, 11-18 even, our current cohort, £2,000 of computer equipment and said, 'There you are, a gift, see how that helps with your education', that would cost us £6 million. So if that £20 million or £40 million, which is going to be put into buildings under the two-school plan, is invested in the three-school system, if that is invested in the delivery of the education to our children, that I can guarantee you, would help with the outcomes. Having two bigger schools, two bigger buildings, is not.

I will sum up with some questions for Deputy Fallaize. I fully expect that if a two-school model is voted through, the majority of Education, Sport & Culture will step down, because having served on that Committee for the time I did, I know just how unworkable the two-school model is. I think the research that has been done for £72,000 proves it and I think the gang of four are in denial about it.

But I will ask this of Deputy Fallaize: as proposer of the amendment, as a three-term Deputy, will he promise to do something he has never achieved before? Will he put his political reputation on the line and undertake to stand as the President of ESC and deliver what he has sold to the Assembly? (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) I want to know if he will stand behind it.

Will he confirm, well he already has actually, that the capital expenditure for this grand adventure will be significantly higher than has been proposed by Education, Sport & Culture? Will he confirm that he expects the general revenue costs for the two-school model to be lower than the general revenue model proposed by ESC?

Will Deputy Fallaize undertake and analyse the benefits of contracting the management of our education system to the proven institutions that are out there now, the independent colleges?

Thank you, sir. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Deputies Lester Queripel and Leadbeater, do you wish to be relevés?

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, please.

Deputy Leadbeater: Please, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you. Then, Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you very much, sir.

Firstly, I need to commend the staff at Education, Sport & Culture for embracing lifelong learning by keeping Deputy Meerveld informed even when he is no longer a member of the Committee. I just caught a brief snippet of Deputy Yerby's interview on the radio this morning. I think she was absolutely right, two speeches at the end of yesterday did probably change the tone of the debate. Yesterday ended with two very passionate speeches; two very different speeches.

The first from Deputy Lowe was what we would expect, a speech in defence of La Mare de Carteret, a plea to act now for the benefit of our children and an explanation as to why we all need to hang our heads in shame. I would ask perhaps for newer Members or Members elected the time before last just to take that speech, possibly, with a pinch of salt. I say that because it was implied that some of us, some of you, were embarking on an exercise the likes of which we have never seen before when, clearly, that simply is not the case.

For the two Members, if I can refer to them throughout this *short* speech, I hasten to add, as the G4, Deputy Tooley and Deputy Graham, who are new to this Assembly and are bold enough to challenge the Education, Sport & Culture proposals, be assured there is no need for you to hang your heads in shame whatsoever. In fact, I would ask why *any* Member of this Assembly who has sat right through the golden age of overspends feels comfortable holding their heads so high.

The last speech from Deputy Dudley-Owen was different. It was perhaps the first real defence, other than Deputy Meerveld's, possibly, as a former Member, of the three-school proposals which we have heard from a sitting Member of Education, Sport & Culture. It was described as 'pugnacious, gutsy and to the point' and I would not disagree.

But its impact in my view was slightly tempered by the not-so-subtle attacks on P&R that we see so frequently. In fact both speeches late yesterday had to have the obligatory reference to P&R and questions over the leadership or otherwise of that Committee. But you really cannot have your free school meal and eat it, can you? You cannot on one hand talk down the role of the Committee and on the other hand work with one of its Members to place a last-minute amendment.

On leadership, just incidentally, when I sat in this Assembly when Deputy St Pier was bold enough to challenge the conventional four-school model and suggest a three, it was a very uncomfortable moment I think for a lot of States' Members when that speech was given, but I said in my speech to States' Members that I thought that was what leadership looked like. I stand by those remarks.

But I commend Deputy Dudley-Owen for delivering the speech she did. It was clearly cathartic for her and necessary for the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, who to date, I am afraid, have sold their proposals like a mild-mannered regional manager of a gents' outfitters: 'It might just have something new for you, it is a bit different and it might just fit your child.'

The G4 were always going to be able to sell their proposals with more conviction, because they are their proposals. They own them. They have given them shape and form and hopefully they can breathe some life into them. They have not simply fronted-up proposals written by a policy team at the centre.

Just on that, when Deputy Inder ended his *tour de force* of a speech on Wednesday, he appealed to us to be more supportive of the Education staff team. He commended them, and it is absolutely right that he did so. But the Education, Sport & Culture team does not end at the doors of Sir Charles Frossard House. Your staff, your teachers, your lecturers, your head teachers, your CFE managers, are telling you that you are going in the wrong direction. It is them that have to deliver a model they believe simply cannot work.

Aggregate all of the many years of service between those people, hundreds of years at the chalk face, the overhead projector, the whiteboard, the PC. Can we really set aside and dismiss it? Can we do that – on what grounds? How many of you have said in your speeches, 'I am not an educationalist but ...'? If we are not, then simply listen to those who are.

Deputy Lowe said we should be ashamed of the condition of La Mare. I agree. But, wait. Who was it saying we should be ashamed of the results at La Mare over the years? The answer, actually, very few, other than for Deputy Jane Stephens, when she dragged the results out of the then Education department and it was not particularly pretty. Like two people in an arrivals lounge arguing over a suitcase, eventually something had to give, and the contents were laid bare.

The 12% pass rate. Five subjects, A-C, a 12% pass rate at La Mare. Remember what people were saying? We had the best education system in the world, look at the results from the Grammar and all that time we had a school that was failing – and failing by some measure. La Mare is working today because of the great team that are in place. It is well-resourced, it has the right ethos and it has the right leadership.

But there is an irony in all of this. The school committees year in and year out have indulged themselves in campaigns to rebuild the school. They became so obsessed with buildings they actually completely lost sight of outcomes. The very painful truth is, and this is not an over-

statement, that children's education and consequently their life chances were compromised by attending a state-run school.

The G4 proposals understand outcomes come before architecture, though architecture has its place, Deputy Langlois. That is not just a casual aside, I do believe architecture has its place in schools, incidentally. The strength of the 11-18 model is that larger schools are beehives. They have an in-built self-reliance through sheer numbers. Vulnerable children will have more support because consolidation of specialities in one larger unit is just do-able.

Now, I like the notion of small schools. I think we all do. Or, at least, perhaps I thought I did. But when your child does have an issue, it becomes apparent small is not beautiful or, for that matter, efficient. An odd comparison may be just imagine your child was unwell and you were given the option of taking your child for a two-mile drive to a cottage hospital or a four-mile drive to a specialist paediatric centre. I suggest it would be the latter, for you know well the staff with the requisite skills would be at the centre that ensures their skills and training are kept up to scratch too.

Yesterday Deputy Leadbeater gave an excellent speech and reminded us all of the unique challenge every special child faces, as well as their parents I hasten to add. I agree with him. The challenges are great, and we cannot rely on bland assertions from the supporters of both models that special needs will be incorporated. It is just such an enormous piece of work.

Just to give you an indication of the scale of the challenge, a 16-year-old child who leaves Le Murier to attend the access course at the College of FE would have no type of qualification. Why? Because at a special needs secondary school you cannot get any type of formal qualification. So you start much later than your peers at the CFE. The point being that some children are capable but are simply not given the opportunity of getting any type of formal qualification. Their learning is held back, is compounded because they move from a special school into a college environment and the difference is stark and it is very difficult for the children who are capable to catch up with their peers who have been given something of a jump-start in other schools.

The right number of support staff in the right place will help those children who need the one-to-one secondary setting. What we have heard from parents through this debate is families whose children attend Les Voies will tell you how wonderful it is, rightly so. Families of children, autistic children generally, who attend The Base, will tell you how wonderful it is. And the majority of parents, I am sure, whose children attend Le Murier, will tell you how wonderful it is. All they are saying to you is: 'Thank you for attaching the right resource to my child.' You do not need to do that in quite so many settings and continue to segregate and separate children out.

This point was made very well by Will Morgan from The Cotswold school and, in a conversation with me, he said support staff will go to settings where the staff and child are well-supported. We hear that parallel in nursing. We constantly hear about care for the carer. Teachers will go to places where they can maximise the support for both the child and them.

Incidentally, I attended the Education, Sport & Culture presentation at Beau Sejour on Friday and it may be my misunderstanding, but I was expecting to hear from Mr Watkin, because the 11-16/post-16 education was very different. I actually think perhaps the meeting would have benefited from an impartial individual rather than the proposals being sold entirely by ...

I beg your pardon, I give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Sir, thank you to Deputy Brehaut for giving way.

Just by way of explanation, Mr Watkin had been scheduled to come over in December, when obviously our original plans had been put back to January and, therefore, with the rescheduling of the laying of the paper into January, he was not able to make it for the public presentation, which had originally been envisaged.

So thank you to Deputy Brehaut for giving me that opportunity to explain.

Deputy Brehaut: Okay, thank you very much.

805 In summary, I would ask Members to heed the advice of David Corke from the Association of Colleges, who made us aware of the changes coming our way. Thousands of long-established conventional exams are being phased out. There is a new model T on its way and we cannot ignore those new exams, or we do so at our peril.

Please reflect on the confident, competent and, frankly, good-humoured presentation we had
810 from Will Morgan: 12% of his students are on free school meals, their parents earn less than £16,000 a year, their results are exemplary, and the intake of that school is not hand-picked or selected. That has been implied several times on social media.

Please listen to the teachers, the heads who want you to embrace the two-school model. We were hearing only yesterday from Deputy Graham, even before the 11-16 train had left the ESC
815 platform, five head teachers felt the 11-18 model was the more appropriate way forward.

If it is possible, please do not listen to, or at least perhaps tune out, those voices that want to distil this very complex issue down to one site, one school or one parish. Particularly, with regard to Deputy Meerveld's speech, raising this spectre of democracy in this process. This spectre of democracy and this is what is taking so long. I would just make this appeal to Members. You need
820 to shift focus to ensure that we get the right result.

I will be candid. For too long politicians in this Assembly have thought of the next election and their chances. Do not do that today. Think about the next generation and their chances.

Thank you.

825 **Several Members:** Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

830 Mr Bailiff, fellow States' Members, I will start by stating that I rather drastically cut my speech, mainly due to some of the excellent speeches that have preceded mine. In particular Deputy Roffey, who I felt succinctly spoke of his deliberations and outcomes, whilst showing respect to other Members.

I thank Deputy Trott for his questions, Deputy Graham for an informative speech and
835 Deputy Ferbrache for his concerns – all of which I do agree with. However, now I fear we are moving into the realms of repetition, which adds nothing. So my speech will focus on two key points that I feel have not been focused on yet: licensing and lifelong learning.

Some of our patience is running rather thin. Without anything new to say, we now seem to be falling into rebuttals on a personal level, rather than on an intellectual level. I have no intention of
840 trying to summarise debate, reply to or criticise any other Deputy's speech as surely the proposer and Deputy Le Pelly will reply to debate on a meaningful level. We should all try to be respectful of each other.

What I will say, sir, is if anyone seriously thinks that Deputy Yerby is naïve, or may be naïve, then indeed we have some very confused Deputies who may wish to consider engaging more
845 positively with other Deputies in their deliberations and during debate. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I believe in policy politics, not personal, or paranoid politics.

I do not intend repeating the previous questions that have been asked, or repeating other observations, but I will say this: I believe that we should be looking forward to the future, not backwards. Not back to who said what and why in 2016. Why? Well, because I intend living in the
850 future. One of Victor Hugo's famous quotes alludes to this when he said:

I prefer the future to the past because that is where I intend the rest of my life.

So let us all decide to live our lives and hold a policy and strategy for the future. This should be an exciting time in the evolution of our secondary education provision; an opportunity to move on from a divisive, emotive and inflammatory past; an opportunity to unite educationalists and

Government; an opportunity to strive to achieve the best educational outcomes for all of our children and all other people of the Bailiwick.

Sadly, this has become a divisive and emotive debate that, at its very core, is a relatively simple question. However we appear to be detracting from this core question. Do we want to have an 11-18 provision or 11-16 provision with a separate 16-19 provision and what are our intentions towards lifelong learning?

We face a dilemma; a conundrum. Is our education system to be determined by the shape of our infrastructure that is the schools we have and the space we occupy, or should we be saying what do we need to do to offer our young people and our workforce the best possible opportunities and the chance to realise their future and full potential? There can only be one answer to that.

Do we want the best educational outcomes for all of our children and the people of the Bailiwick? The highest added value to our potential and existing workforce? Or do we want to try to work around our existing buildings? Do we want to give our educationalists the autonomy with the correct level of accountability to deliver our educational system?

The need for and prospect of local governance of schools has been promised by politicians and asked for by educational leaders for nearly a decade. We know that the last Committee established a founding board of directors of the College of Further Education more than five years ago. The board was promised full powers within two years of their formation. It has not happened. But why? Who has decided against decisions of previous Assemblies this is not going to happen?

Currently, we have a Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture that is technically the board of governors of every state school on this Island. It is utterly ridiculous. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) The heads I have spoken with have been frustrated in their efforts to run their schools. The benefits of close involvement of business in the governance of our schools are denied to them and we continue to sustain significant and costly central infrastructure, which frustrates our educational leaders.

It also appears to be disproportionate to the size of the Island. Do we want local school governance? My feeling from this Assembly is that we do. I do. I would like to see a board of governors rather than a board or committee of politicians making decisions regarding the running of our schools. We need to get politics, or more pertinently, politicians out of our educational system as quickly as possible. This Assembly appears to be united on this, but intent and delivery are clearly two very different things.

Two days ago, via a successful amendment, this Assembly confirmed this intent. But we still have no implementation date, even though we have been assured that, even without this amendment, the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture have been working on this and will continue to do so.

I totally agree with Deputy Ferbrache's speech regarding the timelines. We need to wait another year, the third year of this political term, for the Committee to bring back to the States the preferred governance model. So three years into the political term – three years.

Let us move on to educationalists. We can probably all agree that we want to be able to retain and recruit the best teachers, that we would like equitable and resilient distribution of teachers. But do we want to evolve our College of Further Education, strengthen it, make it more resilient? Do we want to promote lifelong learning? After all, we are debating the future structure of secondary and post-16 education in the Bailiwick. Post-16. So that is, in fact, any age.

How do we attract more teachers? For example, and I do not think anyone has mentioned this yet in this debate, sir, would it be helpful to change the licensing provision? This is my first key point. Are we going to continue to send excellent teachers off-Island and have a costly exercise of recruiting another teacher? Costs just not in the recruitment process, but the cost to the educational system of losing excellent teachers. The cost to our students of not having consistency and continuity of provision.

Do we want to listen to our head teachers? I am really pleased to say that I have spent more time with educationalists, from on and off Island, whilst deliberating secondary and further

education – more time with educationalists than with politicians or with the media. I sincerely hope that we have all done that.

I have asked direct and pertinent questions. I have respected their answers, their viewpoints and their concern. I have encouraged them to expand on their viewpoints. I have listened to them.

910 We then get told that teachers have a vested interest. Do teachers have a vested interest in our Island's education? Well, I hope so! Yes, I think we can safely say that teachers have a vested interest in our pupils', children of all ages, education – just as my doctor has a vested interest in my health. If I might say so, we should have a vested interest in the views, experience and knowledge of our professional teachers and current education leaders.

915 My second key point is that, as a recent Member of the Economic Development Committee, I have a real commitment and passion for the development of our workforce. The only real resource that we have as an Island are the skills and entrepreneurship of our people. We must offer the highest level of educational advanced training that we, as a community, can source, especially in light of the forthcoming debate on longer working lives.

920 This policy paper explains the utter importance of lifelong learning, of our workforce being able to retrain at any stage of their lives, at any age. At the moment we have three separately constituted institutions, the College of Further Education, the Institute of Health and GTA: each differently constituted, each overlapping their roles, each with a different form of governance and each too small to achieve real economies of scale, or to effectively negotiate with suppliers and providers of education and training. This too is utterly ridiculous. The only thing they all have in
925 common is they are funded from the taxpayers' purse and all are the responsibility of Education, Sports & Culture.

In my opinion, only the alternative model offers real rationalisation, offers a future that will see the expansion of the Island's further and higher provision on the Island. Only the alternative
930 model holds out the hope of genuine rationalisation, economies of scale and an institution which is more than the sum of its part.

I am afraid that Education, Sport & Culture's model, splitting the College of Further Education in half, creating two hybrids with no real international comparators, offers nothing but confusion, diseconomies of scale, and an uncertain future of further and higher education on this Island.

935 The world has moved on. At least those who are prepared to listen with an open mind have. This Island will live or die on the basis of the collective intellect of its workforce. We need to ensure that our post-16 provision is held in high regard, it is evolving, it is funded, and it is supported to ensure that we are able to ensure that all of our people, regardless of age, are able to access the most appropriate level of education that we can, as a community, resource.

940 In his speech, I would really like Deputy Le Pelley to explain exactly how it is to be achieved in Education, Sport & Culture's model, that splits the College of Further Education in half, creating two hybrids. Surely, there will be an inefficient ... of offer? Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

945

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

I would have liked to have written a reasonably detailed speech, especially as education is to me the most important area in which we are involved. However, I have not this time as events have got in my way, or rather a floor got in my way. So I am pleased that most of what I have
950 wanted to say has been said. The positives have been listed, all of which I consider relevant to this amendment and this debate, together with some of the concerns that I do have. I too think it most helpful that the officers of Education, Sport & Culture are emailing Deputies during this debate, providing information to those who are no longer on the Committee, and I look forward to receiving these emails too! (*Laughter*)

955 Speeches have been informative and clear, although unfortunately speeches on the three-school model, in my opinion, have been less about their model and more about, well, scaremongering. However, they have been made in a respectful manner. That is, as

Deputy Graham has mentioned, until the halos started to slip a little, late yesterday. I am still hoping that those listening, including those who report on this debate, would note the overall tone and perhaps take comfort.

That said, I will add my two pennyworth to the debate by considering two words which have been used a great deal by Members, by those who I have spoken to and from those who have contacted us by email and by letter, for which I echo my gratitude.

Firstly, uncertainty. There will still be uncertainty, whichever model we choose, but I believe the strength of the alternative model arguments – how they have set out their vision, how the best around the world, not just the UK, has been adapted to apply in Guernsey, the accumulation of the points and the way they have communicated it – gives me confidence.

Details on the bricks and mortar will follow, but what I have now is a real sense of certainty. Any further amendment put forward by the Committee at this twelfth hour, especially when already they have been rejected by both sides, for good reason, would I believe bring uncertainty and would quash the benefit of the small steps we have made in gaining back people's respect by this debate.

However, the other word I have heard a great deal, is optimism. Our educational professionals have said they see a bright future with the alternative model, for all pupils. As optimism is contagious, I too am optimistic.

So I say no more than to ask Members to vote for this amendment, for all the reasons its supporters have voiced in this debate. Fortunately sir, we do not live in a dictatorship, so I believe, through our democratic process, the numbers who vote for this model can send a message. Let it be an optimistic one.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

I think I am the 37th Member to speak, so I suspect most Members have in fact made up their mind. There may be still one or two who are wavering one side or the other, so I am clearly seeking to address some comments to them. I am also seeking to respond to some of the comments which were made in relation to both P&R and myself.

I think I should begin by also repeating the acknowledgement of Deputies de Sausmarez, Ferbrache and Brouard and Alderney Representative Jean to extend thanks to all those involved, both in the G4 and the Committee for their work. Also, as Deputy Tindall has said, it has largely been a good-natured debate.

As the P&R letter of comment noted, the Committee have largely discharged the Resolutions, albeit that the schools, we think, are not broadly of a comparable size. But as Deputy Inder said in his speech, he referred to this concept of Guernsey folklore: if you say something enough and keep repeating it then it becomes folklore. I think the March 2016 Resolutions now fall into that category because they are being presented as a direction to Education to deliver three schools. It fell to Deputy Ferbrache, with his laser-like attention to detailed evidence, which has been a feature of his professional life, to remind us that actually the Resolutions were simply to include it as an option.

In responding to the alternative model, the Committee have really pressed the disadvantages, as they see it, of the alternative model, rather than the advantages of their own. Deputy Meerveld did that again this morning, which I think is a fairly negative sort of defence. The Committee have largely looked back rather than forward. We have had a lot of analysis and research time spent clearly by Members of the Committee on the March 2016 or the November 2016 debates, not recognising that things have moved on.

Indeed, Deputy Inder himself said that he has moved a considerable distance and could – he said, 'I could' – even move to the two-school model. So he should not be surprised that many

other people have done exactly that in the time that has elapsed since those earlier debates. Of course, the Assembly has changed as well, since the March debate.

Much was made by Members referring to the Education department's sources on school size in that March 2016 debate. There is a reference to 600 to 1,000 size schools being the ideal size – forgetting, of course, that was in relation to 11-16 schools, not 11-18 schools. If you add the sixth forms of around 250, that puts you not far short of the alternative model.

Of course we then have the question of federation and much time drawing out the previous references in those debates, to federation having been criticised at that time within the suggestion this is what is now being proposed. But I think it was Deputy Roffey who first identified that that of course is not what is being proposed.

I am deeply concerned that the Committee's proposals do not present a States 11-18 offer, only leaving the grant-aided colleges as the only institutions on the Island providing that offer. I think, as Deputy Graham said, that is unacceptable.

I began, probably like Deputies Roffey, Stephens, Oliver and Le Tocq, believing that probably the tertiary college was my preferred post-16 model. But I have been convinced that we simply do not have the scale to be able to offer that. Deputies Stephens and Hansmann Rouxel I think made an excellent point, that whilst post-16 is largely the point of contention and much of the debate has revolved around that, if we do not get secondary right, it is irrelevant. Because each stage builds on the last and that of course was precisely the argument presented on why the States needed to provide funding for pre-school, in order to feed into primary. It is no different at the back end of children's education.

So which is the best secondary model for Guernsey and Alderney? I have to say I did like Deputy Brehaut's cottage hospital versus paediatric specialist hospital analogy, because it is that size issue that Deputy Stephens picked up on, which makes the alternative model better in the 11-16 space and it is exactly the same set of arguments that I presented in the speech which Deputy Brehaut referred to in arguing why we needed to move from four to three. We simply did not have the numbers in the system to enable us to offer viable secondary schools following the ending of selection without that decision.

Yes, it is all about educational outcomes. In other words, having more subject choices and fewer single-teacher subjects and so on. Let us talk a moment about educational outcomes. It is a phrase that has been used an awful lot. I was blown away, I have to say not in a good way, by the Committee's I think breath-taking almost dismissal of that in relation to the use of the term in Wednesday's part of the debate.

One of the teachers who has given me permission to quote from their letter – I have actually also got permission to use their name, but I will not do so – in referring to educational outcomes, and this has been sent to everybody, said it is something that the teaching profession has been asking for evidence of from the current ESC Deputies for a number of months, to no avail.

When I corresponded further to say can I quote this, I had a further exchange, which said:

This question has been asked at all consultations I have been to so far, with no clear evidence-based response, other than a long-winded speech about fairness for all. The profession wants high attendance, high engagement, high attainment, as well as career-specific and life enrichment opportunities for all our young people. Small schools require teachers to do far too much. We want to be able to focus on teaching, learning and feedback. This will improve outcomes. The only way we can do this in a fully comprehensive system is within large, locally managed schools.

If anything has demonstrated why, as Deputy Merrett said, we need to get politicians out of the classroom and off the back of the teachers, this debate is probably it. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)**

Let us talk about the profession. Deputies Parkinson and Dorey, I think, were probably the first to say, and others have as Deputy Brehaut noted, that we are not educationalists. Neither are the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture. Neither are the G4. As Deputy Brehaut said, we need to listen to those who are.

So who are the experts here? They are of course the teachers and lecturers. Why is it that education is the one profession that we seem to think it is completely acceptable to ignore the advice from? We do not do that with our doctors, or our lawyers, or our accountants, or our architects. But it is unambiguously clear that a majority, I accept not unanimously, and not just from the Grammar School or the College of FE, prefer the alternative model.

I know I am not alone in having been disheartened and actually disappointed that the Committee, leading up to this debate, have dismissed the views of the profession as being vested or self-interest. That is hugely demoralising to be disparaged in that way and I think we have to recognise that these are hard-working, dedicated professionals, doing their best for education in the Island, with honestly held views based on their professional experience of what is the best option.

It is clear from the correspondence that we have had that many in the profession have lost the confidence of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture. We have experienced, senior leaders who have gone out on a limb to express their views to help inform debate and have been rewarded with a breach of confidence, which frankly is embarrassing for us all. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)**

Deputy de Sausmarez I think answered the question very well, what are educational outcomes? I am not going to repeat that. Deputy Fallaize referred to Denis Mulkerrin. In all the education debates in this Assembly that I have been in, I think I probably have referred to Denis Mulkerrin. He is the most influential person for me in informing educational debates in Guernsey. He was the person who informed my thinking around the move from four to three, he was the one who provided the arguments that converted me on the question of selection.

Why is it that his views are so important? He is an award-winning head who knows the Guernsey context and he is the person in whom we have trusted our opinion sufficiently to engage to write two reports, one on secondary and one primary education, and indeed to put him into the last Education department as a non-States member. So, why would we not listen to him?

He said that 11-18 is the best model and we have already heard that 22 of the 25 top state schools are 11-18. He said that it provides better continuity for pupils, plus economies of scale. He said it was easier to recruit in 11-18 and I think Deputy Roffey's point is incredibly important. We do not need to worry just about recruiting, as anybody who runs any organisation or business knows. Actually, what you do need to do, the first job is to make sure you do not lose your talent and I think we are at significant risk of that. That is one of the risks that we run if we adopt the Committee's model.

He said it is infinitely easier to very accurately set pupils according to their ability. One high school teacher who has asked not to be named said that a smaller number of classes in each year means that we have a greater range of ability in each class, which makes it more difficult to cater to the needs of each child. That is what we are talking about when we are talking about educational outcomes.

Denis also said that it offers greater extra-curricular choices, it offers better emotional support and development, points that Deputies Stephens and Brehaut picked up on as well. Finally Denis said, and I think this was key for Deputy Oliver and I understand why, they are more aspirational places.

We then have the question of T-levels, which Deputies Brehaut and Soulsby and a number of others have referred to. We cannot ignore that. They can be accommodated within the alternative model in a way that I think many are struggling to see how it can be done within the Committee's model. Finally, the alternative model offers more flexibility, which was key for Deputy Stephens, and that flexibility is important because this may be a once-in-a-generation debate, but education is evolving. It is constantly evolving, which is a point that Deputy Dudley-Owen made. We need to have the flexibility that enables that genuine transformation and enables us to respond to the changes in education in the future.

Even Deputy Gollop, from the Committee, conceded that the alternative model could secure 'superior outcomes', to use his phrase; albeit he feared that it would be at greater cost. So let us

turn to cost. Deputy Green expressed considerable unease and uncertainty that existed in relation to the alternative model. Intuitively, I believe that the alternative model in the longer run will be at lower cost after the transformation that it has been able to deliver. I cannot evidence that from the information before me, but intuitively I believe that to be the case.

1110 But that is not my primary concern. Cost is not my primary concern, because my primary concern is value for money. Value for money, or best value as Deputy Stephens put it, is not about the cheapest. It is about securing the best outcomes at the lowest cost. As Deputies Trott and Ferbrache noted, this is not a blank cheque.

1115 As Deputy Dorey said, we will need to come back and present for many further approvals through this Assembly. But we need, as we did in March 2016, to make the decisions in the right order and it is right that we should make a decision about the policy that we want first, then it is our responsibility to ensure that that policy is delivered at the lowest possible cost. In other words that we get value for money for that. That, sir, is exactly the same approach which we have adopted for the Committee for Health & Social Care and their transformation of health. It is no different.

1120 So it is a lazy and easy caricature that Policy & Resources just want the cheapest. Because, I think Deputy Brehaut said, the Committee cannot have it both ways, arguing that Policy & Resources do not want to rebuild La Mare to save money and then accuse us of backing a more costly option. The Committee either refused to believe or do not understand that some of us just want value for money. Best outcomes at the lowest delivery cost.

1125 Those are legitimate views, which are honestly held. So do not question Members' integrity and do not imagine political motives, conspiracies or plots that simply do not exist. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

1130 Deputy Gollop and Deputy Dudley-Owen said that if the alternative model is approved, where is the funding going to come from? Will there be funding there? Well if the alternative model is approved, it will be injected into the capital programme in place of the current proposals and it will receive all the necessary funding needed, subject of course, to all the same controls, gateways, Government approvals, processes, delegated authorities, that already exist to ensure that we do get best value for money for the expenditure.

1135 Deputy Lowe's speech focussed almost exclusively on La Mare and securing its rebuild, come what may and had few comments, really, to do with the system of secondary education itself; focusing very much on that school. That I think is entirely fair. She has, as Deputy Brehaut said, been entirely consistent in that argument.,

1140 Deputy Trott, when this was discussed by the Policy & Resources Committee a week or so ago, as we were considering our letter of comment, made the point very well that supporting the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture's proposals is the easier decision. Now Deputy Ferbrache has called many times since he has returned to this Assembly for us to make bold and brave decisions. In this case, the alternative model is exactly that.

1145 Implementation will be tough, for all the reasons that Deputy Meerveld set out very well in his speech. Frankly, sir, nobody in their political right mind would want to present, lead or implement the alternative model. But leadership is not about – and we are not here to do – what is easy or what is popular or even, necessarily, what we feel is what people want. We are here to do what is right. As Deputy Le Tocq said, both options have risks and, as he also went on to say, change is going to happen anyway.

1150 Deputies Soulsby and Oliver referred to the need for effective leadership and in that context, they were speaking about the need for that effective leadership in schools. But it applies politically, too. With both the risks that are faced and the change that is inevitable, as Deputy Stephens said, we need to have confidence in future delivery. That requires firm, clear, confident, committed and consistent political leadership to carry public confidence. The Committee's proposals simply do not provide that.

1155 Yes, the Committee have a mandate and the States have given them a direction. But, as Deputy Ferbrache said, it was merely an option to look at three schools. So they also had an opportunity

to transform. It is the responsibility of all of us in this Assembly to seize and make the most of every opportunity for the benefit of our community.

1160 I think, sir, the Committee have failed to do so. They have failed to do so because, without the conviction –

Deputy Le Pelley: Point of correction, sir.

1165 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: I think Deputy St Pier is misleading the States, sir. The mandate that we were given was to actually look at a three-school model, of three 11-16 schools, without an assessment at 11 to actually determine which school they were going to. He is completely twisting things around.

Deputy St Pier: I am coming to that.

Deputy Le Pelley: If you do not mind, sir, I am still standing. I think it is something of a travesty, sir, that he actually can get away with making those kinds of statements.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, point of correction.

1180 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: To reconcile these two positions, I think they are both right. Because, actually, the Resolution was that 11-16-year-olds should be educated on three sites. It was not three 11-16 schools. I think that has been misrepresented in this debate. The States made no commitment to 11-16 schools whatsoever; it was 11-16-year-olds on three sites. So I think Deputy Le Pelley is right, that that was the firm Resolution, it was not an option, but I think Deputy St Pier is right as well, that it was not for three 11-16 schools.

Deputy Dorey: Point of correction, sir. *(Laughter)*

1190 People have been using the word 'mandate' a number of times. This is not a Committee's mandate. It is a Resolution of the States, which is totally different to what is a Committee's mandate.

Deputy St Pier: Any more, sir?

1195 **The Bailiff:** No.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, I shall resume.

1200 I think the point I was making before Deputy Le Pelley stood was I think that the Committee have failed to take the opportunity to transform with their proposals and I believe that that is because they do not have the conviction of those who wanted to end selection, or the faith of the convert, such as Deputy Graham.

1205 The task or the exam question to them looks like this: how do you transition from four selective schools to three non-selective schools? That is the question which they felt they were set and that is what they have answered. But I think, in doing so, they have missed the opportunity before them and before us.

The post-16 element of the Committee's proposals was presented as the jewel in the crown, but the amendments that are coming left, right and centre, I think, demonstrate that they are not confident, committed or consistent in the leadership of their own proposals. I think that appears

to be why Deputy de Lisle resigned and why he called on the Committee to consider their positions when he spoke yesterday.

I think the only thing that is consistent in their proposals is that they want three schools and, unfortunately, for me, that just shows a slightly obsessive and depressing focus yet again on buildings rather than what goes on in the building, or the model of education we want, or – dare I say it – the educational outcomes that we want.

Meanwhile, that is juxtaposed against the advice of the profession and the experts. I quote here, again, I have had permission to use this and again to use the name, but I will not quote it. It has been sent to us all:

The Committee for Education, Sport & Culture's proposals will expose future generations of students to a level of risk that is so significant that it is certain to damage the chances of a significant number of students.

I do not think that we should accept a mediocre proposal. I think we should be aspirational, and I urge Members to listen to the views of the majority of the experts involved and to support this amendment. *(Applause)*

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak before Deputy Le Pelley exercises his right to have the penultimate speech? No. Deputy Le Pelley, then. This will be followed by Deputy Fallaize, who will reply to the debate.

Deputy Le Pelley: Sir, fellow States' Members.

I would like to start by addressing a few of the comments and questions posed by speakers over the past day or so, but particularly by Deputy Fallaize in proposing his amendment. I would like to start by confirming that the previous States' Resolution did ask us to look at post-16 education and that there was a specific Resolution to consider three secondary schools and using Les Varendes for post-16 provision. That is that we were specifically directed to consider an option to remove state provision from the 11-18 sector.

With regard to all the things that Deputy Fallaize listed that we could provide in larger schools, we offer many of those now and will do so in our proposed three 11-16 schools. Yes the Grammar School did have nearly 1,100 students, more than a decade ago, but more than 40% of these were sixth formers. Quite different proportions to those proposed in the 11-18 schools suggested in the alternative model. To confirm, there were 610 students in years 7 to 11 and 457 in post-16, in 2005.

The key thing underpinning our proposals is the size of the sixth form provision and the combination of academic and applied general qualifications, as offered in The Cotswold school, but not in the alternative model. There is no doubt disadvantaged pupils do better in smaller schools of, say, 600 to 1,000. This is clear from the same report that the alternative model quotes.

In Deputy Fallaize's analysis of the best-performing schools, was The Cotswold School on his list? It is nothing like ours, so it should not be on that list. But, if it was not on Deputy Fallaize's list, why bring him over? The previous Education department board proposed their preferred model as teachers working across all key stages. That was an opinion, only of the previous Education department board. It is important to note that only about 38 out of 79 Grammar School staff currently teach across Key Stages 3, 4 and 5. Of course, we have far more teachers currently working in our 11-16 schools than we do in our 11-18 school.

We are putting all the full-time 16-19 together, not splitting it into three. We will have 68 full-time posts in the sixth-form college, only seven less than the current Grammar School. So we can easily deliver the A-level and IB curriculum in a resilient way. The Committee's proposals for a university college could work. The alternative model is nonsense. What university has students solely on level 1 courses?

Traffic: it is not correct to say there are no issues. We have a requirement for private land to re-model junctions, with significant additional costs. Now, Deputy Fallaize has tried to clarify that the two sixth-form sites can offer the same curriculum. This modelling was scrutinised by Education

officers and another deputy head teacher, but it is absolutely not true to say that they verified this work. They do not agree with the modelling and it was not carried out according to the specified and jointly agreed brief, originally agreed between the two deputy heads and the education officers.

Although the majority of subject choices may be available, these are not the same qualifications and not necessarily all on one site. For example, if you can only do an IB certificate on one site, and not an A-level, then not all subjects will be available on both sites. Nor will the IB full diploma be available on both sites.

So how does this deliver equality of opportunity? The curriculum available at the bifurcated sixth form, including the lack of applied general BTechs, as advocated by Bill Watkin in either a school or a sixth-form college, is a huge disadvantage of the alternative model. Plus, there will be no going back to one single sixth form institution in the future.

Finally, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture is already over-budget and requested to make 3% savings. The alternative model proposals for post-16 are even more expensive and there is absolutely no possibility of Education, Sport & Culture achieving the PWC suggested savings at post-16, for the alternative model's post-16 structure.

Of course no price tag or resources regarding other aspects of the alternative proposals. For example the review of the Education Law. Just to respond to Deputy Stephens' comment about needing a new Education Law to support the placement of children with special educational needs, placement of children with additional SEN needs, within the current 1987 Education Law, does not determine or specify where we should send a child to be educated.

The Law allows that any child can effectively be placed at any school, irrespective of need, condition or disability. The only stipulation which can influence decisions is that the paragraph which states that the attendance of the child at school would prejudice the provision of efficient education or the efficient use of resources should be considered.

I accept that this could be strengthened by any re-write of the Education Law. But it is not specifically required in order for Education, Sport & Culture to place all children within a mainstream environment, for example. I think the broader issues of equality rights should be addressed through any forthcoming equality rights or disability legislation, which should also include within that, an opportunity to appeal to an independent tribunal, as per the Special Educational Needs and Disability Tribunal (SENDIST) within England and Wales.

Turning to some of the comments Deputy Roffey made, the criticism that the amendment has none of the hallmarks of a true conversion regarding the evening up of sizes is unfair. We would be mandated, and P&R would only approve a business case and tenders then, if in accordance with a States' direction. La Mare de Carteret, the rebuild stacks up financially. Look at our appendix. Travelling around the sites, true it would be the exception at 14-16, but not at a 16-19 under the alternative model.

The difference for some students at post-16 is rather than for one or two subjects, out of eight, nine and ten – that is 10% under the one-school, four sites model – it could be for some sixth formers a third or two thirds of their timetable. That is much more travelling for this student.

I just want to add a couple of other things in there, because of things that have been said in between times. In response to Deputy Fallaize's comments on the traffic feasibilities, saying that there are no show-stoppers, I question whether he read the same traffic reports that I did. The traffic report does identify major issues. In particular, around the Baubigny schools, which identify the issues which are detailed in the report, sections 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 5.1 and 5.2.

The most significant is the Oatlands/Route Carre junction. In order to get the traffic modelling to work it requires the purchase of privately owned property to enable staggering of this junction. Another junction also requires privately owned land to create pedestrian footpaths to make it safe.

I remind you that the two-school feasibility studies were agreed by P&R to provide enough information for the States, to quote Deputy St Pier, 'to allow for a well-informed debate'. It is questionable why certain information from these feasibilities appears to be being ignored. Please,

1310 States' Members, do not ignore the facts which you have in front of you. There are site issues. Just look at the feasibilities and information which you have.

Deputy Soulsby suggested we needed to give more money to the College of FE. I would like to remind Members that the recent PWC report highlighted how expensive and inefficient our current College of Further Education delivery is. I do not seek to criticise the quality of that delivery, but sir, Members, the average cost for an hour of delivery at the Grammar School and –

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, point of correction.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

1320

Deputy Soulsby: I did not just say give more money; I said more investment.

Deputy Le Pelley: Thank you.

I would like to remind Members that the recent PWC report highlighted how expensive and inefficient our current College of Further Education delivery is. I do not seek to criticise the quality of that delivery, but Members the average cost for an hour of delivery at the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre in 2016 was £131 and for the College of Further Education was £168. It therefore costs 28% more for every hour of delivery at the College of Further Education.

Deputy Yerby said that we have to be realistic. She said we know that the two-school model will work. With respect, no we do not. The feasibility studies have identified issues. The two-school model cannot work at two of the current four sites, unless additional private land is acquired and even then they fall below the school Building Bulletin recommendations for schools of this size.

In addition, as my Vice-President has already explained, the sixth form curriculum modelling in the alternative model is contested. Now Deputy Yerby did say, when she referred to an email saying that it would work, I am aware of several people who disagree with her, but either do not or cannot speak out in this way. I will just flag that up, if I may.

The revenue costs are larger in the one-school two sites, because of expensive College of Further Education and expensive two small sixth forms. Deputy Roffey retains concern about separating A-level and IB from other qualifications. Well he should do. Deputy Graham mentioned LMS. We are waiting for a business case. We have been waiting for a long time for a business case from the College of Further Education. We have also got problems with over-spending of the budget. Had the current Committee not actually stepped in, we would have been considering something in the region of a £600,000 overspend on an £8 million budget. That is an awful lot overspend.

It is because the actual board had the ability to step in and say, 'sorry, you cannot do that, that is unwise', we have actually managed to reduce that to something like half of that as an overspend from that college. But £600,000 projected overspend towards the end of the year, on an £8 million budget, is quite serious. If one had been cut adrift and told you have got all your LBG status, you have got your LMS status, we are not going to ever come back or have any more say over it, off you go, how do you address that? Perhaps Deputy Fallaize would like to address that in his speech?

Now to my general comments about this amendment. To me, the alternative model raises more questions than it answers. Most important to me are the questions over educational outcomes. What is the educational benefit to our students of splitting the Sixth Form Centre into two, under the alternative model? I can only see disadvantages of this proposal, as I will explain later.

Most of the arguments I have heard in support of the alternative model appear to centre on the issue of teacher recruitment. I agree. But the most important variable affecting educational outcomes is the quality of teaching and learning and the most important asset in any school is its staff, not buildings.

However I do not agree that the alternative proposals are the only way to enhance these outcomes. The Committee's policy letter includes many measures to improve the quality of teaching and learning in our schools. Not least the implementation of the Bailiwick of Guernsey curriculum. I outlined these in my opening speech.

Over the last six years, progress and attainment in our secondary schools have improved and this will, I am sure, continue. But educational outcome measures are broader than just progress and attainment. For example, being able to participate effectively in our community and promoting positive mental health and wellbeing. Most importantly, there is no evidence that sixth forms attached to schools are necessary for doing well or that they improve teacher recruitment and retention.

This was confirmed by Bill Watkin, the chief executive of the Sixth-Form Colleges' Association, when he visited the Island on Monday. 'What about the Guernsey context?', I hear you say. We currently have just under 76 full-time equivalent staff teaching in an 11-18 school. We have about 130 great teachers teaching 11-16 only. Bill Watkin reported that sixth-form colleges are highly attractive to teachers. So no problems there, either.

In addition, the P&R letter of comment reports that there is currently no discernible issue with recruitment or retention of teachers, with very low numbers of agency staff required generally only when unplanned, extended absences occur outside the usual recruitment cycle. Clearly Guernsey proves that we do not have to have 11-18 schools to attract great teachers. We have great teachers everywhere.

Those behind the one school on two sites model have made a number of claims about the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture's recommendations, which I will address one by one. I appreciate that there will be time to explain the advantages of the Committee's proposals in general debate, but because this amendment would essentially replace the Committee's proposals, I feel it is vital to dispel these myths at this point in the debate.

Firstly, they question whether our proposals for a sixth-form college are viable and whether our proposal is for a sixth-form college at all. When Bill Watkin visited, he said that in the UK funding context he felt that sixth-form colleges needed to have around 1,000 students to be financially viable and that he expected that in future there would be very few sixth-form colleges below 800 students in England.

Proponents of the alternative model have used this statement to claim that our sixth-form college proposal is unviable. However Bill Watkin went on to clarify this statement to say that with the higher per-pupil funding in Guernsey, for 16-19 students, a smaller college would be viable. I would remind Members that our proposals are for a sixth-form college of between 850 and 900 students.

The alternative modellers also claim that the Education proposal is not for a sixth-form college, because it includes level 1 and level 2 courses, as well as level 3. It is true that Bill Watkin did say that our proposals are not fully in line with the traditional notion of a sixth-form college, catering solely for high achievers with university aspirations, and that care would need to be taken to ensure that the percentage of level 1 and level 2 courses were not too high to detract from the level 3 mission and focus.

However he also explained that, to be a member of the Sixth-Form Colleges' Association, colleges had to have over 80% of their courses offered at level 3 or A-level equivalent. Some of the College of Further Education staff have claimed it will only be 76% to 79% level 3 courses in Guernsey, in the Guernsey sixth-form college. But I understand that this is based on a slight misunderstanding, relating to where some of the work-focused courses will be offered in the future. The detailed modelling of our sixth-form college shows that there will be 80% to 85% level 3 courses in the sixth-form college, which means that our sixth-form college can and will be a sixth-form college.

Indeed there are several examples of colleges which offer levels 1, 2 and 3. Sir John Rigby College in Wigan is an outstanding sixth-form college, which also offers vocational qualifications at levels 1, 2 and 3. The Guernsey sixth-form college will also deliver the International

Baccalaureate, because we feel this is a qualification to which our young people deserve to have access.

1415 A big deal has been made of the fact that our three schools will not be exactly the same size. Of course they are not now. But this is an important point to address. Whichever of our three schools a child goes to, they will have access to the same curriculum, the same breadth of choices of GCSEs and other level 2 qualifications. I will repeat that: the same breadth of choices of GCSEs and other level 2 qualifications. If States' Members really feel that having schools of equal size is
1420 so important, even though we believe our recommendations provide the necessary equality of opportunity, well they can.

We have drafted an amendment to our proposals which will do this. It does come with a price tag, because we would need to provide a small extension at Les Beaucamps to allow us to reduce the size of the new secondary school being built at La Mare de Carteret. We estimate that that will
1425 cost an additional £4 million to £5 million. So States' Members are free to decide if they want to follow this path to three more equally sized schools.

The alternative modellers claim the proposed sizes of schools are not supported by evidence. Again we would disagree. For example, there is ample evidence that smaller schools are better for disadvantaged students and for social outcomes. For every high-performing large school we can
1430 find an equally high-performing small school. What we believe is important is that our schools are the right size for *Guernsey*. This is where we are – here. Not too big, not too small. Just right.

The alternative model highlights that there will not be an 11-18 offer in the state sector. No, there will not. But we fail to see why that is a problem. Why do we want to provide 11-18 education when it restricts the options for students in two such small sixth form sites? Now, I
1435 know that the proposal is for one sixth form across two sites, but I do not understand the point of this split across the two sites. Why not just have one sixth-form centre or college?

Under the alternative model, only one sixth-form site will offer the International Baccalaureate and only one will offer minority A-level subjects, such as further maths, music and product design. What is the educational advantage of splitting the sixth form across two sites such that either (a)
1440 qualification choice is restricted, or (b) some students have to transfer school sites at 16, away from their friends, or (c) some students or teachers have to travel between sites during the week.

I will now read an email I received earlier this week from a teacher. I think you may have all received it, but if you have not read it, I am going to read it to you now. I think it is relevant for those people that may be listening on the radio:

1445 I am writing with first-hand experience, teaching in an academy in the UK, which was one school over two sites. It does not work. The following reasons are what I experienced and experiences from students and parents.

1. I was made to travel between sites during the day, with only five minutes between lessons. This resulted in me being late to lessons and students missing out on their education, waiting for their teacher.
 2. Students had to travel between sites by school minibus and again, they were late for lessons. This resulted in teachers having a difficult time starting lessons, as there were students dripping in for 15-20 minutes after the lesson started.
 3. Teachers were spread very thin.
 4. I found it difficult to build a rapport with my students as the school was too big and I was not always on the same site to be there for my tutor group.
 5. Difficult to recruit or retain staff.
 6. Great teachers leaving because of working over two sites.
 7. More kids left behind as they were more of a number than a person.
 8. Parents were extremely unhappy with this model for their children, mainly stating that the school was too big, teachers were constantly changing, head teachers did not know their children, pastoral support was limited because of the size of the school.
- I could go on and on. What I will finish on is that after teaching in a one-school, two site model, I do not agree with this.

I am an educationalist. I hear that Deputy St Pier does not consider me to be one, or that anybody else on the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture was one. I would like to point out that Deputy de Lisle, who until very recently was also a member of that board, is also an

educationalist. Rather cleverer than me, I am afraid. But I am proud to say to him well done, because he has got three degrees. I have not.

We have both spent an awful lot of time teaching in schools and I tell you that, from my experience, it is difficult if you have not got a teacher-base and you have to actually move your stuff around from one room to another. It is going to be a lot more difficult if you have to move your stuff around from one level in a school to another level, carting books and stuff up flights of stairs when you have only got a two-minute changeover for lessons. It is a lot more difficult if you have to move from one building to another building on a site. It is going to be a whole lot different if you have to move from one site, seven or eight miles across the Island, to another site.

Two sixth forms will not, therefore, be equal or offer the same equality of opportunity. Given that so much emphasis has been placed by States' Members on the ability of the secondary schools to offer equality of opportunity, why does this argument not apply to the sixth form too? My recollection of the March 2016 debate is that this concern over equality of opportunity seemed to be one of the main reasons that States' Members favoured three 11-16 school sites over four. That debate was also in the context of a one school over multiple sites model, which was convincingly rejected.

Why is Deputy Fallaize now advocating federation – by that, I mean one school across more than one site – when it was an approach he criticised so heavily in the March 2016 debate. I quote, he said:

Students will perhaps, by their own choices, tie themselves to their sites and they will have restricted opportunities.

This latter comment could be now applied to one sixth form spread across two sites.

For next year, our secondary teachers have decided that they do not want to offer any federated courses. This is because they are expensive and do not offer value for money, they involve travelling time for students and staff and therefore are disruptive to learning. Several senior teachers who attended the public consultation at the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre raised their serious concerns about not having the member of staff on the same site as the student, as detrimental to learner outcomes and experience. This is proven by the outcome data from the federated courses and may well impact on the learner outcomes at Key Stage 5.

Also, schools do not own the results or welfare of students who are not in full-time attendance of their school. Concerns were raised by the curriculum leads on federated courses in 2016. The outcomes for the learners in 2017 were of concern, as many learners *did not* achieve expected targets or learning outcomes.

I am concerned that a federated approach, one school over two sites, seems to be the only way to make the proposals for two small sixth forms work. What happens if one sixth form offer is much more popular than the other? What happens to the sixth form on the other site and the students left behind? Or will students be forced to transfer schools at 16, just to rebalance the numbers?

I would like to remind Members that our current Sixth Form Centre is a joint sixth form for all of our 1,570 high school students and there are approximately 410 students coming through the Grammar School. It also welcomes students moving over from Alderney and transferring from the grant-aided colleges. This joint sixth form provision is currently regarded as working very well.

In addition, I believe that both the speakers brought over by the Committee and the group of four, have advocated the importance of a blended 16-19 curriculum, incorporating both A-levels and advanced general qualifications, such as BTech. For example, The Cotswold School offers a blended 16-19 curriculum. In the Committee's proposals, these opportunities would be available to all our post-16 students under one roof. The same cannot be said of the alternative model, where there would continue to be a division between academic and vocational pathways for the offer to post-16 learners.

This option will maintain the lack of parity of esteem between academic and vocational qualifications. Those who do not obtain grades to continue to sixth form at their school would have to leave or move at the age of 16. As already explained, even those that do stay on at an 11-

18 establishment may have to move site, depending on their choice of qualification. What is the educational benefit of this?

The alternative model report pays lip service for students being able to mix and match courses between the Sixth Form Centre and the College of Further Education. Education officers have been trying to achieve this for over 15 years, with very limited success, due to different timetables, different conditions of service etc.

So I hear you say, 'change the two timetables so they match'. If only it was so easy! The timetables would have to consider everything from year 7 to year 13 and include the delivery of all the vocational and the technical subjects and courses being offered at the College of Further Education. This is a massive task and you are going to be considering that under two different governing bodies, with different strategic drivers, different budget pressures, different management, different term dates, different employment contracts, different hours of operation.

Bill Watkin was very clear that a single, larger sixth form would be able to offer a wider range of courses and that larger sixth forms achieve better results. The Committee wants to be able to offer a wider range of courses at post-16, including the new T-levels. We will not be satisfied to offer the same courses we have now, over two sites, in a way that restricts qualification choice for our students, unless they wish to travel or move away from their friends. To me that is simply not good enough and our students deserve better.

Under the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture proposals, what we will have is a state system that we believe offers the best for all our children and young people, both now and in the future, whatever changes may come our way. Those supporting the alternative model say our proposals deny lecturers the chance to practise across all phases of their discipline. We, the Committee, say our proposals give lecturers the chance to expand their teachers into new areas of their discipline.

Of course we will provide them with the necessary training and support, if they need it, to help them make the most of this opportunity. For many lecturers, they will still deliver the same as they do now. We have modelled the staffing structures for both the sixth-form college and the further and higher education institute based on the courses and qualifications that we deliver now, as well as looking to the future and the exciting changes to the post-16 education that are to come, including the introduction of the new T-levels.

Areas where there would be no split in the staffing across the two post-16 institutions are access, art, performing arts, IT and sport, adult community learning, construction, flexi-learning, hair and beauty, hospitality and catering. There are four areas where there would be some split between full-time and part-time courses. These are business and management, child care, health and social care and engineering. The first three are already sourced across more than one institution, when the GTA University and the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies are taken into consideration.

Under the Committee's plans, these would hopefully merge to become a Guernsey university college. Staffing-wise, it is not essential to have an 11-18 school to deliver stability of staffing and more than one subject specialist. The modelling in our sixth-form college proposals has five full-time staff across chemistry, biology and physics. The only subjects where we have one specialist are music, which we would look to combine with performing arts, and some individual languages, where we are looking at alternative ways to boost resilience across all of our schools.

Our proposals have 68 full-time staff in the sixth-form college, spread across eight faculties. To say that the staffing in the sixth-form college cannot be resilient is just not true. Yes, we have modelled the sixth-form college staffing independently, to prove that this can be achieved, but this would not preclude flexibility of deployment to offer a greater number of staff the opportunity to teach 16-19, if this were desirable. Of course, this would be a decision for the leaders of our organisations.

The alternative model's proposals, with respect to devolved governance and leadership and the Education Law, are a bit of a red herring in this debate as they can and will happen under either the two-school model or the three-school model. It has been said that, in the Committee's

proposals, there is no commitment to devolve governance and leadership away from the education centre. We do give that commitment. As for devolving further powers and leadership to our school heads, absolutely.

But we will need P&R's help with this because, as I previously explained, they are responsible for many of the functions. For example, P&R are responsible for HR, for finance and IT, which would be devolved to schools. They say that we have made no commitment to replace the outdated Education Law. Well, yes, they are right. But why is it so important just now, when there is so much other change to manage?

The existing Law is outdated. It does include some archaic language and it does need to be re-written but, most importantly, we do not need to change the Law to deliver the transformation of secondary and post-16 education that the Committee is proposing. I am not sure parents would notice any difference with the new Law, or without. The reality is we will need some significant dedicated resource to re-write the Law. At the moment, we simply do not have it. I would rather all our resources went into the successful delivery of the practical aspects of this huge change in order to ensure a smooth transition for all our children.

We could, of course, buy in people to help us change our legislation. Perhaps we could prioritise it ahead of Brexit! I do not think so.

On that note, our proposals have taken great care to plan as smooth a transition for students and staff as possible. Something we know little about under the alternative model. The Committee's recommendations provide parents with certainty. If they are approved, parents will know where their children are likely to go to secondary school and when they will go. They will know that they will move with many of their friends. They will know the size of the school they will move to. They will know that they will not have to travel between schools to access the sort of broad curriculum all of our children must have the opportunity to access.

They will know that they will be able to move to the sixth-form college at 16, if they want to carry on with full-time education. Whatever course, qualification, or level they want to study and whichever pathway they wish to follow, either on to university, further education or employment.

The Committee has carefully considered how the transition to the new structure will happen and it sets this out in detail in its policy letter. This has been shared with parents at a number of different meetings over the last six months or so. Even if our later amendment on evening out the size of the secondary schools is accepted, there would be very little difference to the Committee's proposed pupil transition.

The effects on the transition would be that we follow the contingency transition plan outlined in our policy letter, with the new secondary school opening in September 2022. This is possible now, anyway, given the delay in the debate from December 2017.

There are two differences for pupils: (1) the 2019 cohort for the new secondary school will stay on at the Les Varendes site for three years instead of two. As I have said, there is already a risk of this because, due to the delay in debate, we could already miss the September 2021 opening of the new secondary school by a matter of weeks. (2) There would be a very minor variation to the proposed primary school feeder system, whereby from September 2021 or 2022, the majority, if not all, of Notre Dame pupils would go to Les Beaucamps instead of being split across Les Beaucamps and the new secondary school.

The Committee's recommendations aim to minimise disruption for staff and learners, in order to preserve educational outcomes.

The Committee's recommendations are ready to go. Staff affected will have plenty of time to consider where they would wish to work within the new structure and choose, depending on their career ambitions and preferences. Staff appointments will be made ahead of the move to the new structure, to ensure we have all the teachers, lecturers and support staff in place, ready for the new school opening. There is a timetable for staff appointments. The Committee's recommendations do not anticipate any compulsory redundancies. The same cannot be said of the alternative model, under this amendment.

We know how much the Committee's recommendations are going to cost. Yes, it does require the investment of many millions of pounds in new facilities and improving some of our older buildings. This sort of investment is required, no matter what structure we end up with, but we are confident that our recommendations offer the best value for money; that they are achievable in the shortest timeframe and with the least disruption to pupils, staff and parents.

In the alternative model, that is if the Committee's proposals are amended, there is no information on when the transition to one-school, two sites will happen, and no idea given of how much this will cost.

I would now just like to outline some of the transition challenges I believe we will face if the two-school model is approved at this States' sitting. The alternative model provides no information on which two school sites will close and which will need to be extended, really doubled in size. It provides no information on when and how the change will happen. Yet these are precisely the questions we will all, as States' Members, receive in our inbox from parents at the end of this debate if this amendment is voted through.

There are 18 different permutations of the one-school, two-sites model, from the Design Engine feasibility studies and the headline capital costings. Further work will need to be undertaken on which site will be best to use. It seems to me to be clear that the largest and optimal size sites for expansion are Baubigny and La Mare. But to use La Mare would place all our secondary school places in the very north of the Island and lead to the highest levels of capital expenditure, leaving both Les Varendes and a brand-new site at Les Beaucamps vacant.

To expand at Les Varendes or Les Beaucamps will need very careful, logistical planning and the possibility that either of these sites might need to be vacated, to allow the building work and extensions to be carried out. Clearly, without knowledge of the building programme and timescales, it is very difficult for any transition planning to be carried out.

This does not even take into account the inevitable delays incurred in acquiring additional land, which would in itself prevent any design work commencing without current landowner consent. Yet, parents will be expecting answers within the next few weeks. The 9th February is the deadline for parents in year 6 to finalise their school choices ahead of the 11-plus results.

The Committee for Education, Sport & Culture staff started work on potentially six different transition models for just two of the 18 possible two-school options, but will need to re-work even these due to the change in focus from a two 11-18 schools model to a one-school over two sites model, as this has different implications for the staffing transition.

The alternative model states that the ending of selection and the move to two or three sites are two different timescales. Yes they are, but they are heavily linked together. If the smoothest transition for pupils and staff is to be realised, that is. For example, there are at least four different transitions for the Baubigny and Les Varendes sites and two transitions for Baubigny and Les Beaucamps.

The future all-ability catchment for the Les Varendes site is not the same in each option and varies depending on which school is the nine or 10-form entry. Therefore it is not sensible to suggest that Education can just publish the new catchments within weeks of the January debate, without the States making a firm decision on which two school sites will be used.

Yes, Education can publish a catchment map for year 7 children in September 2019, but this would be likely to change again during subsequent years. What then happens regarding keeping siblings together, bus routes etc, unless a detailed plan is worked through at the outset? How will all the building works be managed to ensure a move to one school? Will all pupils move at the same time? Will cohorts have to be split? What about the staff transition? Can all new appointments be advertised at the same time? How will staff be deployed in the interim transition years? Parents of pupils starting secondary school in September deserve to know – soon.

These are all questions to which we do not have the answers in the alternative model. But there is a coherent transition plan for the Committee's proposals. The alternative model is also silent on the proposals to rebuild La Mare de Carteret Primary. Be under no illusion, the transition

for a one-school, two-sites model will not be implemented swiftly, efficiently or without significant upheaval or cost.

1655 Meanwhile, whilst all this planning takes place, we could have the very one-school, four-sites model which was proposed in March 2016 and which was shot down in flames, meaning that students have to move sites at Key Stage 4 to access a broad curriculum. Ironic, isn't it?

I have two remaining issues that I wish to cover. These are costs, both revenue and capital, and a future flexibility. The capital costs of the Committee's three-school proposals are significantly
1660 less than delivering a two-school model with College of Further Education provision. The capital cost of both phase one and phase two of the Committee's proposals are £110 million in total, including both La Mare de Carteret Primary and the new technical workshops at Les Ozouets. That is assuming Les Beaucamps does not need to be extended. Seventy-four million pounds of this amount is for the La Mare de Carteret High School and the sixth-form college, only. That is, it
1665 does not include La Mare de Carteret Primary and workshops.

Potential capital costs of all possible one-school, two-sites options were circulated to States' Members and suggest that all two 11-18 school options are over £90 million, excluding La Mare de Carteret Primary and the College of Further Education. That is the two-school model will be at least £16 million more expensive and could be considerably more.

1670 On the revenue side, without the merger of post-16 provision outlined in the Committee's proposals, i.e. from four to two post-16 institutions, Sixth Form Centre, CFE, GTA and Institute to sixth-form college and Guernsey university college, there is not the opportunity to make the full post-16 savings identified in the PWC report. Indeed, the alternative model proposals make post-16 provision more expensive, as the current Sixth Form Centre is spread across two school sites,
1675 leading to fewer economies of scale and additional transport costs.

My final points relate to business continuity and flexibility for the future. The States has no or very limited redundancy in terms of critical infrastructure assets. The fewer school sites the Island has, the greater the risk from a business continuity perspective, should one site be unavailable. It will certainly be vastly more difficult to accommodate in excess of 1,300 pupils in any remaining
1680 infrastructure, should one site become unusable for any reason.

In terms of pupil numbers, the Committee's proposals can be flexible, should pupil numbers increase, where St Sampson's could still be extended, or decreased, when the new school at La Mare de Carteret could reduce in size slightly. For post-16, the sixth-form college could increase in number, it would still be viable with, for example, a 10% decrease. On the contrary, any increase
1685 in pupil numbers will be difficult to accommodate in two schools, where the sites were already extended to their maximum and any decrease could have devastating consequences for the two small sixth forms.

Sixth form numbers are projected to fall below 400 over the next few years, between now and 2023, which would be below 200 on each site. Two hundred is the minimum number of pupils allowed by the English government for new school sixth forms. There is considerable evidence to suggest that bigger sixth forms do better.

What happens, for example, if Blanchelande reintroduces a sixth form, as has been suggested by some? Or the Ladies' College increase their offer? Your numbers in your colleges, alternative modellers, will come under very great stress. I know some concern has been raised about the split
1695 between the sixth-form college and the further and higher education institute initially. However, the Committee's proposals are flexible enough, in the future, to allow all post-16 education currently offered by the Sixth Form Centre and the College of Further Education to be located across Les Varendes and Les Ozouets sites, but with different governance structures.

For example the Committee's proposals could work for a sixth-form college and a further and higher education institute. That is if Proposition 7 is accepted. Or for a Guernsey university college or a tertiary college or even a sixth form federated with the three 11-16 schools, dependent on what is decided by the States under Propositions 7 and 8 of the Committee's proposals.

If the alternative model is accepted today, there will be no going back. No prospect of a sixth-form college in the future, no prospect of a tertiary college, no opportunity to re-merge the sixth

1705 forms to one sixth form centre. I have already explained the educational disadvantages of splitting the current Sixth Form Centre in two. Please do not make that mistake today.

I have got a couple of other points just to make and it really is right at the very end. I would like to thank, in particular, my two vice-presidents. Sounds like a big bank, doesn't it, with two vice-presidents? One of them, of course, is the current one and one of them is the previous one.
1710 Both of them have delivered excellent speeches.

Deputy Dudley-Owen yesterday, right at the end of the debate, spoke with strength and gave a lot of detail as to what you needed to think about, very seriously. Deputy Meerveld, this morning, I thought, gave a brilliant speech. Absolutely brilliant. I hope that people have taken very good heed of what he had to say.

1715 A couple more things I would like to just point out, because there were one or two little things that were not quite right. Deputy Brehaut, you stated that you thought, or made a statement that students at Le Murier leave that school without the opportunity to gain formal qualifications. That is not absolutely true, now. Le Murier does offer and provide access to a range of qualifications, including GCSE where appropriate. Previously, when they were inspected, they did not offer
1720 enough, but the leadership has changed. Just in case anybody wanted that corrected.

Deputy St Pier, through the Chair, I would like to say that the majority of primary school teachers and teachers in the three high schools that have contacted me, and there have been many of them, have expressed support for the three 11-16 model. I appreciate that there may well be people in other sectors that have not been happy, but the majority in those sectors have been
1725 very happy with the proposals. Also, I do not know about any breaches of confidence. Certainly, nothing has been breached by me. If you know anything about that, I would be very pleased, sir, if Deputy St Pier came to 'see me later' – there is an educationalist, of course!

I think that is probably all off the bits and pieces that were raised. There was a question about having access to our officers and emails. I think somebody mentioned about Deputy Meerveld
1730 having access to something. I would just like to inform everybody here that my officers at the Education, Sport & Culture centre are available to anybody to ask questions of. In fact I believe that one of the group of four this morning has even asked questions of them this morning. That is an open invitation.

Sir, Members, whatever anybody's views on the Committee's proposals are, please reject this
1735 amendment now.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members, it is 20 past 12. There is just one more speech and that is for Deputy Fallaize to reply to the debate. I propose that we continue to sit to enable a vote to be taken
1740 before lunch.

Some Members voted pour; others voted Contre.

The Bailiff: Actually, that is close. Perhaps if we had an indication of how long you think you might speak for, Deputy Fallaize?

Deputy Fallaize: Well, half an hour, I suppose. I could guarantee to be finished by 1 p.m.
1745

The Bailiff: Okay, I will put it to you again, then, that we continue to sit until one o'clock. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: That is carried, this time.
Deputy Fallaize.

1750

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Le Pelley's speech reminded me of what the Education department said in March 2016, when it was faced with proposals to move from four schools to three schools. It was claimed in that debate that rationalising the school estate in that way could save up to £2 million per year and the Education department said that those figures were 'cavalier' and that the savings would be nowhere near that. Now Education tell us that the savings will be in the region of £3.4 million per year.

Of the three-school model, Education said it would be 'extremely disruptive', it would be 'extremely unpopular' with students, teachers and parents. There would be no flexibility for the future and it could not possibly deliver equality of opportunity. The Education department said that lots of teachers would be lost. They even said, and I quote:

The three-school model is not deliverable or desirable. In fact it would be catastrophic. It is too risky. It presents an unacceptable level of disruption. It is not what the public want. It provides no flexibility. It is ill-thought out and it has no costings.

Now this is the model which Deputy Le Pelley's Committee is now laying before the States and saying that it would be absolutely ideally suited to Guernsey and its needs. I accept that this is a different Committee, but it is served by the same officers and the point I am making is that it is a characteristic of education authorities, over the years, that when they are faced with proposals they do not like, they simply throw up their hands and say, 'It cannot possibly be done. It is unworkable, it is unviable. It will be catastrophic.'

I do not in any way suggest that the transition to two 11-18 schools would be easy, because it would not be easy. There are challenges and complexities, but it would not be the catastrophe that Deputy Le Pelley has just told us it would be.

Deputy Stephens asked a series of questions which I think were mostly answered in debate by Deputy Graham and Deputy Yerby and others, except perhaps for two. She asked which model would maximise access and opportunity for the greatest number of students. Well, in the alternative model, at the 11-16 phase, there is scale provided and breadth of provision, which is lacking from the Committee's proposals, which allows more variety, more subjects, more opportunities for each student to find his or her niche. I think that does qualify as more opportunities for the greatest number of students.

At the post-16 level, the alternative model maintains the full sixth form offer and I will have to expand upon this shortly, in response to some of the things that Deputy Le Pelley has said. What is crucially important is that, for the students who face more challenges accessing education, who need to be immersed in a practical learning environment and need to be among a broad range of learners. Now that is provided in the alternative model in the single, integrated College of Further Education, in a way that does not apply to the division of technical and vocational studies that the Committee is proposing.

I accept that, for Deputy Stephens, there is little to choose in terms of post-16 provision between the two models. I think the case has been made that ours is preferable at the 11-16 phase, because of the breadth of provision.

Deputy Stephens also asked about the relationship between the structure and teaching standards, and this is an important point, because we are really debating structure. Ultimately we want to get to the highest possible standards of teaching. But local management, of itself, will make a significant difference. If we are able to recruit from the widest possible pool of great teachers, that will make a significant difference and if we have more teachers per subject, which allows for more collaboration, more subject specialism, fewer points of failure, that will provide a better chance of teaching standards being as high as possible. So I think that is where there is a relationship between structure and teaching standards.

In response to Alderney Representative Jean, I want to be very clear: the alternative model includes and requires no reduction in resources at St Anne's School. I do not know what Deputy ... I nearly promoted him to a Deputy, if that is a promotion! I do not know whether Alderney

Representative Jean has been told otherwise, but the modelling shows absolutely no diminution of resources at St Anne's.

What the alternative model does offer is larger schools in Guernsey, which would be in a stronger position to partner with St Anne's in Alderney. That is absolutely critical. In terms of the strength of St Anne's School and the resilience of St Anne's School, the stronger our schools are the more resources we have, the better able they will be to partner successfully with St Anne's.

At the post-16 level, for students in Alderney who choose to come to Guernsey at post-16, our model provides the full offer for the sixth form students, but it also provides the single integrated viable College of Further Education, which matters as much to Alderney students as it does to Guernsey students.

I know that Deputy Dudley-Owen is very cross with me and others who have had the temerity to disagree with her views on secondary and post-16 education, but I say this in all seriousness: the highlight of the debate, for me, over two-and-a-half days, was when Deputy Dudley-Owen told us that the Committee's model was preferred to the alternative model by the former big cheese at Education Scotland. Because, for about 20 years, education in Scotland has been in very steep decline. It has dropped like a stone through the international league tables and the Education office and the education infrastructure in Guernsey is now inextricably linked with Education Scotland. Contractually and culturally, in terms of inspections and standards and curriculum, to a large extent.

Now, this is another area where there is essential need for transformation. We have to aspire well beyond the standards which are now being achieved in Scotland. I do not regard an endorsement from Education Scotland as anything to be proud of. Frankly I am not surprised they endorsed the Committee's model.

Returning to the local context, Deputy Le Tocq I think made two important points. The first was the alternative model provides an opportunity to reconcile those who were previously opposed to selection and those who were previously in favour of selection. I do not mean people in here; I am talking about the profession and the community.

The 11-18 offer is important to many people – it is important to some of us who were strongly opposed to selection – it is also important to many people who were previously in favour of selection. Some of my left-wing friends have castigated me on social media for this and have no time at all for this idea that the previously warring factions over selection at 11 should be reconciled. I make no apology at all for wanting to be associated with a proposal which does try to bring together the previously divided views on selection at 11. I think that is in our community's interest.

Deputy Le Tocq also spoke about risk. It is true that the alternative model contains some practical risks. More practical risks than the Committee's model. But the Committee's model contains serious educational risks and I would rather face up to the challenges of practical risks than educational risks.

But on these practical risks, States' Members who have read the report produced by the ... I have got them all here – this is what the £73,000 paid for. I do not know how Members have waded through all of those. Incidentally, the group of four Deputies were not given £73,000. We asked questions of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, which said, 'We cannot answer those questions without additional resources, so we will approach Policy & Resources for additional resources.'

Anybody who has read through all of those documents will know there are practical complications with the alternative model, but they have been exaggerated in the days leading up to this debate by some Members of the Committee. The reality here is somewhere in the middle. There is no point trying to deny that there are not any practical risks or complications, but there are not as many as some of the Members of the Committee have suggested.

Deputy Yerby, I think, summed it up when she said that the studies show the alternative model is viable, we know there is a practical configuration, but we do not yet know which is the optimum configuration. That is essentially the result of the technical studies which have been carried out.

Deputy Ferbrache wants assurances on sites and costs, and I can tell you that we are as impatient as he is for this information. But I will not make empty promises simply to secure Deputy Ferbrache's vote or anybody else's vote. There is no point in doing that. It would be dishonest. But I would make three points in response to Deputy Ferbrache's questions.

If we had to make Propositions today, firm Propositions on which sites to use – as Deputy Le Pelley has said, they would be as a result of the initial studies carried out – it would have to be St Sampson's and La Mare. I suspect if we had done that, Deputy Ferbrache and others, justifiably, would say, 'Hold on a minute, more work needs to be carried out before we can make a final conclusion about which would be the optimum sites.' So that is why we have taken the only position we could take, which was that more work needs to be done to determine the optimum sites.

Secondly, there is the issue of political will. Now Deputy Ferbrache sat with the four deputies who are proposing the alternative model, and others, in I think at the beginning of September, and discussed whether it was worthwhile even looking into this sort of model. I think, and I know Deputy Dudley-Owen said that our report was rubbish or words to that effect, we have made quite reasonable progress in three or four months. It is a question of political will to get this done.

Thirdly, do not believe that there is practical certainty about the Committee's model. We have an amendment coming later from the Committee, possibly, to change the size of their schools. We have Members of the Committee standing up saying, 'We have not got our post-16 proposals quite right.' We have a former vice-president of the Committee trying to get the whole issue of post-16 education completely off the table in this debate.

If you put all of those things together, you cannot say the Committee has a model which is absolutely worked up, ready to go, all the costings are known, the whole thing is practically certain, when their post-16 proposals, let us face it, are collapsing around them; even by the admission of some of their own Members. *(Interjection by Deputy Gollop and laughter)* Yes, thank you. I thank Deputy Gollop; Deputy de Lisle did say that as well.

The post-16 sector, professionally, is saying almost universally that the post-16 proposals are probably not viable. Post-16 is half of this debate, effectively; the secondary and post-16 debate. How can we be certain about the Committee's capital costs and timelines and delivery commitments when they, themselves, or some of them, at least, now appear highly uncertain about their own post-16 proposals. We cannot.

I will give way to Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, I am not asking about the Committee's, I have my own reservations about those. I am asking Deputy Fallaize not to deflect the questions by turning to the Education Committee's proposals, but to give me as direct an answer he can on the points that I have raised. I have made it very clear, both before the debate and during the debate, I do not expect anybody to give a promise that they cannot keep.

Deputy Fallaize: I accept that but, of course, at this stage, we are deciding whether the Propositions to go to the vote ought to be the Propositions in the amendment or the Committee's Propositions, so I think the comparison is worthwhile. The problem is we are replying to this debate with one hand tied behind our backs, aren't we? We are not the Committee.

If the amendment is successful, the Committee will be directed to carry out the further work. I would be very disappointed, in the same period of time which has elapsed since I sat and other sat with Deputy Ferbrache a few months ago, if we could not have identified which were the optimum sites. Very disappointed, because I do not think there is that much work that still needs to be done to determine which are the optimum sites.

If the result of that work is that there has to be consideration of negotiation to purchase, first of all, that is a completely different issue. But we are not going to be standing here in a year's time, or the Committee should not be if it has got the political will to deliver it, saying, 'We do not

yet know what the optimal configuration of the sites are.' There has already been significant progress and there can be, in the weeks ahead. That is as best as I can do to answer his question.

1905 A further point about costs, because Deputy Meerveld said that the alternative model may be £20 million to £40 million more expensive in terms of capital costs. For reasons that we have explained in our report, and I will not go into now, there is a lot of doubt about the figures that were issued in relation to the alternative model. Even if I accept Deputy Meerveld's ballpark figures, the total cost of providing secondary and post-16 education over the period of the next 40 years, at today's prices, is around £1 billion.

1910 We are probably talking about buildings or a system, broadly speaking, that would last that kind of length of time. So, if you say to me, am I prepared to bear an additional £20 million of capital cost on a project which effectively is a £1 billion undertaking over 40 years, in order to get better educational outcomes, I am prepared to bear the additional costs. Some Members may not be. I am.

1915 Deputy Le Pelley said that the alternative model schools would not meet Building Bulletin criteria. What he did not tell us is that none of the Committee's schools do at the present time, and they will not in the future.

Deputy Trott asked three questions. Do we accept the criteria, such as affordability and availability of land –

1920

Deputy Meerveld: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

1925 **Deputy Meerveld:** La Mare de Carteret rebuild was designed and approved under the new Bulletin. Obviously, over time, Building Bulletins change, and criteria and requirements change. But La Mare de Carteret plans that were drawn up and approved by the DPA were done under the Building Bulletins and met the requirements at the time.

1930 **Deputy Fallaize:** The Building Bulletin size specifications have got smaller from the Building Bulletin 98-103, but the existing high schools – and two of them are remaining out of the state of three – two of them do not meet the present Building Bulletins. Deputy Le Pelley says they do not need to. I do not disagree with him, but then why criticise the alternative model for not meeting those criteria?

1935 Deputy Trott says do we accept affordability and availability of land would be key in further planning of the alternative model? Yes, absolutely, which is why we cannot propose the sites today, because clearly one has to go through the process to understand which would be the optimum configuration of the site.

1940 The open cheque book claim that was made of the Policy & Resources Committee, I think was quite daft, because Deputy Trott has said exactly the opposite in his speech. He said, does the community understand that schools will close? Well, after Deputy Inder's leafleting campaign, I suspect that they do.

Deputy Inder: Point of correction, sir.

1945

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Three does not go into two. I do not think it was my leafleting campaign that put some concern into public minds about the closure of schools. It is a bit rich to blame me for that one.

1950

Deputy Fallaize: I did not blame Deputy Inder for that. I said that he undertook a leafleting campaign which no doubt informed the public about school closures. I think those people who

are interested in these matters are pretty well appraised; have been, through the media and through the debate about what we are debating today.

The third question was: do we recognise the irony of replicating the grant-aided colleges? I said earlier I would not make false promises in order to secure votes, but I am certainly prepared to flatter Deputy Trott to secure votes. *(Laughter)*

A Member: He has only got one!

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, he has only got one. So, if 6722 sees good things from the colleges in the alternative model, then that is fine by me. I think he basically said that we cannot choose an inferior education system just because it is cheaper; we have to choose the best educational system and then apply financial rigour to working out the practicality of it all. That is essentially our position.

I will give way to Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: That is a very fair assessment of the motive behind the questions, but there was one extra issue and it is this. Deputy Fallaize is very keen not to over-promise, for fear of under-delivering. He is right to do so, because it would be wrong for the media and our community to believe that if we vote for the alternative proposals today we will end up with two schools.

There are a very significant number of hurdles that need to go through. That is a consequence of a proposal that is, by nature of the timing of its creation, so bereft of detail. That message should be understood by all. We are making a political commitment. We are by no means making a concrete commitment. It would be foolish for us to do so.

Deputy Fallaize: I accept that as a description of the Propositions which would be before the States.

Deputy Meerveld does not want two schools because one might burn down or flood. I look forward to his proposal to open two new hospitals in case the Princess Elizabeth burns down or floods. *(Laughter)* Was that what he wanted to put behind Mont Cuet at one point, or was that a runway? I cannot remember.

Deputy Meerveld, when is quoting the rebuild costs or the redevelopment costs of the College of FE, he constantly refers to what was the work of 2016 and suggests that the cost would be £67 million. Only a few weeks ago, in fact in their own policy letter, the Committee suggested that the redevelopment of the college would cost £47 million. I am going to use Deputy Meerveld's figures from a few weeks ago, rather than his figures from today –

Deputy Meerveld: Point of correction sir.

Deputy Fallaize: Inflation is not running at that rate. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Under the two-school model, as has been confirmed by Deputy Fallaize, they have not identified the sites to build on. They have made statements previous to this, and I think in this Assembly as well, that there would be increased investment in the College of Further Education with their proposals and that they will build them a new building. That statement has been made by some of the speakers.

Under our very practical and pragmatic proposal – 'our', I say, I am still living with my Education hat on. Under the ESC proposal you have very practical and pragmatic utilisation of the estate and the College of Further Education would be utilising part of the existing buildings at Les Ozouets and Les Varendes site –

The Bailiff: I do not think this is a point of correction any more.

Deputy Meerveld: My point of correction is this. Since the Committee's plans utilised two buildings which may not be there, because they may be used on the two-school sites, the only numbers we have that are available that are being worked up for a complete rebuild of the College of Further Education on a greenfield site, are those done by the previous Committee, in the proposal from the Billet of March 2016, which stated it would be £67 million.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir. I am afraid that just is not correct. The Committee knows full well that it had what was called the three, two, one study carried out. How to go from three sites to two sites to one site, after it was elected, which shows that the figures do not need to be as high as £67 million.

Deputy Meerveld asked some perfectly fair questions. Do I accept the capital cost would be higher? Yes. Do I believe the revenue cost would be lower? Yes. Do I want to contract the independent colleges to run schools in the state sector? No. The fourth question was would I stand to be President of the Committee? Well, in answering this I am damned if I do and damned if I do not. If I say yes, then there will be an enormous number of groans around the room and people will say, 'Ah, we knew what this was about all along.' If I say no, people will say, 'You are not prepared to take responsibility for your alternative model.'

I can tell Deputy Meerveld and other Members of the States that I am fully prepared in every respect to take full responsibility for the alternative model. But I am not going to try and conflate this debate with some kind of motion of confidence or motion of no confidence in the Committee.

Deputy Meerveld: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Just one of the questions. I did not ask Deputy Fallaize whether he would be willing to contract to the colleges; I asked him if he would undertake to do the analysis and research and present that back to us if the two-school model is successful, because it would be a legitimate comparison.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: No. *(Laughter)*

With all these interruptions, interesting though they are, I may have to be a few minutes after one o'clock, I am afraid. I do not want to put anyone else off from interjecting! *(Laughter)*

Deputy Meerveld also tried to provoke fears in the States' Members about the next election. Frankly I think that is desperate stuff, I really do. What is the point of being in politics if you are constantly struck rigid with fear about what judgement may be made at the ballot box in a few years' time?

Several Members: None!

Deputy Meerveld: Point of correction sir.

The Bailiff: Is this a proper point of correction, Deputy Meerveld?

Deputy Meerveld: Yes, sir. I do not believe I mentioned the election in anything other than this debate might fall over that election, if it is 18 months to two years from now, when the plans come back.

Deputy Fallaize: No, I think he did talk about the public reaction. Anyway, I am not going to say any more about Deputy Meerveld or he will keep interrupting and we will be here until two o'clock.

Deputies Leadbeater and Brouard, these were very genuine concerns, I thought well expressed about less able students, if I can call them that, in the 11-16 phase. This is a personal view which I hold, perhaps more than some of the other Members of the G4. I have never stressed this role model argument. I accept that it is an argument, but it is not an argument that I find particularly persuasive.

For me the focus has always been more on the 11-16 phase and the benefits which can be delivered to the 11-16 phase as a result of scale and the attachment of the sixth form, because it brings benefits in terms of teaching. The alternative model provides, in compulsory education, amongst other things, maximum opportunity to recruit from the widest possible pool of great teachers, which is bound to help children of all abilities, including those of lower ability.

It provides scale, breadth of provision, breadth of opportunity, including in extra-curricular terms and including at GCSE, which is bound to help children of lower ability. It provides more opportunity for setting, where that is appropriate, so that more children can learn in classes of others of a similar ability, which is bound to help children of lower ability, and it does open up opportunities for more specialist provision. That is not just specialist subject teachers, it must also be extended to SEN and additional needs provision and vulnerable children.

In terms of governance and the Law, I thought Deputy Meerveld – oh I have mentioned him again, sorry! (*Laughter*) – did a brilliant job of undermining the Committee's new-found commitment to devolution, because he told us all the reasons why it was so terribly risky. I have heard all this stuff from before, from successive Education Committees. It is what Committees get told by Education officers. But you do not delegate education policy, you do not delegate law-making responsibilities, you do not delegate the central Government functions. You effectively set the standards, you set the expectations, you regulate and then you devolve leadership to the school leaders and you allow them to get on with running their schools.

I honestly hear no commitment from the Members of the Committee to genuine devolution. Deputy Inder spoke about his induction when he went to the Committee. I think he said induction and not indoctrination. But he also spoke about the difficulties of local management, as if it cannot be put forward as a panacea. Of course it cannot be, but I do not think there is anybody –

Deputy Inder: Point of correction, sir.

I just did not say that. I was in the room if he was not. Through you, sir, what I said was that the idea of LMS does have financial considerations and everything that I have seen so far, it is just not going to be something that is done in two or three minutes. What I actually said about the induction, as described to me by one of the officers at the time, is that the College of FE is a financial basket case. There is nothing I have seen since I have been on the Committee that has proven any different.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

I think we have explained quite well why governance and the Education Law need to be seen together. It is no good saying the Law is permissive. That is the problem. The Law is permissive, and it allows the centre to have complete control and domination of the whole of education services, so that the permissiveness is not an advantage of the Law – well, it might be an

advantage of the Law to those who want to maintain rigid control centrally, but it is a disadvantage.

2110 Deputy Meerveld actually explained this quite well: it makes the Committee the governing body. Deputy Merrett picked up on this, as well. The Committee cannot be the governing body to so many schools. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) As Denis Mulkerrin explained in his review, that is what the Law requires but practically it is a nonsense.

2115 Post-16, Deputy Inder said that they might have got their post-16 proposals wrong. I think that is an under-statement. In terms of parity of esteem, Deputy Le Pelley, when he spoke, implied that, not in order to but a result of it would be that level 3 in the sixth-form college would get up above 80% or 85%. He implied that some of the lower level learners would not be there.

2120 These are full-time learners. Now the whole principle behind the Committee's proposal is parity of esteem. We have got to have all these learners in one institution, but now Deputy Le Pelley has told us that some of these learners will not be at the post-16 college, or what they call a sixth-form college, so that is going to undermine this concept of parity of esteem. The Committee is being very unclear about this. It is not clear at all where they envisage some of the lower-level learners, whether they will be immersed in a practical environment in the training college or whether they will be in the sixth-form college. I do not think the Committee is clear about that, 2125 but different audiences have been told different things on that point.

I will give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir, through you, to Deputy Fallaize.

2130 It is quite clear that the level 1 and 2 learners access learners will be in an area within the Les Varendes site where additional needs and specialists will be catering for and assisting learners who are at that level at that time. We have never said anything different.

Obviously, under the governance arrangements, it could be that those learners who choose subjects to have a practical application could potentially be down at Les Ozouets site and would obviously be using the workshops down there. So I am not quite sure why there is not clarity 2135 around that. We have always said it will be levels 1, 2 and 3 within the sixth-form college.

Deputy Fallaize: I do not think that is clear at all. If they are not all in the sixth-form college at Les Varendes, you are undermining your principle of parity of esteem and they need to be immersed in a practical learning environment. That is the advice of all of the post-16 2140 professionals.

Deputy Roffey and Deputy Le Clerc want to know that there will be more possibility to mix and match. We have set out at paragraph 4.2.6 the pathways which the professionals advise are possible: engineering, finance, health and social care and performing arts. There is a belief amongst the Committee that any amount of mixing and matching of subjects is a good thing, but 2145 actually it might not be.

There might be a trade-off between quantity and quality and it may not be of use for somebody to do level 3 theatre studies and A-level further maths. We may not be a large enough jurisdiction for us to provide enormous mix-and-match options, because we do not have enough the students and I think the key is that the mix-and-match options have to be offered where they 2150 are likely to benefit the student, either in the workplace or educationally.

Deputy Parkinson captured an important point, which was the need to provide A-levels where teachers are also teaching 11-16, because that is where there are synergies in our system at the present time. Ninety per cent of A-level teachers are teaching 11-16 as well.

2155 I have to address this point about commuting, because Deputy Le Pelley has raised fears, if one took what he said literally, of dozens and dozens of students commuting. The sixth form curriculum modelling carried out by the person contracted by the Committee shows that there is no need for commuting. There could be a small number of students who could choose to commute if they wanted to do a subject on one site and a subject on another site, but they could

equally choose if they wanted either to make compromises and stay on their present site or not make compromises and move site full-time.

The curriculum modelling shows that 21 A-level subjects can be offered on both sites. It is very difficult because ... It was the Committee who engaged this professional, he did the curriculum modelling, I sat at a meeting with education officers and the Education Committee, I think on 3rd November, and I said to the Committee and the officers: do you fully endorse this work that we are being given on curriculum modelling? The officers and the Committee said, 'Yes, we fully endorse this work.' Now Deputy Le Pelley says there is a dispute between the work that was done and the officers. I can only go by the curriculum modelling which we were shown or provided by the Committee.

Deputy Le Clerc raised a point about flexibility to adapt to T-levels. I think it is quite obvious that T-levels can only be provided successfully in a single college which combines both college-based and employment-based vocational and technical learning. It could be done in a tertiary college. The two credible options at post-16 are a tertiary college or school-based sixth forms and a separate College of Further Education. That is not what the Committee is proposing and their division of technical studies between separate institutions will not allow this Island to take full advantage of national developments in technical education.

Deputy Meerveld calls our proposals selection at 16. I think that that is nonsense. You might as well say is university education wrong, because it is selection at 18? Those of us who opposed the 11-plus do see a problem with selecting children at 10 or 11. I think students who are making choices at 16 are slightly different creatures – I do not use that word advisedly! – to those who are 10 or 11.

Deputy Le Pelley says there will be resilience in their post-16 college. The current staffing need for A-level subjects: geography 1.7, biology 1.2, PE 1.1, history 1, computing 0.9, French 0.8, chemistry 0.8, physics, DT, Spanish, drama, music all less than that. That is the current A-level teaching requirement.

Now what are these teachers going to be doing when they are only teaching A-level and they do not have any 11-16 timetable? They are not going to be teaching a whole raft of technical and vocational qualifications, that has been well-explained by the Education professionals. So what are they going to be doing? We do not have enough students to do this. We have got to allow the synergy between 11-16 teaching and A-level teaching. It is inextricably linked.

I cannot believe that Deputy Meerveld is supportive of the Committee's proposals, despite saying that half of them, the post-16 side, are wrong. But he also says – I did have to speak about him a lot, actually – that there will be lots of subjects with fewer than 10 students under our model. I can tell him that at the present time, the following subjects are taught at A-level with fewer than 10 students: chemistry, computer science, design technology, English literature, environmental studies, French, further maths, ICT, music, physics, IB art, IB business, IB chemistry, IB French, IB geography, IB history, IB philosophy, IB physics and IB nature of science.

I think that is probably all of them. That gives you an idea that, when Deputy Meerveld says our model will lead to some students being taught in classes of fewer than 10, so what? It is happening so much now.

The Bailiff: I know you have had interruptions, but how much longer are you planning to be? Do we need to rise and come back after lunch?

Deputy Fallaize: Five minutes, sir, I promise.

The Bailiff: We will then have a recorded vote. We cannot go to lunch now, keep going. I may not indulge you in the same way another time, but keep going on this occasion.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

2210 I was opposed to federation in 2016. That was commuting at Key Stage 4, 14, 15 and 16-year-olds. It is totally different if one is dealing with post-16 learners and the average local education authority sixth form is 205 students.

2215 The drop-out rate I think needs to be confronted, because the Committee claims that there is a 30% drop-out rate among full-time level 3 students. Actually, over the last 10 years, an average of 83% of sixth form students have remained on roll within their original cohort for the two-year period and some of this drop-out rate is accounted for because students recently have been taking four AS-levels as one-year courses. They were never intended to be two-year courses and they are included in the Committee's figures.

2220 I think that the alternative model, clearly, is viable. Ultimately, I think the vote will turn on how ambitious we are for our education system. Those of us who have presented the alternative model are essentially saying it is not good enough to approve an education system because it is cheaper. It is not good enough to approve a system because it makes good use of existing buildings. It is not good enough to approve it just because the logistics are more certain. It is not good enough to approve it just because the States made a previous Resolution which is more consistent with what the Committee is proposing than with what we are proposing.

2225 Yes the Committee's model is ready to go, perhaps not at post-16, but at 11-16, but it is a recipe for mediocrity. Our ambition surely must be towards the education system which, on the basis of evidence, is most likely to maximise opportunity and excellence for years to come. On those grounds I think, I would say this I suppose, the alternative model has carried the educational arguments in this debate.

2230 With the possible exception of Deputy Le Pelley, in fairness to him, not one other speaker has implored the States to vote against the alternative model because they think the Committee's model is educationally superior. Not one other speaker has said that. I think the alternative model has won the argument on the advantages of scale, at 11-16, on the desirability of maintaining 11-18 in the States' sector, on the need to maintain a single integrated College of FE, on maximising the chance to recruit from the widest pool of great teachers if we have the 11-18 offer, on the flexibility to adapt to developments in the technical curriculum and on governance and on devolution and on the Law.

2235 The question remains: how ambitious are we for our education system? I implore Members to vote in favour of this amendment.

2240 **The Bailiff:** Members, we now go to the vote on the amendment, that is amendment 2, proposed by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Graham. I suspect there will be a request for a recorded vote. There is. A recorded vote, Greffier.

2245 **A Member:** Can we have a separate vote on Proposition 6, please?

2250 **The Bailiff:** No, I think we have to take the amendment as a whole. If people want to vote separately, they can do so if this carries and when we get to the votes. As an amendment, it either stands or falls in its whole. Deputy Green?

Deputy Green: Yes, when I spoke yesterday, I genuinely forgot to declare an interest in that my wife is a teacher with the schools' music service.

2255 **The Bailiff:** Thank you. The vote, Deputy Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 13, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	Deputy Paint	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Green	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Dorey	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
Deputy Yerby	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Prow		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Gollop		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Leadbeater		
Deputy Oliver	Deputy Le Pelley		
Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy Meerveld		
Alderney Rep. McKinley	Deputy Inder		
Deputy Ferbrache	Deputy Lowe		
Deputy Kuttelwascher	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Tindall			
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Mooney			
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Smithies			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			

The Bailiff: Well, Members, the voting on amendment 2, proposed by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Graham, was 26 in favour, with 13 against. I declare the amendment carried.

2260 We will rise now and resume at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 1.11 p.m.
and resumed at 2.30 p.m.*

**The Future of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick –
Debate continued –
Propositions carried as amended**

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

2265 **The Bailiff:** Well Members, can we just I think agree what we do next. We have now dealt with amendments 3, 5, 6 and 2. The next one that we were going to take was amendment 1, proposed by Deputy Meerveld and seconded by Deputy Ferbrache. I assume that one has now fallen away. Is that ... ?

2270 **Deputies Meerveld and Ferbrache:** Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Yes, so that is not to be laid. Thank you.
Amendment 4 that came from the Committee, Deputy Le Pelley/Deputy Dudley-Owen, I assume that one is not to be laid either? (**Deputies Le Pelley and Dudley-Owen:** No.) No.

2275 So of the ones that have been circulated, I know that others have been trumpeted, but of the ones that have been circulated, we only have amendments 7 and 8, as far as I am aware. Amendment 7 being the Deputy Ferbrache/Deputy Kuttelwascher amendment that was circulated I think on Wednesday; then amendment 8 that was circulated at lunchtime, proposed by Deputy Leadbeater and seconded by Deputy Meerveld. I hope everyone has a copy of amendment 8, it
2280 should have been left on the desks at lunchtime.

It seems to me it is probably appropriate to take 8 before 7, because it seems to follow on more closely from what we have just been debating.

So we will start then with amendment 8, proposed by Deputy Leadbeater.

Sorry, Deputy St Pier.

2285

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I believe this does engage Rule 24(2)(b) and will therefore require a suspension of the Rules.

The Bailiff: Does it involve – ?

2290

The Procureur: Sir, I have raised this with Deputy Leadbeater who was of the view, perhaps he may wish to confirm to the Assembly, that there would not be any financial implications. That really is a matter of fact, sir. I cannot comment on that. The Member may wish to make a comment directly. If there are financial implications, or the timing of works are to be altered then
2295 yes, Rule 24 would be engaged.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater, is Rule 24(2)(b) engaged, or any other part of 24(2)?

Deputy Leadbeater: As far as I am aware, there is no cost implication, sir.

2300

The Bailiff: No cost implications. *(Interjections)*
Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: No cost implications that go further reaching than the proposals by the
2305 Committee for Education, Sport & Culture.

The Bailiff: Right. Well of course, those proposals are no longer before us ...
Rule 24(2)(b) is:

A Member who proposes to move an amendment ...

(b) which may have the effect of increasing expenditure; or substituting another contractor; or altering the timing of any works ...

must furnish the proposed amendment ... not later than [three o'clock in the afternoon] on ... the seventh clear day before the meeting.

2310 So you are saying that it does not have the effect of increasing expenditure, substituting another contractor or alternating the timing of any works. Is that correct?

Deputy Leadbeater: Sir, under the amended Proposition, the alternative model, we have no timelines and costings to benchmark it against, but I think it is clear to see that the proposal set out in amendment 8 will have a far shorter timeline, as they do not include the further research that needs to be done on the various viable sites, etc. and it is clearly going to be a lot cheaper to build what is proposed in this amendment than it is to build two big schools. I think that is fairly obvious but clearly there is no comparison that we have, to make that judgement.
2315

2320 **The Bailiff:** So you are saying it will not increase expenditure, does not at this stage substitute another contractor because we do not have a contractor, it will alter the timing of works though, because it brings things forward, you are saying.

Deputy Leadbeater: It brings things forward, yes, rather –

2325 **The Bailiff:** Well, that does seem –

Deputy Leadbeater: –than having an adverse effect on timing.

2330 **The Bailiff:** Yes. But it does not say ‘delay the timing of any works’, the Rule says ‘altering the timing of any works’. I think it brings the timing –

Deputy Leadbeater: The thing is, sir, we have got no timings to benchmark it against.

2335 **The Bailiff:** But you have just told us it will bring it forward.

Deputy Leadbeater: I just think that is fairly obvious.

2340 **The Bailiff:** Well, in that case it engages the Rule. Procureur, do you agree? Altering the timing means both bringing it forward and delaying it.

The Procureur: Sir, I agree with your interpretation. The issue simply is it is very difficult with an amendment at this stage to be able to quantify exactly what is going to happen given that actually this amendment is very much predicated on the alternative model proposals going forward.

2345 I absolutely agree it does not matter whether the effect is to bring it forward or to delay it; it is just it seems to me quite uncertain to know exactly what the effect is going to be going through it. This amendment is predicated on using the existing schools so I can assume in relation to expenditure there may be an argument that nothing is necessarily going to change with that, but timing of works I simply do not know, sir. I cannot opine on that.

2350 **The Bailiff:** In which case I think we need to have a suspension of the Rules.

The Procureur: Yes, sir. It would be sensible, if there is a feeling that it is reasonable that the timing will increase, it seems to me reasonable to say we will suspend the Rules.

2355 **The Bailiff:** Yes, so Deputy Leadbeater, do you wish to propose that the Rules be suspended?

Deputy Leadbeater: Please, sir.

2360 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld, do you second that?

Deputy Meerveld: Yes, sir.

2365 **The Bailiff:** I put to you then that the –

Deputy St Pier: Sir, could we have a recorded vote, please?

2370 **The Bailiff:** We will have a recorded vote. I put to you the Proposition that the Rules be suspended, in other words Rule 24(2)(b) be suspended, to enable amendment 8 to be laid.
Greffier, a recorded vote.

Would it be helpful for anybody listening if I just read the explanatory note, because I believe there are people listening? I will just read the explanatory note.

'This [amendment] will enable 11 – 16 education to continue at Les Beaucamps High School, St Sampsons High School and the new La Mare de Carteret High School. It will also enable post 16 sixth form education to continue at Les Varendes, and for a new College of Further Education and Institute of Social Care Studies to be located on a single site next to the Princess Royal Centre for Performing Arts at Les Ozouets Campus.

There are many options for the potential vacant space at Les Varendes site in the future. It would be an ideal location for initiatives such as a degree level distance learning centre for example as part of the proposed Guernsey University Centre.'

2375 That is not reading the amendment; that is the explanatory note. The amendment itself is a bit longer, but hopefully that puts it in context for anyone listening, who is not present here in the Chamber and has not seen the amendment.

So Greffier, the vote please.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 19, Contre 19, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	Deputy Dorey	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Green	Deputy Yerby		Deputy Trott
Deputy Paint	Deputy Soulsby		
Deputy Brouard	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Dudley-Owen	Deputy Roffey		
Deputy De Lisle	Alderney Rep. Jean		
Deputy Langlois	Alderney Rep. McKinley		
Deputy Prow	Deputy Kuttelwascher		
Deputy Oliver	Deputy Tindall		
Deputy Ferbrache	Deputy Brehaut		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Tooley		
Deputy Lester Queripel	Deputy Parkinson		
Deputy Leadbeater	Deputy Le Clerc		
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy Mooney		
Deputy Meerveld	Deputy Merrett		
Deputy Fallaize	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Inder	Deputy Stephens		
Deputy Lowe	Deputy Smithies		
Deputy Laurie Queripel	Deputy Hansmann Rouxel		

2380 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, the voting on the Proposition to suspend the Rules was 19 in favour, 19 against. It is therefore tied and I declare that Proposition lost.

But I understand that the Committee will now lay an amendment in the same terms as this amendment. (**Deputy Le Pelley:** Yes, sir.) Deputy Le Pelley, is that what you are proposing?

2385 **Deputy Le Pelley:** It seems pretty obvious to me that there is a fair amount of support –

The Bailiff: Well, not a speech at this stage, but –

Deputy Le Pelley: That is correct. (*Laughter*)

2390

The Bailiff: So the Education, Sport & Culture Committee has apparently resolved to lay this amendment, so it is being proposed by Deputy Le Pelley and seconded by the Vice-President, is it? Deputy Dudley-Owen.

2395 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen. So that gets round the Rule.

So Deputy Le Pelley, before you make your opening, do you wish the amendment to be read? I have already read the explanatory note.

2400

Deputy Le Pelley: Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: Greffier.

2405

The Deputy Greffier read the amendment:

Amendment 8

To amend the Propositions as follows:

(a) delete Propositions 1, 6, 10 and 11,

(b) for Proposition 2, substitute the following proposition –

"2. To agree that from the earliest date practicable secondary and post-16 education will be provided through the following establishments –

(a) Les Beaucamps High School, St Sampson's High School and La Mare de Carteret High School (in relation to the provision of 11 to 16 education),

(b) the current Sixth-form college at the Les Varendes site (in relation to the provision of 16 to 18 education), and

(c) a new establishment to be developed at the Les Ozouets site (in relation to the provision of post-16 education not provided at the Sixth-form college and currently provided through the College of Further Education and the Institute of Social Care Studies).",

(c) in Propositions 4, 5, 9 for "the 11 to 18 School" substitute "schools",

(d) in Proposition 8 –

(i) delete the text – "once the States have agreed the two sites to be used for the 11 to 18 School," and

(ii) at the end insert – "for admission to the schools referred to in Proposition 2",

(e) in Proposition 12 –

(i) for "this model of education", substitute "the model of education referred to in Proposition 2", and

(ii) delete the text commencing "and further to note that the feasibility studies ..." to the end of the Proposition.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley will open the debate on the amendment.

Deputy Le Pelley: Thank you very much, sir.

2410

A tied vote of 19/19 suggests to me, sir, this is a very interesting amendment that needs to be aired, needs to be debated. I think we have had two and a half days of discussion now about where we are going to go. We have some direction as to where the States sits at the present time, but I think it is important that we have a chance to hear all debate on all things. I am just pleased that when we get to a tied vote like that – I know the tied vote means it is lost – I am happy just to be the vessel, if you like, that allows this, or the sponsor that allows this amendment to be placed.

2415

I so wish it to be debated, and therefore I am happy to propose it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld, you are rising to speak? Sorry, Deputy Leadbeater, sorry.

2420

Deputy Leadbeater: Is it going to be seconded first, sir?

The Bailiff: Oh sorry, yes, we need it formally seconded. *(Laughter)* Deputy Dudley-Owen, do you formally second it?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes, and reserve my right to speak.

2425

The Bailiff: Right. Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

2430 I thank the Committee for laying this amendment today, (*Laughter*) as I truly believe that three schools are what is needed, and it will provide complete parity of opportunity and excellence for all students and not favour only the academic few as the amendment that this Assembly just passed clearly does. I carry out that last sentence though by saying that is only the case is you believe that 11-18 education is far better than 11-16 with a separate post-16 offering, which G4 have clearly articulated that they do.

2435 I say it will only favour the few because, as Deputy Brouard pointed out to the Assembly yesterday, the majority of students leave school at 16 years of age. Most go into some type of further education, work or maybe a combination of the two and this is exactly why we have to get our post-16 educational provision right. I believe that keeping the Sixth Form Centre where it is at Les Varendes, and amalgamating the College of Further Education on one site as opposed to the three rundown buildings that it operates out of now is the best solution we have, and it will not incur massive costs.

2440 Les Ozouets campus is the logical location for the new College of Further Education and Institute of Social Care Studies. It is a massive site that is already used by the College of FE, it has the Princess Royal Centre for Performing Arts located there, the Schools Music Service, and the wonderful Youth Commission for Guernsey & Alderney. Parts of the existing structure could be retained making further capital savings.

2445 Getting back to the argument for two large schools as opposed to three, sir, I have heard so much these last few days about how larger size cohorts are so important, but to that I say: have a look at La Mare de Carteret, have a look at the results, the proud students, the school ethos, and the amazing teachers, because if you do, the argument for two massive schools falls flat on its backside. La Mare de Carteret High School is an establishment that we should be proud of. I am (A Member: Hear, hear.) and if you pay a visit and spend some time there you will become too. We should be supporting La Mare, not smashing it to pieces and condemning it to the grave. The community spirit, the camaraderie, the total dedication that runs through that school will be lost for ever, and this kind of ethos will never, and could never, be recreated within two massive schools.

2450 This amendment is about a combination of equality, opportunity, excellence, community and the best outcomes for our young people for years to come. This is also a cost-effective option and would not cause any further undue delays.

2460 I truly believe that this is what the public want; it is what the parents want; it is what the young people want. It ticks all of the boxes by keeping community sized schools where every child has the same opportunity as the next regardless of his or her ability.

2465 One of the college of FE students talking on the *JKT Show* this week said that she would not have coped at a large school, and this young lady is not alone, there are many that would not cope, but we have a chance now to put that right and ensure the wellbeing of those who would simply be overwhelmed by the alternative model unamended.

2470 Sir, Deputy Fallaize said in his summing up that it was a good thing that his alternative model can reunite the warring factions from the selection debate, but that is no good if you just start another war. Just take a look at Western foreign policy and the message left behind in places like the Middle East and North Africa. It is totally counterproductive to try and stop a war by creating a new one. The way to stop a war is through diplomacy, by listening to all of the parties involves, yes also consulting experts, but they do tend to provide opposing views sometimes and trying to work through and find a solution, but you have to accept that you will probably never find a completely perfect solution with the very best of outcomes. So what you might seek is fairness

2475 and equality for all: the amendment just passed does not do that; this amendment seeks to redress that inequality and at the same time find some middle ground amongst our community.

Sir, I will reflect back to my speech yesterday, and the consultations I had with teachers, parents, grandparents, and in particular young people – excuse me, I cannot concentrate! The young people I spoke to overwhelmingly wanted three schools, and those I spoke to had great concerns about two massive ones, we should listen to them, not simply ignore them. I believe that this amendment will give our young people what they are asking for, and will provide an equal opportunity for our future generations to come.

2485 Sir, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture's policy letter fell down on its post-16 provision. The alternative model's Proposition fell down with its lack of equality and lack of understanding that the people of Guernsey do not want two great big schools.

2490 Sir, if Members are minded to support this amendment, we can promise our community, our parents, teachers, young people that we have listened to them, that we have come up with a top-class flexible education system, promise them that we can get on with producing it without any delays. I sincerely hope that we can promise them, that we will support whoever is on the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture in driving these plans forward.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

2495 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, sir.

I have absolutely no doubt, listening to that, about the sincerity with which this amendment is being put forward, but I do have three really fundamental problems with it.

2500 The first is that at the heart of our debate for the last two days, I know it has been nuanced and there have been other considerations, but it has been whether two schools is better than three schools, or whether three schools is better than two schools. And by a two to one majority we reached a decision just before lunch, and I accept that the third who disagreed with it still feel that that decision was profoundly wrong, but we come back after lunch and we are being basically asked, can you support three schools instead of two? If this is successful perhaps I will come back on Monday morning, or whenever it is, and put forward another model to go back to two. Where does this end? I think after two days' discussion, that subject has really been put to bed, with due respect.

2510 The second one is that another consideration we have been going over, over the last two days, is whether or not the post-16 college, the full time college, which was going to be for A-levels, IB and level 3 and some level 1 and 2 technical courses, was going to be too exposed by the fact that it was going to be a stand-alone, it was being separated out from the part-time courses, and there was a lot of concern saying that there would not be the economies of scale, and that you would have lecturers with ... you need 1.4 and what would the other 0.6 do, or whatever? Here we are being asked to have a stand-alone sixth form, just sixth form, not attached to any school whatsoever. That exacerbates that problem.

2515 Thirdly, we have heard from Deputy Leadbeater that this is a cost-effective option. It is anything but. Read the explanatory note, we will find something to do with the redundant space at Les Varendes. I would be dead against it, but if people want a sixth form and three 11-16 schools, then it would obviously be an awful lot cheaper to do two thirds of what Deputy Leadbeater is suggesting. Use Les Beaucamps, use St Sampson's, but for the third 11-16 have it in the revamped Grammar School site. That way, not only is it cheaper but the sixth form would be co-located and could have synergies and economies of scale within an 11-16 school.

2520 I would be against that, because I do not think there would be equality, and it would be too unfair on the people who were going just to 11-16 schools, but why on earth build a new one when you have got one sitting there, and you are saying we can probably find something to do with this, there are lots of options? Of course there are lots of options: it is school – use it as a school, if that is what you want.

Sir, I think we are chasing our tail and going round the mulberry bush here. That is one of the reasons I did not vote to suspend the Rules. We have decided that it was going to be put forward anyway, but I would really like to hear from the proposer the answers to all of the three points that I have raised.

2530

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, I appreciate it is an amendment brought by the Committee, but it is really brought by a very principled Deputy in Deputy Leadbeater, so let's forget the form and look at the substance.

2535

I am very grateful, and I often have different thoughts about procedural rules than Deputy Fallaize, he likes procedure and I do not. He likes rules and I do not. But he voted the same way as I did, I imagine we are both going to vote the same way in relation to this amendment, because I am not going to support the amendment, but I voted that it is debated, because the people of Guernsey and Alderney, the people of the Bailiwick, need to know that every conceivable option has been put before the States and considered.

2540

Deputy Roffey makes a good point about costs, it is not cost effective because you could do the sixth form at the Grammar, that is really what he is saying, instead of spending x million pounds rebuilding La Mare.

2545

One of the things we have got to grasp, which we have not grasped, but we are going to have to grasp sometime, is what happens if we do not use Beaucamps as part of the two schools? What happens to this building that has only been operating for six or seven years that the States have invested £40 million or £45 million or whatever the precise figure is in public money?

2550

So it is right that Deputy Leadbeater puts this, because he puts it on behalf of a big chunk – not a very good word, but I hope he knows what I mean by that – of the population of the Bailiwick, and when people just say, 'I do not want to hear from this, I am going to dismiss, I am going to take a procedural Rule, I am not going to vote, because I do not want to vote in favour of it', I think that is sad, because I think democracy is that you hear everything. We cannot say we want to ... We are in the third ... well, two and a half days of this debate, and we are not going to reach all the business that we have got to reach, and do all the stuff that we have got to do, but this is the most important debate in 50, 60, 70 years in relation to education.

2555

So well said, Deputy Leadbeater. Well done, Deputies Le Pelley and Dudley-Owen in allowing this item to be debated, but I cannot vote for it.

2560

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I will support the amendment, despite obviously that it fails one or two issues, in that it has not been fully consulted with every possible expert and every possible professional. But then, although of course we accept that the alternative model won the day in the last vote, in reality it has only been around in its current form for three weeks, perhaps two working weeks given the Christmas and New Year break, and this of course is another variation on a theme.

2565

Now earlier we had a mini-debate this morning with different points of view from Deputy Dorey, Deputy Fallaize and others, on the merits and the outcome of the March 2016 debate. What we actually voted for then, and I do accept that people are saying we should move on and it is time, you cannot be tied to some old bible that belongs to a previous Assembly.

2570

But one of the reasons I joined suddenly, if that is the right word, Education, Sport & Culture in December, was there was a shortage of Members coming forward to support the Committee, and they were even in danger of it running unconstitutionally because the vice-president's post was absent, for example. I felt I had enough work and pressures in my life, but it was important that they continue their work, not just in education but in sport and culture and arts, and they need a

2575

2580 quorum for meetings and all the rest of it, because this has been a Committee with able individual people, supported by hard-working experienced staff, who have been under an enormous pressure in every possible way the past year, and one of the pressures has been that they have not been delivering what the States really wanted.

2585 We know the vote of no confidence was won by the Committee and they continued in office and perhaps, personally to my surprise, they came up with a model which was much closer to what one might call the anti-11-plus brigade than the political and moral positions of many of the Committee. They did move. But the Resolution that they I think were implementing... I have got a note here saying that the relevant Resolution was as follows, which has just been replaced today of course.

That 11 to 16 education in the States' sector shall be provided in three schools, ideally of a broadly comparable size but in any event of a size capable of securing equality of opportunity for all students.

2590 The Committee did that, albeit with a disparity of size between the biggest and smallest, which could have been amended, and I think on balance I would have voted for the amendment, despite the cost and the delay in it. The next part of the Resolution was, it has to include the following options:

the optimum changes to the education estate which are necessary to give effect to the States' policies contained in Propositions 1 and 1A, provided that the Committee shall first have considered the following options:

And there were two. Number one was

redeveloping a secondary school at La Mare de Carteret; and ceasing 11 to 16 education at Les Varendes and consolidating post-16 education, including sixth form studies and the College of Further Education, at Les Varendes and Les Ozouets; and

Two, the other option:

'maintaining 11 to 19 education, i.e. including a sixth form, at Les Varendes; and ceasing 11 to 16 education at La Mare de Carteret.'

2595 Which was really a two schools and one school option, so you would have had one 11-19 school at the old Grammar School site and Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's would continue.

2600 That is what broadly the States voted for, and the Committee came up with a variation on that theme with a Sixth Form Centre, but that was the context. I think regardless of the fate of the Committee, or what we have achieved or have not achieved, the Committee delivered fundamentally what the States were asking for in 2016.

2605 I do appreciate some Members, such as Deputy Fallaize, were always sceptical of the wisdom of that, and were arguing along with the then Deputy Elis Bebb and others that two schools was a more sensible use of resources and I think to a certain extent Deputy Roffey questioned the wisdom of rebuilding La Mare as well. But most States' Members went along this tramline including we remember Policy & Resources by a majority, and the Committee has been treated rather shabbily inasmuch that they went on and did the job against their former political positions and suddenly the game changed. Members suddenly decided they wanted something different, and then the professionals all weighed in saying, 'Well actually, we do not like the *table d'hôte* menu we ordered for the dinner in a month's time. What we want is something different. There you go.'

2610 This amendment, bringing it back to this, is remarkable similar to I think the spirit of 2016 and 2017 and probably more accurately reflects public opinion at the moment rather than the different arguments we have heard from sundry professionals.

2615 It is the most conservative model for Guernsey in that it fundamentally keeps things similar to as they are. Les Beaucamps continues in its fine new building, without any extensions. St Sampson's the same, and La Mare de Carteret, we honour our promises and rebuild it. The

advantage of that would be significant for the construction and building sectors, and that would give a degree of economic multiplication to the economy, which is another reason to support the amendment. Les Varendes would continue as a larger sixth-form college, there is spare space there perhaps, but we have to bear in mind there could be an extra 100 pupils in the future who would not do scholarships, plus other people would be attracted to the brave new curriculum and resources there.

As other Members have noted perhaps the one element of the 11-16 package that I had most misgivings about was the further education partition of elements of the estate of the excellent College of Further Education.

Like other Members I would like to see a university college there developed, but in the meantime I think that a College of Further Education rebuilt and reinvigorated with brand new facilities on Les Ozouets, but maybe working in a devolved governance structure united at some level with the Sixth Form Centre, which would get around one of Deputy Roffey's legitimate concerns of delivering effectively a unified 16-plus choice, but on two different sites using two different ways of doing things.

I appreciate we do not know every element of the cash in this, and it does not answer the two versus three-school element, but what it does do is to give I think greater speed and greater ease in terms of logistics, transport, planning and many other areas in delivering on our Resolutions, and I think this is an opportunity at least for all of us, regardless of how we voted in the last debate, to say whether we want this option for the Island or whether we are rejecting this one as well.

I thank Deputy Leadbeater and Deputy Meerveld for bringing it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

We have the Rules for good reasons. I mean the Rules are to be agreed by the Assembly and the Rules are there to protect us from making a decision at the last minute without having considered the implications of an amendment. That is why I voted not to suspend the Rules, because I think that, as Deputy Ferbrache said, it is the biggest issue that we have debated for 50 or 70 years. I do not believe that I think there are other issues that have been important, but I do think that before we vote on something like this, which has significant implications, that we should have had time to consider it, and that is why I voted, as I said, to not suspend the Rules. I will vote against the amendment. But that is not the only reason why.

One of the key points in the debate we had on the previous amendment was the Sixth Form Centre and the fact that effectively putting it in with part of the College of FE was not viable. I am not going to repeat all the arguments, but the implications that you needed two teachers for every subject and there were I think at least eight subjects which do not require even one teacher, there were four that required between one and two, and the implications for A-level education if we did not have that cover were immense. It involved a senior teacher writing to us to say that, and although this quote was in relation to the Committee proposals, I think the words could be used for this amendment as well, in relation to that:

For the sixth form education it will expose future generations of students to a level of risk that is so significant that it is certain to damage the chances of a significant number of students in terms of access to their chosen university or employment ...

I am sure words like that can be used for this one, because of the lack of cover of teachers for a significant number of subjects in relation to A-levels. The sixth-form college cannot stand on its own. It has to be part of a 11-16 school, and I hope that is what we concluded from this yesterday and this morning, and also Wednesday afternoon's debate. Therefore for those reasons, I cannot support it.

2665 Also the original proposer spoke about La Mare and a community school, but of course the proposals which were in the original report, and I presume that these are the same, involved La Mare being an eight form entry school. It will be very different to La Mare that we have today. It will be so significantly bigger that I do not think it can be compared.

So for those reasons, I would ask Members to vote against this amendment.

Thank you.

2670 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

2675 **Deputy Inder:** Sir, I think first of all, I have got to congratulate the alternative modellers for the work they have done over the past few months in getting this successful amendment through. It was in fact a convincing win, or certainly a convincing defeat for Education, Sport & Culture. So I cannot take that away from them at all, but sir, just a little bit more rational now and as a previous Member because obviously I tendered my resignation almost –

2680 **The Bailiff:** You are still a Member until a successor has been appointed, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: All right. (*Laughter and interjections*)

Through you, sir, I thought I had dodged at least one bullet, but quite clearly not, but anyway ...

2685 I think whether we like it or not, and I have seen elements of what I referred to in my first speech, and I am certainly grateful for this amendment being laid, because if I could analyse – and Members of the Assembly might have a different view – the comments we have had from parents, teachers, all the emails that we have had, I would suggest ... I kept these in three folders, yes, nos, maybes, and I think, to be honest with you, if I could go roughly a third, a third, a third, there was certainly 'yes to two schools', there was 'yes to three schools', and there was 'bring back the Grammar', and 'where was the plan the first time?' Now, if you add those two together – the 'bring back the Grammar' and 'yes to three schools', which might beat the two schools, I genuinely think what we have done today – and I did not want this to happen – given the timelines through to 2020, I think we have put selection back on the agenda for a 2020 election, I genuinely think that has happened.

2695 Just to talk about what we are not hearing, I mentioned it in my first speech, the quieter voices, and it has happened again in March 2016, now what we heard in the main were a lot of the information that we got the new evidence which was not the evidence of two years, and I cannot get away from that, what we were saying two years ago is not what we are saying today. What we did hear from, and I cannot remember whether it was Deputy St Pier, Deputy Dorey or Deputy Fallaize, but in the 2016 there was reference to a local educational specialist who quite clearly said that larger schools – I cannot remember the exact words – along the lines of, they do not help people from disadvantaged backgrounds. Now that was said in 2016, but we did not hear this evidence today. So we appear to be picking and choosing the evidence that suits us.

2705 Everyone received the letter from the parents of La Mare, okay, it was emotional, but I did not hear that in anyone's speeches over the last two and a half days. We did not hear from the teacher who wrote to us an open letter, the teacher at La Mare, Mr Dodd, who had real concerns about larger schools, we did not hear from him over the last two days. We heard from the Grammar School or variations of it. We heard from the IOD, we heard from Mr Mulkerrin, and we are doing it again, and again, and again – we are picking and choosing our evidence.

2710 With the greatest respect this Assembly, who claims to have an open tent where we embrace all of the peoples, in this debate I genuinely do not think we have done. We just have not heard the quieter voices. We have listened to the people that to a degree, with the greatest respect, suit our argument.

2715 So I am still behind the three-school model. I genuinely do not think the size of the schools are going to help us at all. I think the alternative modellers – I am trying not to say G4 – have done a

fantastic job. However, I do not think it is over today, so I have got to give them some respect there, and I suppose if nothing else there has been a convincing majority for the two-school model.

So I am really at a point where just ... I come from a very practical background and I think very much in black and white, it either is or it is not, and what really has disappointed me is the weighting towards, let's say, I am not even too sure how to – I do not want to use the word 'class' – but a type of people that we probably hang around and we are used to, and we are just have not been listening to smaller voices that we claim to listen to every time that we have got a strategy. We claim that we want to listen to these people but we do not really.

So I am going to support this because I am absolutely convinced, based on the evidence that I have heard, I have seen, that was used in March 2016, that two large schools are just too big and will have a detrimental effect on the more disadvantaged in our society.

I am going to leave it at that, sir.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

I have always been a proponent, sir, of small community schools, and also retention of community spirit, and I sometimes become concerned that we might be rationalising ourselves a little too much, because very often of financial pressure and some of the advantages from that point of view.

I think dispersion is fairly important as well in terms of activity with regard to schools and other facilities, but I was against, for example, the closure of St Andrew's, that was a primary school, and also the infant school at St Sampson's, and that actually has led to a lot of congestion around the Vale School. Also 70 children moved from St Andrew's to St Martin's, and St Martin's is a school now that is larger than most of our secondary schools in fact. It is almost 600, with a staff of 53 –

The Bailiff: Is this relevant to the amendment before us, Deputy de Lisle?

Deputy de Lisle: Well, it is just getting on to the fact that I have always been supportive also of the rebuilding of La Mare de Carteret. We started in 2001 with regard to an education policy which was to rebuild three secondary schools to the standard of the Grammar School, and we are almost there, but not quite because we have got the one at La Mare yet to build.

But the point that I am making here is that smaller schools linked to community are very important, and once we go away from that we get all these pressures of congestion around schools, that I think we have got to try and avoid in the future.

So I would be quite supportive of this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I shall be very brief. I am very mindful of Deputy Soulsby's wisdom tooth analogy. I am not going to repeat the points made in my speech on the previous amendment.

I do endorse fully the points made by Deputy Ferbrache around democratic opportunities to make arguments with regard to this most important decision we will make in this term.

Neither shall I rehearse the arguments the size of schools. What is absolutely clear there is no perfect and clear solution. However, Deputy Leadbeater has provides us a pragmatic and cost effective solution. I stand shoulder to shoulder with him, and I shall support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

2770 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I will be brief.

I find it surprising that the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture are happy to support an amendment that does not have any costings in it, given that was their huge criticism of the alternative model. Anyway, we are where we are.

2775 I would be interested to find out how Deputy Lowe votes as well, given that her criticisms yesterday of the States considering an alternative model with what she considered not enough costs.

Two versus three schools, we have had that debate, overwhelming won for the two school model, please let's not have that debate again, we have been through it all, the decision was made.

2780 Community schools, Deputy de Lisle talked about. Well, the secondary schools are different from the primary schools, you have Beaucamps which feeds children from Pleinmont to Fort Road, That is quite a lot of area of Guernsey – what community is he talking about there?

2785 Again, we have this talk about cost, and Deputy Leadbeater opened this statement by saying that this will be cost effective, but there is no evidence to say it is cost effective. It might be cheaper, we do not know there is nothing to prove it, as we have spoken in the previous debate, as I did, and Deputy St Pier, the issue is value for money; it is not how much it costs necessarily.

Picking and choosing evidence, said by Deputy Inder: well, there is no evidence here anyway. In fact it is a classic case of on-the-hoof amendment which has not thought out what the realities of the situation are now.

2790 Yes, we have a Sixth Form Centre but the pupils that attend that Sixth Form Centre just do not live and breathe and exist within that one building. It is a very big sixth form, which is why it makes absolute sense to split it in two, particularly if you are at a parents' evening when you have got 250 children there and parents for just one year. So to me it was never an issue about splitting the sixth form. But for those pupils, yes, that is where the Sixth Form Centre is, but that is not
2795 where all their lessons are currently held, so tutor groups for instance are in the main body of the Grammar School, chemistry labs, physics labs, design technology labs, they are split around the school. So it is not right to say that if you close the Grammar School element of it, that will be fine and all the sixth form can continue in that one element. That will not be the case at all. You will have a very underutilised building that would still need to be kept open for those students doing
2800 the sciences and other arts subjects.

So, really this ... I understand where Deputy Leadbeater is coming from here, but really we need to reject this amendment based on the lack of evidence, costings and the fact that it has not been thought through.

2805 **Deputy Paint:** Sir, for a very long time this Assembly, or the States of Guernsey, have worked with compromise. They have not been using the attitude that 'I am right', when both sides may be wrong in some places. I see this amendment as an attempt to try and find repair to the damage that has been made to the reputation of this Assembly. So I will be voting with the amendment.

Thank you, sir.

2810

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Sir, I was not actually going to speak on this, but Deputy Paint brought me to my feet.

2815 This is not a compromise. If it had said keep Beaucamps School, St Sampson's and then the Sixth Form Centre and on Les Varendes site to bring La Mare on that and then add a Sixth Form Centre, that would be a compromise. This is not. I just wanted to say that.

Thank you. *(Laughter)*

2820 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Clerc.

Deputy Le Clerc: Thank you, sir.

Sir, I think some Members of this Assembly must have gone out at lunch time and bought rose-tinted glasses, and I think we need to bring this back to some reality.

2825 Deputy Dorey has already said about La Mare School. Currently it is a four form entry school, a small school, and I think that is what parents and teachers think will be rebuilt on that site. It will not, it will double in size. It will be an eight form entry school. It will be the biggest secondary school on the Island. Things will change. If you vote for this model things will change, and they will not be what you expect them to be.

2830 There is also on that site a primary school that will be rebuilt, and I should know, but I cannot recall the number of pupils that are at that primary school, but I expect it is around the 400 mark. So you will have over 1,000, probably 1,300 children on that site. So if you look at that in the whole, that is going to be a big school. No difference to the two-school model that has been approved by this Assembly.

2835 Just picking up on something that Deputy Soulsby said earlier on, if we are going to put some infrastructure into the Les Varendes site and it is just going to –

Deputy Le Pelley: Point of correction.

2840 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: Sir, the suggestion that 800 students in a 11-16 school, plus a group from a primary school of 4-11 making up the numbers to try and compare them against an 11-18 school is a very false economy, and a very false comparison. They will be schools under total different age groups, totally different teachers, totally different sites. They will be segregated. So I do not know how you can keep on saying that that site will have so many children, 1,300 children or whatever it is. They will be two separate schools.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

2850 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Sir, I will just pick up on Deputy Le Pelley's points. Yes there will be two separate schools, but there will still be the movements of those children on and off the site at approximately the same time. I am down at La Mare School at least once a week every other week. It is going through the eye of a needle to get into that school and on to that site. It does work reasonably well, I will say, but that is through a lot of time and effort of the parents and the staff down there.

2855 But I am just trying to prove a point that actually people are thinking that we are going to be rebuilding La Mare and it is going to be a similar size. It is not. It is going to be double the size on the secondary site.

2860 I would just like to finish by saying that if you have Les Varendes site and you were delivering A-level qualifications you will need physics labs, chemistry labs, all the rest of it. If we have only got ... and it was Deputy Fallaize said earlier, that we have got less than 10 pupils taking some of these subjects, that means those chemistry labs, that physics lab, the music department will be redundant most of the time, if you separate out the Sixth Form Centre from the 11-16 schools. So

2865 I would urge you to throw out this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel, you have been waiting a while.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

2870 Sir, I start from the same point or same place as Deputy Ferbrache. I have no doubt at all this amendment has been laid with absolute sincerity and good intent, and been spoken to with absolute sincerity and good intent by Deputy Leadbeater and others.

But whether I like this amendment or not, and actually I do like the model being put forward because regardless of what has been said by Deputy Le Clerc and Deputy Soulsby, my preference is for smaller more community-based schools. But I cannot find the report to support this model, I cannot find the business case, I cannot find the costings, I cannot find any of those things.

Now if I was going to indulge in the politics of preference, I would vote for the amendment. If I was going to indulge in the politics of convenience, I would vote for the amendment. But I try to work to the politics of principle, and it would be very double standard indeed if I did not apply the same thinking to this amendment as I applied to the alternative model when I spoke to it on Wednesday. I said where the alternative model fell down for me is that I could see some appeal to it, I could see the good points to it, but there was a whole raft of information missing: there was no information in regard to the implications for the estate, there were no costings, there were none of those things, sir, and pretty much the same thinking applies to this amendment.

So though even though I quite like what is being put forward, the information just is not there for me to make an informed decision in regard to the things that are missing, and the things that are missing from the alternative model as well.

It is a shame to have to say it, but I do not think ... if I vote for this amendment then it would show me as having double standards as far as I am concerned, so I cannot indulge in the politics of preference or politics of convenience. I have to stick as best I can to the politics of principle and the same points apply to this model. So unfortunately I will have to vote against it.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

Though I voted in favour of suspending the Rules, because I just always do when people want to lay amendments, I understand why some Members did not because this is essentially now a policy debate about whether to have 11-16 schools or 11-18 schools, and in fairness we have spent I think something like 14 or 15 hours debating that before the vote on the previous amendment.

In terms of public opinion, and the same is true of professional opinion, this is just a perspective, I have no way of testing this scientifically, but I think there is a misreading of public opinion here, and of professional opinion, because I think there is almost no support at all for the three-school model. I think there is loads of support for the four-school model, and I think there is some support for the two school model.

For example the four Deputies who put forward the alternative model had several meetings with staff groups in various secondary schools, and from two of the high schools the overwhelming message from the staff was 'Can't we just keep four schools?' Almost no one said 'we are in favour of the three-school model.' We kept saying ... I think it was Deputy Le Clerc talked about difference in the size of La Mare in the Committee's original proposals and the size of the schools in the alternative model. We kept making that point, and the professionals kept saying, 'Well, we do not want the three-school model so do not compare that with your option. We want to just stay as we are. Why can't we just have four schools?'

I agree with Deputy Le Clerc when she says that a lot of people in the community who support the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret, a lot of them do think that more or less the school will be rebuilt along its present lines. Not in the same location but the same type of school, and the reality is that it would increase, I think I worked out by 130% in size. So in a sense I think that once the States decided to consolidate from four to three, looking back now, they were always on a journey to two, and actually it would have been better if at the time we had just had a debate between four and two, but it was probably too big a leap at that time.

2925 This term community schools is emotive and false, because La Mare de Carteret at the moment I think I am right in saying – and Deputy Lowe will correct me if I am wrong, because it is normally Deputy Lowe who quite correctly makes this point to us – it serves eight parishes. La Mare de Carteret: the intake comes from eight different parishes. So I think it is difficult to term a school a community school when it has children arriving there from eight different parishes – literally from miles away. There are parents who more or less drive past Beaucamps to take their children to La Mare. So I do not understand why that is a community school, and yet let's say the Grammar School, which is serving 10 parishes, is not a community school. St Sampson's School serves far fewer parishes than La Mare, but is St Sampson's not a community school because it has got 700 students and La Mare has only got 400-odd? What is meant by a community school? A school has a community around it, the school community that is the community which it serves.

I will give way to Deputy Yerby, sir.

2935 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Sir, I thank Deputy Fallaize for giving way. I do not think I mentioned 'community school'; I mentioned community spirit running within the school. I just want to clarify that point.

Thank you.

2940 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, I appreciate that, I did not think that Deputy Leadbeater had said 'community school', but that has been a feature of the debate, and I think there is some sense that if you have small schools or smaller schools then they are community schools, and that larger schools are not.

I will give way to Deputy Lowe.

2945 **Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, Deputy Fallaize.

I think the word 'community' also comes from ... You were talking about Beaucamps: Beaucamps, as you know, the catchment area is all St Andrew's and St Martin's so the community of St Martin's and St Andrew's are encapsulated in Beaucamps, and in the same way La Mare takes the students from Torteval, St Peter's, Forest, which of course are lot smaller parishes that make up the eight parishes that are represented under the legal requirement at La Mare.

2955 **Deputy Brehaut:** For clarification, and St Peter Port South – (**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.) I do beg your pardon.

Deputy Lowe: I did not plan to list the eight, I can do if you want to, but the eight parishes that are left from –

2960 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, I thank Deputy Lowe for that, and I entirely accept that point, but of course there are parents or student travelling from quite a long way away in Guernsey terms to come to that school.

2965 My children are at the Vale School, both of them, and of course so are now the children who would previously have been at St Sampson's Infant School. Now I defy anybody to distinguish between the children who would previously have been at St Sampson's Infants and those who would always have been at the Vale, because now it is just one school community which serves its catchment area. So I think one has to be very careful about. It is bit like politicians when they say that we need pragmatic responsible public finances: that sounds good but what does it mean? What do community schools mean? I think all of our schools are strong community schools, they all serve their own communities.

2970 I would not mind betting that in the two-school model there will actually be fewer children who will have to travel as far from their home to get to school as they do at the moment, because there are some children travelling several miles to get to school, and actually if you just divide the

Island in two you may find that the vast majority of students do not actually have to travel as far as some are at the moment.

2975 The main issue though is that I think the States have probably accepted on policy grounds 11-18 schools as opposed to 11-16 school; the difference between this amendment and the Committee's original Propositions is that the sixth form – it is called a sixth-form college in this amendment, but it would just be the Sixth Form Centre as it exists at the present time. So you would shave off the 11-16 section of the current Grammar School and leave the Sixth Form
2980 Centre. With the greatest respect that is worse than what the Committee put forward earlier. I mean they are going in the wrong direction if they want to – they would be better off to propose a tertiary college if they want to try and make some kind of argument about having separate post-16 provision – I hope they do not, because I do not agree with that model – but this is moving in the wrong direction.

2985 The problem with the sixth-form college as proposed was not that there were too many students and that there would be too many teachers or lecturers, it was that there were too few students and too few teachers or lecturers, but now they want to cut it in half again because they want to take out the fulltime College of FE students, and this just will not be ... I mean it would be essentially a school, it would be the Sixth Form Centre operating as a school with 400 to 450
2990 students. It would not be a particularly vibrant community, I do not think it would be a particularly attractive place for teachers or for students. I suspect if we went down there now and asked, certainly all the professionals and most of the students, I doubt very much they would find that a particularly attractive proposition.

2995 This amendment in fairness does retain technical studies in a single integrated organisation, which is an improvement on what the Committee proposed originally, but I think, obviously I do not think 11-16 schools are preferable to 11-18 schools, but I would have real concerns about a Sixth Form Centre of 400 to 450 –

I will give way to Deputy St Pier.

3000 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I was just wondering if Deputy Fallaize would agree with me that it also creates the problems of a completely separate cohort of teachers at the so-called Sixth Form Centre, and all the problems of recruiting into that and of course the completely unknown costs of running that as well.

3005 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes. Clearly the timelines and the costs are very uncertain with this amendment, but I do not think I am in a particularly strong position to condemn the proposer of the amendment for that reason. Yes, clearly the point that Deputy St Pier makes is correct.

3010 But this is not a compromise. The only compromise, if the issue is compromising between the vote the States took before lunch and the Committee's original Propositions, is three 11-18 schools. In terms of policy grounds and size grounds, that is the only compromise. The advice that I have always received from post-16 professionals, and from the officers at Education, is that we do not have enough sixth form students to run three sixth forms in the States' sector, but this, as Deputy Oliver said, this is not a compromise; this is a completely different system and at post-16 it is particularly vulnerable.

3015 I will give way to Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Deputy Fallaize.

3020 I think you mentioned it was 130% larger than the current capacity. As I understand, the current capacity of La Mare is 480 pupils. Previously Education had said it was 600 pupils. With the new school capacity of 960, it is 200% more than the current capacity. If you go back to the previous capacity, which was said to be 600, it is 160% more than the previously said capacity and the number of students in the school this year is 417.

Thank you.

3025 **Deputy Fallaize:** The point is it is a heck of a lot bigger. (*Laughter*) I do think that has to be recognised, because I think a lot of people who believe passionately and very sincerely in the redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret School do believe that essentially all that would change is that the students who are there, or that number of students, would be in their new redeveloped, fit-for-purpose building, and actually the character of the school would change very significantly

3030 under a three-school model.

I will not support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

3035

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

First of all, I would like to just thank Education for allowing the amendment to be placed by adopting it, and also I would like to thank those Members who this morning voted in favour of the two-school model who also allowed the debate to happen.

3040 I think I would much rather spend a few more hours debating it. It may not be successful, it may be successful, but we need to have the best outcome and we need to get all the evidence in this Assembly.

Sorry –

3045 **Deputy Brehaut:** The amendment is submitted without any evidence, which is the reason we decided not to debate it the first time and why rather that vote was necessary because it needed a suspension of the Rules. There is simply no evidence there.

The Bailiff: That was Deputy Brehaut

3050

Deputy Brouard: Thank you.

I think I mentioned the words yesterday: we know most of the ingredients, it is how we are going to put those ingredient together on a very small Island with not only limited resources, but also our own educational needs. It is not going to an easy fix whichever way.

3055 Anyway, I thank those Members who allowed the ... or attempted to allow.

Deputy Prow, thank you for what you said, if you are making a line of people who are standing shoulder to shoulder I will join the line. We have got three of us so far, I do not know how many more we will get by the end of the day.

3060 The penny I do not think has dropped in the Island what we passed this morning of the two-school model. I think and I will use these words, we are closing four schools and opening two. That will be a *significant* amount of work, disruption, concern and those who put it forward and wish to go with that particular model, please make sure you stand there shoulder to shoulder with the people who are putting it forward. Do not leave it, because it will be a very difficult sell, I would think, for the Island.

3065 One other point, I think Deputy Fallaize made, was that when he was talking to the school professionals that they said that they preferred to have four schools. It just shows how we select what evidence we use, because if that was the evidence that he had then why put forward two ...

I will give way to Deputy Fallaize.

3070 **Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful for that.

I said that at two of the high schools where we met staff, they made the point that they would have favoured four schools. Only at two of the high schools.

3075 **Deputy Brouard:** Using Deputy Dorey's maths then, that is probably 50% of them agree! This is exactly the point, we pick our evidence where we want to pick our evidence for the argument.

Which is rightly so, and it is just for us to make the best of those particular points and make sure that they have some weight.

3080 I think Deputy Leadbeater, through the Committee, has put forward a practical solution. I am happy to support the three schools. The rebuild of La Mare I think is an absolute must. The idea of having one Sixth Form Centre I think is much better than having it split.

3085 Obviously who would not prefer to have three fantastic schools and three fantastic large thriving sixth forms, but we just do not have the numbers. If you want that you have to move to another country. This is the difficulty we have. We are trying to square the circles. Or we are trying to make the squares into circles. It just does not always work in the size of the community that we have.

I would prefer, if we are going to have a sixth form I would have preferred it to be attached to a school, as I mentioned yesterday.

3090 This is not a nirvana; it is a journey and we all have to come up with our best ways of getting there, and I think what we have the moment I will put my shoulder next to Mr Prow and Mr Leadbeater.

Please support it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

3095 **Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy Ferbrache pricked my conscience a little because I usually do not vote against, I generally vote in favour of debate, but I thought because of the debate we had this morning there would be no stomach at all for anyone to get to their feet to open up a debate on a two-school or a three-school model again.

3100 I think for anyone who was perhaps listening to the vote at home and popped out for a couple of hours and went back home would be completely bemused as to why we have an amendment in front of us for three schools.

3105 This is an issue, it is not about education any more, it is about the broader context, it is about judgement. This amendment was ruled not to be debated – okay, the vote was cancelled out by the respective States' Members in this Assembly. However, Education again took a judgement call on whether or not this amendment should be debated, and I think we need to reflect on that.

This is a Committee that came to this Assembly with a two-school model and lost that in a fairly resounding fashion – I do beg your pardon. I do beg your pardon –

3110 **Deputy Le Pelley:** Point of correction.

I did not come with a two-school – never, *ever* would I come with a two-school model!

Deputy Brehaut: Sorry, sir. (*Laughter*) Thank you, sir.

3115 Thanks to the Education Department this has been a very long day. They came to this Assembly with a three-school model and they lost it.

This for me now is an issue about judgement, and I think it is a significant error of judgment for the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture to place an amendment when there was clearly no mood, or little mood, in this Assembly to debate it.

Thank you.

3120 **The Bailiff:** I see nobody else wanting to debate it, so I invite Deputy Le Pelley to reply to the debate.

Deputy le Pelley: Thank you very much indeed, sir.

3125 When I had the privilege of representing my former Association of Teachers, many years ago when I was a representative at their annual conferences, we used to have three options whenever we were debating anything. You had to declare this before you actually stood up or before you

were actually called to speak, and the reason for that was so that you could actually guarantee a fair and balanced debate. The speaker, or the chairman, in our particular case the presiding officer, would actually ensure that there was going to be a balanced debate by looking at the number of speeches that were about to be made and whether they were for or against or neutral. That way if anybody jumped up and said, 'Terminate debate', at least we had actually had a fair and reasonable amount of debate on both sides.

Really I want to talk to this amendment. I am sure we are not fooling anybody by saying this is not something that Education was laying. We laid it because there were 19 votes on each side and it seemed that it was a sensible thing for us to get this out in the open and to actually have it debated.

So really what I would like to do is to talk about the pros and cons. I have made notes of everybody who has been speaking, I notice that the last speaker before me jumped up and said we really should not be doing this. I have heard of bad losers, but I really thought I saw the example there of a bad winner. *(Laughter)*

I would like to talk about the pros. The pros suggest if this was passed that there will be a larger sixth form, it will keep 400-plus students together, and so will retain breadth at A-level and IB; it rebuilds La Mare de Carteret; it keeps the College of Further Education separate but it makes it easier for mixing and matching; there will be far less human resources issues; there will be no compulsory land purchases; there will be an easier transition for pupils; possibly it will be cheaper than the alternative model; and at the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre there are purpose-built classrooms that are the correct size.

Now to balance that because I did say that I was going to be talking to this amendment rather than for or against it, the other side of the coin. It will be too small to staff a Sixth Form Centre independently unless there is federation with 11-16 schools or the College of Further Education. Teachers will have to travel. It could be, well it probably would be, an inefficient use of the whole of Les Varendes. It is not clear if it will keep the size of schools inequitable. It still requires a full rebuild of the College of Further Education. It is probably – and it surely is – more expensive than the Education, Sport & Culture's model.

But this argument stands or falls, I think it was Deputy Laurie Queripel talking about principles, about not having the budget, not having the costings and all that sort of thing. But this stands or falls on exactly the same principles as the alternative model that we discussed and debated and by a majority agreed this morning.

So I do not make any apologies for actually debating or bringing it forward. Democracy – a Greek word – it is really about making sure that everybody has a chance to air every view, and that every relevant item is actually put on the table and debated and discussed, that every member of society who may be listening in to this debate feels that we have actually given it a pretty good airing. So there are no apologies for that. Parents, staff and students need to know what happens next. What will happen to each and every one of them?

There is lots of noise from those who think they already won the debate, and that further debate is unnecessary. I totally disagree with that view. I think it is very important that we discuss this right the way down to the wire. I do not want to stifle debate ever. That is why I may have actually erred in the past and voted actually to not debate something, because I have actually been up to my back teeth with it – sorry about the dentist again – but generally speaking I think it is always best to actually vote for further discussion, further debate. You never know, there might be just one little gem that comes out that people have missed in the past, and that little gem can be a real game changer. I always recommend if there is any doubt let them talk it out.

Sir, I am very pleased that the Education, Sport & Culture Committee, Vice-President, Deputy Dudley-Owen and myself, have been enablers to enable this bit of the debate.

I do not think that the alternative model supporters realise exactly what complex and intricate position they have put the current ESC or its successor in office into. We are in limbo land, we are really in a big hole *(Interjection)* and it is caused by people like the last little interrupter voting the way that they did. I have no problem with people voting that way, that is absolutely their

3180 democratic right to do so, but having voted that way without making sure that there is something in place to take that void, we are leaving an awful lot of people in Guernsey unaware of exactly what happens next. It is a very serious thing. I really do not think that you have worked out exactly where people are going, what they are going to be doing.

3185 We may have an amendment coming forward in a minute from Deputy Ferbrache and another that may help to resolve the situation. But believe you me at the moment all things are nowhere. We really are in a massive pickle.

3190 I am not going to ask people, my Committee to vote one way or the other, because I have not had a chance to work out whether they actually are fully behind it or not. Perhaps I have exerted my authority, perhaps twisted my Vice-President's arm, but I think on the balance of everything that this debate had to be had, and I am very pleased that we have actually had it, and I am happy for you to vote whichever you feel. It has been aired.

Thank you very much.

The Bailiff: We vote then on the amendment –

3195

Deputy Leadbeater: A recorded vote please, sir.

The Bailiff: We will have a recorded vote on amendment 8 proposed by Deputy Le Pelley, seconded by Deputy Dudley-Owen.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 11, Contre 28, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Paint	Deputy Graham	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Brouard	Deputy Green		
Deputy Dudley-Owen	Deputy Dorey		
Deputy De Lisle	Deputy Yerby		
Deputy Prow	Deputy Langlois		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Soulsby		
Deputy Leadbeater	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy Roffey		
Deputy Meerveld	Deputy Oliver		
Deputy Inder	Alderney Rep. Jean		
Deputy Lowe	Alderney Rep. McKinley		
	Deputy Ferbrache		
	Deputy Kuttelwascher		
	Deputy Tindall		
	Deputy Brehaut		
	Deputy Tooley		
	Deputy Parkinson		
	Deputy Lester Queripel		
	Deputy Le Clerc		
	Deputy Mooney		
	Deputy Trott		
	Deputy Merrett		
	Deputy St Pier		
	Deputy Stephens		
	Deputy Fallaize		
	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
	Deputy Smithies		
	Deputy Hansmann Rouxel		

3200

The Bailiff: Well the voting on amendment 8 was 11 in favour and 28 against, I declare amendment 8 lost.

That brings us to amendment 7 to be proposed by Deputy Ferbrache.

Would you like the amendment to be read, Deputy Ferbrache?

Amendment 7

To insert the following proposition immediately after Proposition 16:

"17. To agree that the current selective admission of students to States secondary schools and the grant aided colleges based predominantly on the 11 plus examination shall continue until such time as the States assembly has approved fully costed plans, with detailed transition plans for both students and teachers to a non selective secondary education system."

3205

Deputy Ferbrache: I am quite happy to read it, sir, but I think the numbering may need to change, but I think that is just a consequential matter.

It is proposed by me and seconded by Deputy Kuttelwascher. So subject to the numbering being renumbered appropriately:

Deputy Ferbrache read the amendment.

3210

The Bailiff: I think Deputy St Pier is going to raise Rule 24(2)(b) again, is that right, Deputy St Pier?

Deputy St Pier: Yes, point of order.

I think it does engage that Rule as well, on the basis that it may well increase expenditure.

3215

Deputy Ferbrache: Well, sir, can I just say in relation to that, ever since I was a young man I have always questioned respectfully even those that think they know better than me as to whether they are right or not. That has not changed now that I am nodding up there.

3220

We are clearly talking about the proposals that were approved 26 to 13 earlier today, and those are now the Propositions, unless the States votes them out in due course. But let's assume the States does not do that, then what 24(2)(b) says – I will read 24(2) first:

A Member who proposes ... an amendment ...

(b) which may have the effect of increasing expenditure; or substituting another contractor; or altering the timing of any works;

3225

So those are the words that have been drawn to my attention. I therefore can do no better than look at the amended Propositions or the Propositions that have been accepted. So bear in mind, sir –

3230

The Bailiff: I think you are going to say it does not break the Rule. Is that right, is that what you are saying?

Deputy Ferbrache: Yes, but I am going to go paragraph by paragraph –

The Bailiff: Yes, I know, I am just wanting to check you are not making your speech yet.

3235

Deputy Ferbrache: I am going to explain it to you so you can make the decision.

The Bailiff: I was not sure whether you had entered into your opening speech or whether you were still addressing the Rule.

3240

Deputy Ferbrache: I am going to go through – I am holding this piece of paper, sir, and –

The Bailiff: I know your love of the Rules.

3245

Deputy Ferbrache: – I hope it is more effective than the one that Neville Chamberlain held in 1938. *(Laughter and interjections)*

In connection with that I cannot appeal your decision, it is not like you are a judge and I can rush off to the Court of Appeal and say, 'That chap, the learned Bailiff has got it wrong in my view again' – never, ever say that, I cannot say that so I have got to accept your ruling today, but bearing in mind the wording I have just read, Proposition 1 says:

3250

To agree the proposals set out in the report entitled The Alternative Model.

I do not see how that infringes that. Proposition 2 says:

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

3255

Then there are four bullet points. I do not see how it infringes that. Proposition 3 talks about the amendment of the Education Law. Well it clearly cannot infringe that. Proposition 4 talks about:

To agree that the replacement legislation must provide for genuine devolution of governance ...

3260

I cannot see how it infringes there.

Proposition 5 says:

To agree that the replacement legislation must provide for genuine devolution of governance ...

Well, it clearly cannot infringe there.

3265

6. To agree that the 11 to 18 School, operating as one organisation ...

Cannot infringe there.

7. To agree that the College of Further Education shall have a single board of governors ...

3270

My proposal does not deal with that.

8. To agree that in relation to the admission of students to secondary schools there shall be a two-phase approach ...

Does not infringe there.

9. To agree that teachers and others working in the education service must be advised...

3275

Does not infringe there.

10. To agree that the creation of the 11 to 18 School, operating as one organisation ... must be a collaborative endeavour...

Does not infringe there. The next one is:

3280

'To agree that as soon as practicable all students in [the] secondary and post-16... must have access to the best facilities...'

Does not infringe that.

Number 12 to note that the Committee *for* Education and whatever they are called, architects they are going to assess each of the four secondary schools. Does not infringe there.

3285

And number 13, to direct that there should be sufficient policy letters etc.

So I am at a loss to see how the Ferbrache/Kuttelwascher amendment infringes 24(2)(b) under those proposals.

The Bailiff: Because I think Deputy St Pier will say it may increase expenditure. Is that the point, Deputy St Pier?

Deputy St Pier: Sir, yes.

I think the fatal flaw in Deputy Ferbrache's argument is seeking to link Rule 24(2)(b) to the Propositions. There is no requirement in Rule 24(2)(b) for that to happen. It is simply a statement, it may increase expenditure, and that is the impact of this amendment. Not by any reference to the Propositions which were subsequently debated. That is the purpose of the Rule.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, can I propose a suspension of the Rules. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Ferbrache: I am going to do that.

The Bailiff: Well, let's –

Deputy Ferbrache: I am going to do that if there is a ruling against it. *(Interjections)* But I do not accept that. Common sense says it must be relating to the matters you are debating and it cannot be anything otherwise you could just say it could increase expenditure anyway. That would be contrary to common sense. I would not imagine that Deputy Fallaize would ever be party to a Rule that is contrary to common sense. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Well, it must in some way relate to the Propositions or it is going beyond the Propositions and there would be objection taken to it on that ground.

Madam Procureur, are you able to assist at all on this? It is not clear to me whether it ... the word is 'it *may* increase its expenditure'. My view at the moment is I cannot say whether it does or it does not, but it may.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, it may. I hate to say this as a Governor of Ladies' College, but it might impact costs in terms of the number of assisted places and ongoing knock-on effect that that would have.

The Bailiff: I see. So it may increase expenditure in that sense. It may be less or it may be more. Nobody can say, but the word is it *will* increase expenditure – the wording in the Rule. I know you love the Rules, Deputy Ferbrache, but the wording is it *may* increase expenditure. I think –

Deputy Ferbrache: It may increase expenditure because more people go to the [inaudible]. It cannot be that, it must be related to –
Sorry Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Thank you for giving way, Deputy Ferbrache. *(Laughter)*

Sir, on the grounds that we have established beyond all reasonable doubt that a special place holder costs the States less, far from it may increase expenditure, *(Laughter)* it will certainly decrease it.

On the grounds, sir, that we know, beyond all reasonable doubt, that fewer people would take the 11-plus this year than last *(Interjections)* because we know there are less in the cohort, it must not increase expenditure. It will almost certainly decrease expenditure on both counts, sir.

The case is not made.

The Bailiff: If that is the view of the Policy & Resources Committee *(Laughter)* then I bow to their – *(Interjection)* Policy & Resources are the best people able to say whether it does or it does not. If that is the view of the Committee?

3340 It is not the view of the Committee. In which case –

Deputy Ferbrache: I endorse the wise words of Deputy Trott.

3345 **The Bailiff:** In which case if the President of Policy & Resources Committee is telling me the view of the Committee is it may increase expenditure, I have to be guided by that. (*Interjections*) The President has just said to me that he does not agree with what you said.

Deputy Trott: I do not agree with what he said. (*Laughter*)

3350 **The Bailiff:** Right, this is getting farcical. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) There has been a Proposition to suspend the Rules. I suggest that we move to that Proposition proposed by Deputy Kuttelwascher. Is there a seconder for the Proposition that we suspend the Rules?

Deputy Ferbrache: I do, sir.

3355 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

I put to you the Proposition that we suspend the Rules to enable amendment 7 to be laid. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

3360 **The Bailiff:** That was carried. Amendment 7 may be laid.
Deputy Ferbrache you may open the debate.

3365 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, there is absolutely no doubt that both I and Deputy Kuttelwascher were very much in favour of retaining selection. There was no doubt, he voted on it twice, I voted on it once because obviously I was not in the States in March 2016. But we fully accept that within one calendar year spread over two States' Assemblies that the States voted to end selection. We fully accept that, that is the decision the States has made and we cannot revisit it.

3370 But what we have done today, and I was one of the 26 that voted in favour of a two-school model, we have voted for something that we are not sure exactly when it is going to come back. We are not sure, and I quote again the wise words of the Vice-President of Policy & Resources, and bear in mind that the Vice-President was also ... he has held the purse strings of the States for four years when he was Treasury Minister, he was Chief Minister himself for four years, so he is a person of considerable political experience and he said, all we have done today in relation to the two-school model is vote for it. There is no certainty we will get the two-school model through in due course, and he said that when he interjected in Deputy Fallaize's closing remarks.

3375 I sincerely hope we do, because otherwise it will be bad governance, but there is no certainty. What we have got certainty about is that there is uncertainty out there because the people of Guernsey and Alderney expected us to come to a decision this week which would give their children and the children of the future certainty. We certainly have not done that. That is not a criticism of anybody, but we have not come to that conclusion.

3380 One of the points also raised, which again evidences the uncertainty of where we are going to go, is a point made by Deputy Le Clerc in relation to La Mare de Carteret site. She said, well look, if we are going to have an infant's school there of 400 and we have a big school there of 800 or whatever the figures are, we could have 1,200 or 1,300 children effectively in one area. Let's say one of the schools is St Sampson's: we are going to have those kind of problems there with 1,300 children or whatever it may be. Let's say one of those schools is Beaucamps: we are going to have that kind of problem in relation to that.

3385 We are going to have that problem wherever we are in Guernsey because our roads are narrow, they were not built for any kind of institution whether it is a school or an office of 1,300 or

1,400 people in the proximity – unless you are in the centre of St Peter Port. So we are going to have that difficulty.

Also one of the speakers today said before you do anything, if we have got to go down the road of compulsory purchase, if we have to do that, we have been advised – I cannot remember who the speaker was – that it could take two years, from the Law Officers. So two years, and that is before, because of the wording of our planning legislation, before you could put the plans in. Because you cannot put the plans in as you can in the United Kingdom, even though you do not own the property, and say, 'I want to build a golf course on Deputy Fallaize's estate', so therefore I want to do that and then in due course you can or you cannot, depending on the thing, under our planning –

I sit down because Deputy Tindall wants me to sit down.

Deputy Tindall: I think Deputy Ferbrache is giving way to me, sir.

I would just like to add that obviously, although possibly unlikely in the circumstance, it is open for an application to be made with the consent of the owner.

Deputy Ferbrache: Yes, of course with the consent of the owner, but you do not go down compulsory purchase if you have got the consent of the owner. The owner is not going to say, 'I am not going to sell you my land but of course you can put plans in to put a road through my garden, or knock my house down.' So that is a theoretical, i-dotting, t-crossing interjection, which I am very grateful for. *(Laughter)*

But in connection with the practical world and we have got to deal with the practical world, because that is what we are talking about – I go back to Deputy Graham, and Deputy Graham and I spoke about this matter on various occasions – on 28th December, the day after the proposals, and I evidenced that in my speech yesterday, my concerns about delay. That is no criticism, it is just factual. I am an impetuous fellow, I was an impetuous youth and I am an impetuous old man now, and I do think things take too long.

What Deputy Graham said to me, and respectfully – I respect everybody in this Assembly, but he is one of the people I particularly respect, and I do not mean that as any side, I mean that genuinely – he said, 'Look, in a commercial world perhaps you could do this in three months.' We are not in a commercial world.

I have not got any hair because I have pulled it out over the years, both in relation to court hearings when clients have said things that I did not want them to say and in relation to States' things, and life in general. But why do we accept that? We faff around as States' Members – we do faff around as States' Members and – I do not mean any criticism of the civil servants, I do not mean any disrespect to them – we allow them to take too long, time that they would not be permitted to take in the real world. If you have a business and you say, 'Oh I cannot send that memo today; it will take me a week to send it', you would proverbially put your hands round their throats and shake their heads. But you cannot do that in the Civil Service, you have just got to accept what the position is.

Now what Deputy Graham told me, he thought that the gang of four, if I can call it that, would come back and be able to say, he hoped they would be able to come back by June and say it will be school A or school B, or school A and school B. But he said others took the view it could be a month or two longer. So let's say that is July: that is another six months before they come back and say we think it should be Beaucamps or St Sampson's or whatever the two are. I appreciate that. Then it has got to be seen how practical that is. Then it has got to be how much land do we need, how many roads do we need, where are we going to build the extra campuses, where are we going to build this, where are we going to build that? Then it has got to be costed, and Deputy St Pier said, 'We can find the money, we can find the money.' Well, hang on, do we know that we for sure will be able to find the money? Because if it is another ... we have had all kinds of figures bandied from £20 million extra to £40 million extra to £70 million extra.

3440 Of course, Deputy Fallaize is a wonderful interlocutor, a wonderful debater, gifted with words, wish I had his ability (*Laughter*) but in relation to all of that he is saying, it is going to be a billion pound project, but I think what he means by that is that is going to be the revenue it will cost over a period of time. I do not mean it disrespectfully but it is slightly disingenuous to talk about capital costs, because the capital costs will be ... and he said in his opening remarks two and a half days ago now, that they will be significantly more. They will be significantly more.

3445 Now let's just say the Island has a crisis; let's say we are on a black list; let's say all of a sudden we have got to spend all this kind of money. I do not think it will happen but it is a possibility. Until you have dotted the i's and crossed the t's, you cannot be sure, and we cannot afford to spend an extra £20 million, £40 million, £70 million, or whatever that figure may be. What are we going to do? We will be in a blinking mess because of the decision – I am one of the 26 – that we just made a few hours ago. We will be in a blinking mess, but we have got to accept that that is a possibility.

3450 What we have given today to people, and I admire – he is not in the Chamber just at the moment he is probably lurking round – Deputy Inder, saying he is a practical man, a practical thinker. I think I am a practical thinker because theories are wonderful, inspiration is fantastic but you have got to actually live in the real world, and the real world tempers your judgement in relation to what you can achieve. I wanted to be James Bond: that has never happened. I wanted to play football for England: that has never happened. The first was a travesty; the second, I was not good enough to play football. But you have got to live in the real world. You have got to be practical.

3460 My best guess, Deputy Meerveld was giving predictions this morning about times and he said 18 months at the earliest, I think. I think Deputy Meerveld is being unrealistic, and I do not mean that as disrespectful. I think it is two or three years. I really think it is two or three years before we come back with a fully costed, approved plan. What are we going to do to the people of Guernsey? What are we going to do? They have already got uncertainty for 18 months, and if anybody disagrees with my view and says it should be six months, or 12 months, they will be able to say that, and I will respect what they say. I may not agree with it but I will respect it. So we are going to give uncertainty to people.

3470 When I decided to put forward this amendment, I was not sure of what response it would get from the public. Unlike the two-school, three-school model, where until recent days I could only say from the response I got it was 50/50ish. I was persuaded Mr Mulkerrin is very influential and Deputy St Pier said that. I was persuaded by that. I was persuaded by the professionals. I was persuaded by the arguments that this is the right model, but we have got a long way to go. We are at the foothills of Everest. We have got to see if we will get that 28,000 feet, or whatever it is, and rise to the summit.

3475 So overwhelmingly – not uniquely because there have been some – the responses I have received, and I can only say from the responses I have received from members of the public, is that they support this amendment. Now I have not gone out and advocated them, because I have heard of the word 'Machiavelli', I know who he is – well, he is not here any more. But the only way I have ever been able to deal with people is directly. I have never been a Machiavellian person, and I tell you directly that overwhelmingly the responses I have had – not uniquely; there are some that say no – are in favour of this amendment. Because they want certainty for their families, they want certainty in an area of uncertainty going forward.

3480 One of my daughters phoned the other day to talk about family business. We talked about it and she has got a six-year-old and a five-year-old at the Grammar ... not the Grammar, they would be very clever if they were at the Grammar at six and five, but at the Castel School. An excellent school, she has got them there, we talked about that. She said, 'Dad, all of a sudden you are popular.'

I said, 'What do you mean? That does not happen very often!'

3490 She said, 'I have never known it happen!' But what she said was that all these people on Facebook – I think she meant not all of them – were saying that this was an amendment, they

were glad that Ferbrache and Kuttelwascher were showing common sense on behalf of the people of Guernsey.

3495 So I do not think that I need to say any more than that. I would ask you to support, to give the people of the Bailiwick of Guernsey the common sense and the certainty that they need over the next two or three years.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher, do you second the amendment?

3500 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I do, sir.

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

3505 **Deputy Le Pelley:** No thank you, sir. I will reserve my right.

The Bailiff: Deputy Graham, then Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Graham: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

3510 I actually welcome this amendment, but I am going to have to vote against it, and I need to explain that.

The first point I ought to make is I hope in the conversation that I had with Deputy Ferbrache on I think 28th December, that I would have had the sense at the time to have said that a determined Committee could have brought, or could have responded to, that timetable rather than anticipating that the group of four would be charged with doing that, because I have never
3515 really been that presumptuous. But if I did say that, then it was a slip of the tongue.

The reason I think this is a sensible amendment, and I am really pleased that it has been brought, is because I think it asks a sensible question: having resolved to go to a two-school model, what happens if it takes too long or longer than we expect to work it up? What would we do? Effectively this is one answer to that question – it is contained in the amendment.

3520 The difficulty I have is that although in my view it is an entirely benign amendment, and I do not think actually it will change the reality much at all, there are two dangers in it for me personally. One is it is almost an invitation for any Committee really to take its foot off the pedal and have an escape clause.

3525 I think as a member of the group of four who have been behind the initiative to get the two-school model going that is a pretty dangerous amendment for me to attach myself to because we have been arguing all along that a determined Committee could actually start delivering the goods without undue delay.

3530 I do note in making my second point that the amendment specifically refers to transition to an all ability system. So there is nothing in the amendment to suggest in any way that the States might eventually change its mind about selection or non-selection. For me personally I am potentially quite a toxic figure in that because nobody argued more strongly than I did, just over a year ago, for the retention of selection, and I would hate for the integrity of the group of four to in any way be undermined, because we have always said with absolute frankness that there has never been for us a hidden agenda to delay this until the election so that selection becomes an
3535 issue again at the next General Election. But no matter how much I might protest my innocence on that, I do risk I think undermining the integrity of the group of four.

3540 So when I started being a Deputy nearly two years ago, I did resolve to myself that I would never, ever abstain in a debate, and I am going to stick to that, and because of the dilemma – I welcome this amendment; I think if it is passed I shall shed no tears, I might even smile, but I have to vote against it for the reasons I hope I have articulated.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

3545 I have to say I find this a strange amendment from a strange source.

I think there is a fundamental misunderstanding of what happened when we voted to remove selection, because people are saying we voted for non-selection but now it is going to be years before we know what is going to take its place. We knew the second we passed that Resolution what was going to take its place and that was non-selective secondary education. It is secondary
3550 education where the school intake was based on feeder schools rather than how many points you scored in an outmoded exam. That is an entirely separate issue, although I accept there is a slight causal link because school rationalisation makes even more sense I think in a comprehensive set-up.

But there is a totally different question which is: how many schools do we need? Should it be two, three or four? I, like Deputy Ferbrache, am frustrated. I think we made the right decision today, but I am frustrated that this actually means it is going to take a while before we know how many schools we are going to have. There is no uncertainty – the uncertainty about what takes the place of selection is a non-selective system.

Now Deputy Ferbrache says this amendment will provide certainty. No it will not. It will provide continued selective intakes into our schools. How does that provide more certainty than the intake on the basis of feeder schools? Nobody will be any the wiser about which schools are going to be built or for sure whether we are going to have the two schools that we aspire to this morning. No more certainty whatsoever.

The other thing I find odd is that the moment at which he wants to flick the switch in order to allow a non-selective approach to be embedded, and it is basically when we have got the costings and the transition plans. Well, where is the rationale of that? I think there are two rational approaches: the one I support, which is carrying on with what we have agreed and promised this Island, and the parents and children of this Island, that it will be for the intake in September 2019; or put it off for several years, wait until you have got the new school estate on the basis that you think it will work better with non-selection in two large schools, rather than our current four. I would be very much against that, but that would be a rational timeline as well. But to say it is when you have just worked out what it is going to cost you eventually, even though you have still got four schools, when you have worked out what the transition plans will be, but you are still in four schools, then you can flick the switch – I need that explained to me because I do not
3575 understand the logic of that whatsoever.

What if that happens to be, I do not know, in an April or May? Hopefully next April/May, maybe the one afterwards – what do we do? Do we put another cohort through the 11-plus in case we have not resolved it by next September? But it is alright as soon as we have got the transition and the costing, then we will get rid of selection, so we do not actually take the results of that, we now have a non-selective intake. It is a seductive amendment but it makes, I think, very little logical sense.

I have to say it is the flipside of the coin that is something that I tried to persuade Education of. I said to Education now there is a divorce between the date at which non-selection comes in and the date at which you get your new school estate. We are going to do it in the four schools anyway, the non-selection, so why not bring it forward a year? Why not do it in 2018? I was told because we have promised some of those parents who want their children to sit the 11-plus that they will be able to do so in 2018. The flip side of the coin is they are promised, and I think it is a majority – in fact, I am convinced it is a majority of parents who desperately do not want their children to go through the selective process – that they will not if they reach that age in 2019. And
3590 now the suggestion is to renege on that.

Deputy Meerveld thinks that there will be a revolution over two schools. He may be right there will be a lot of kickback. I tell you what, I know scores of parents who are going to go absolutely ballistic having been promised that they will have the ability to put their children into a non-selective system in 2019 if we whip that away now.

3595 Sir, there is no logical connection between the date at which we remove selection and the date to which we have worked out the costings of our new school estate. They are two utterly different questions.

I said it came from an odd source because Deputy Ferbrache is always wanting us to stop shilly-shallying, stop messing around, get on with things. We have voted and told the Island in clear unmistakable terms that in 2019 we are going to have a non-selective intake. Now he wants to send us back around the mulberry bush maybe for one year, maybe for two years. Take away that promise and maybe do it sometime down the future.

3600 Deputy Graham is right, if we have, I do not know the membership of Education this year, next year in three years' time, but if we have those who actually favour selection, and we resolve to keep selection until they have sorted out this conundrum of the estate, where is – you have got a perverse motivation for a go-slow actually. I understand that some people have said this, and maybe on Facebook and maybe his daughter has seen some, why cannot we keep selection? It is taking longer than we thought. When you analyse it, it is absolutely irrational, and I tell you what, there are just as many people who are going to be ... it is going to be Vesuvius going off if this goes through, and I do not blame them.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

3615 I think to build on that, the slight misunderstanding in the amendment is revealed in the explanatory note because it says:

The purpose of the amendment is to ensure the existing functioning secondary education system will not be disassembled or undermined ...

Well, we have a functioning secondary education system now, and will have one next year, and we will have one the year after that and we will have one the year after that. The issue is that you cannot see the admission to secondary school and the number of schools as the same issue. Because they are not the same issue.

3620 What the States have decided to embark upon, maybe not explicitly but certainly implicitly, is – and I said this when I opened on our amendment, this is the case under the alternative model and under the Committee's model – that the Island is going to non-selective intakes of secondary school students from September 2019 in four schools. That is clear. The Committee was not proposing anything different. The alternative model does not propose anything different. So that is a functioning secondary education system.

3625 Now in terms of certainty, in the short term the difference between the Committee's model and the alternative model is that the Committee's model had established which school the students would be admitted to, what would be the catchment areas from September 2019. The alternative model has not yet. That basically does not require months and months; that requires the Committee to decide whether from September 2019 in a four-school model whether students should be admitted into three catchment schools or into four catchment schools. That is going to be the decision that the Committee is going to have to make. The easiest is to do it in four, maybe for a year, maybe for two years, probably slightly better educationally is to do it in three, but if you do it in three you might be slightly prejudging your decision about which sites you wanted to use for the two schools in the long term.

3630 But the way to establish certainty for the students who will enter secondary school in September 2019, and September 2020 and perhaps September 2021 as well, is for the Committee to decide swiftly whether students will go from Year 6 into three secondary schools or into four secondary schools, publish those catchment areas, and that will establish certainty.

3640 It will not tell us where the children are going to go in September 2025 or September 2030 because by then we would have the two schools up and running and of course at that point the catchment areas would have to be completely redrawn anyway.

But the point is I do not understand why just because we move from selective admission of students to secondary school to non-selective admission why that means all of a sudden we are not going to have a functioning secondary school system. We will have the same number of schools, and all that will have changed is that the basis of admission into Year 7 will have changed. So I think that is the first reason I do not support the amendment.

The second reason is that I know that Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy Kuttelwascher are proposing this amendment very sincerely to try to provide certainty. The reality is it is going to make the transition period to two schools more complicated and last longer. The reason for that is because I think it is generally accepted by everybody that once a child is admitted to the Grammar School through the selective system, they must – well, they must at least have a Grammar School education, and almost certainly they must remain in that school until they have taken their GCSEs.

So at the moment the last selective cohort will go to the Grammar School in September 2018 and will take their GCSEs in July 2023. But if we send another year to the Grammar School or maybe another two years to the Grammar School or another three years to the Grammar School, the commitment to maintain a selective cohort at that school is going to be pushed way beyond 2023, and that is going to make it very much harder to transition from four sites to two sites, whether the Grammar School is used or is not used as one of the two sites.

So in that respect it would be totally counter to the decision which we made this morning, and indeed counter to the plea which Deputy Ferbrache has made understandably that we have got to get on with it and the transition has to be as short and as smooth as possible.

The third reason for voting against it – well, actually this is not really a reason why anybody should vote against it, but it is a personal perspective. I can say now – I do not know – there has been some debate about the future composition of the Education Committee and Deputy Inder has said that he has written to the Bailiff to ask his resignation to be laid before the States. I can tell you now, I do not think that you will get anybody who favours removing selection at 11 to sit on an Education Committee to administer selection at 11. I certainly would not.

There is nothing I feel more strongly about than removing selection at 11, in politics. There is no way that I would sit on an Education Committee that has to administer selection at 11. Certainly not once the States have already decided once to get rid of it. I could not.

Now, there might be lots of others who would be prepared to sit on it, but I think you will be looking at essentially a pro-selection Committee. If you are, that must increase the possibility that progress towards the two-school model will take very much longer than it might otherwise and that the issue of selection will just continue on and on and on. So that is a perspective; maybe that is not a reason for anybody to vote against the amendment.

The other thing, the last point, is to do with uncertainty. The most uncertain system ... if the certainty is we want to know where our children are going to go to school in Year 7, the most uncertain system is selection. I have a son in Year 6 who took the first part of the 11-plus on Tuesday, and will take the second part next Tuesday. I wish I could go back 10, 11 years and – well I did not have the child, but I wish my wife and I could have had him a year later, because then he would have not had to have gone through selection at 11. But that is half the students ...

Deputy Inder says you do not have to. If you believe in a comprehensive system, you have got a choice between a selective Grammar School or selective secondary moderns, and you cannot afford to pay out of the system, there is no school that really caters for you.

But the point is that is the system which provides the most uncertainty. Some people would say well that is not a bad thing, it is a price worth paying, we believe in selection, but I do not think you can argue in favour of a selective system, and then say I am doing it to provide certainty. I have no idea at all where my son will go to school, and he will start Year 7 in September.

I will give way to Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, I am puzzled. Deputy Fallaize and obviously Mrs Fallaize could have removed uncertainty for their son, by saying you are not going to take the 11-plus. So they have

made the decision that their son will take the 11-plus, so they have created any uncertainty, not anybody else.

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, and the point is roughly half of the parents of children in the secondary system make that choice. A lot of them make that choice because they do not believe in secondary moderns. I do not believe in secondary moderns, I do not believe in Grammar Schools. I will tell you why my son has taken the 11-plus. It is because he said, 'All I want to do is go to the school where my mates go.' He said, 'What should I do?' I said, 'Well, the safest thing to do is take the 11-plus because you might be selected for Grammar, they might be selected for Grammar, then you can go there. If they are selected to go to St Sampson's and you are selected to go to the Grammar, you have still got the choice of going to St Sampson's.' What else are you meant to do if you believe in a comprehensive system and you have a child who says, 'All I want to do is go to the school where my friends are'?

The point is that uncertainty is created by selection at 11. Half of the students currently in Year 6 and their parents do not know where they will go to school in September 2019 and will not know until, I think, the third week of March.

On the other hand, if the Committee relatively swiftly says, 'Right well, we know we are going to transition to a two-school model ultimately, but let's say for the next two years we will have the admission of students from Year 6 into Year 7 in our four catchment schools and these will be the four catchments', or you could do it in three schools, then that will create certainty. Every parent will know – unless they choose to opt out and use the grant-aided colleges –every parent in the States' sector will know where their child is going to go to school in Year 7.

So this is not an amendment that can provide for certainty. But the underlying issue is please let's not say that the only way of having a functioning secondary education system either is to have the 11-plus, or is to know exactly where in the end the two schools will be and how much they will cost and what size they will be. The way of creating certainty is not to bring back the 11-plus.

For all of those reasons, sir, I do feel quite strongly about this amendment and I cannot support it. I urge all Members who voted against selection at least once, some of us twice, to vote against it. And I urge all Members who want to get on with the implementation of the two-school model as quickly as possible also to vote against it, because it will inevitably cause delay in that task.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Leadbeater: Sir, can I have a bash at Rule 26(1) please?

The Bailiff: Will those who have not yet spoken but wish to speak in the debate on this amendment please stand in their places.

There are five Members, I think Deputy Lowe is standing as well, or are you sitting down? No, sitting down. Right, there are five Members standing. Do you still wish to progress (Deputy Leadbeater: No, sir.) the guillotine motion? No.

Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

Like Deputy Graham, I find myself in a very awkward situation. Like him I was, or in the opposite to him, in the last debate on selection I was probably one of the most vocal Members to end selection in Guernsey, and fought very hard to that end.

However, this amendment has made me think long and hard about the situation we are in, and I am not blinded by any ideology on the 11-plus in the sense that I do not think it works, and I think it was a good decision to remove it, and I would like to move to an all-ability system. But when I am faced with a dilemma like this, I go back to the old touchstone of the real world, as

Deputy Ferbrache refers to it, the commercial world. In the commercial world you would not disassemble your current system while you are still undecided on what you are moving to. This is an accusation that has been made about the States several times in the media on different *Phone-Ins* and I have tried to put people straight.

The fact is the States actually never did that. Back in March 2016 there was a proposal to end selection – at the time, a fully costed proposal with an implementation schedule, everything laid out, a transition model laid out by the then Committee *for* Education and fully costed, that was for a four-school federated non-selective system. The States in its wisdom, based on the St Pier amendment, decided to accept the end of selection, but send the Committee back to work up a three-school model. Again when the existing Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture brought back the selection debate in November last year there was some criticism for us having done that, but at the time it was felt that with 18 new Members in the States, it was not worth working up a three-school model and spending potentially 18 months or two years doing that and then being caught in a situation when half the Assembly turned round and said, ‘Well actually, we want to retain selection.’ So at that debate, again we affirmed the end of selection, but with a very short timeline to a definite delivery of a plan to implement a non-selective system. We now, as of today, have decided to discard a well laid out, fully costed plan with clear transition model that enabled every parent and every student to know where they were going from this point forward. So we are creating that uncertainty.

We are now in a situation where Deputy Fallaize himself says, ‘Oh well, we are going to end selection in 2019 and we are going to rejig the catchment areas to possibly three or four schools, and just run that for a year or two until we have got our two school model up and running and then we will ...’ Do you realise that breaks one of the fundamental rules that ESC applied when putting its transition model? Do not make children change school twice during their education because it can massively impact their outcomes.

Deputy Fallaize: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: I said nothing about any child having to move school twice. The children under the Committee’s plan, the children who entered the Grammar School in September 2019 were not going to move twice. They were going to remain in their school. There is no logical link between the number of schools into which children are admitted in September 2019 and whether or not they have to move twice during their secondary education career.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you for that comment, but I think you are wrong. Under your proposals –

The Bailiff: Through the Chair.

Deputy Meerveld: – I think it is Proposition 6, if I remember – it says, as of 2019 we will work out catchment areas and then later on, when we have got a two-school model, which will be done within the timeframe of the ESC proposal for implementation, you said you will implement within our timeframe of our transition model. Then there will be a second change of catchment areas. There has to be. When you do two schools, you change the catchment areas and the feeder schools. So siblings may be directed to a different school or children may be required to move to schools.

Anyway, that point aside, there is a danger to setting up two catchment areas and doing it twice in a relatively short period.

You have also got the Proposition that – and this is a *very* real issue – what happens if the two school model comes back to this Assembly and it is rejected – the States turn around and say we

3800 do not like the two-school model; we want a one-school; we want a three-and-half school model? Whatever happens, you are now in a situation where you have altered the system to function within four schools but is not necessarily functioning well. You have an issue right now where if you want to transition in 2019, you are going to have to build additional science labs, at existing schools to be able to accommodate the full curriculum. There are all kinds of issues that you are not aware of that are going to come down the line.

3805 Unfortunately, I come back to that principle in the commercial sector: you would not take apart your current working, functioning, well established education system, or any system, before you have even confirmed what you are going to. I am afraid the proposal that has been laid by the gang of four does not have the detail to be able to know what we are actually going to, when it is going to happen, how much it is going to cost, and it could be revoked.

3810 So unfortunately, despite the fact that I was one of the most outspoken people against the 11-plus, I have to agree with the Ferbrache/Kuttelwascher amendment and say I will support it and we should stay with what we have got now until such time as this Assembly has chosen a new model and confirmed it.

3815 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, Mr Bailiff. Again, I will be exceedingly brief.

3820 I said in my earlier speech that one of the main concerns that I have heard from parents and students is this question of uncertainty. In the three-school model, if we can call it that, there was a transition plan.

3825 I am very concerned about the alternative model with regard to transition, because quite frankly I have heard Deputy Roffey, and I have heard Deputy Fallaize, and it is 'we could do this, we could do that.' I am concerned with who are they talking about – who is this 'we'? Where is the political leadership going to come from? Where can I have confidence that the transition, that the alternative model will deliver at least a smooth ... and give some reassurance to those parents and those students.

3830 One other comment that was made to me, and I mentioned this in my earlier speech, was to remind this Assembly, and Deputy Fallaize has just done this again, that some of our students are going through the 11-plus this week. One other comment that was added, and I have some concerns with what Deputy Fallaize said, was about, 'Will the enthusiasm and the commitment to those children when they go to the Grammar School wane because it is a system that is going to be disregarded?'

3835 I think this question of transition is very important, it is something that people listening on the radio will really want to know, exactly how this is going to work.

Having said what I have just said, I certainly can congratulate the four Deputies who put the alternative model, and I congratulate them for getting it through the Assembly.

That is not my point. My point is that I am not reassured about the uncertainty.

Thank you, sir.

3840 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

3845 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, one of the issues that perhaps hung rather heavily over the current Education, Sport & Culture Committee is perhaps one reason why we lost the day earlier, which is because people felt that what was offered in the alternative prospectus was more inspiring, more stimulating, and perhaps more interesting, more world class. I think one snag of the model which we had was it did seem to me the presentations and materials six months ago were somewhat bogged down with the transitional arrangements, which have clearly exercised Deputy Meerveld and many other Members. But actually of course they were doing that because they are responsible educationalists and politicians in their area.

3850

It is the transition, if you like, the guinea pigs who are in the middle from one system to another who always perhaps have the least good outcomes, and we saw that a decade ago when a well-respected school in St Peter Port, a school that we in the constituency used to go to, unfortunately closed. It was very small, it was perhaps a historic anomaly, it did not have quite the facilities we expect and demand, but the outcome of its teachers, senior teachers and pupils being despatched to the three or four winds was most unfortunate. I think almost everyone in the last decade would acknowledge that it contributed to the very poor results that we saw for a period, a term or two ago in the States. We do not want a repeat of that.

I switched positions last year having given it a matter of thought. Unlike Deputy Fallaize and some other Members, to me it is not one of the most important issues in politics. Indeed I would say that increasingly the more I get to meet the younger generation, the less important it seems what school you go to, and there are many more qualities about lifestyle interests, development that have gone beyond that. I think probably today's generations of children and young people are much less class conscious than their predecessors, and that is so much the better.

I would obviously say it is very important issue for some. I switched positions because I felt the composition of this Assembly, and the opinions overwhelmingly of the professionals who have to work within the system was for change and that the time had come for change.

But today we have gone in a slightly new direction, arguably a better direction, arguably not, but it is a new and hopefully exciting direction that will bring long-term benefits. But in the short term, it makes a difficult situation less good.

Perhaps our system of education has been a bit weighted in favour of the most successful quartile or two quartiles of our educational society in terms of academics. I would agree with that. I think probably in the 1960's and 1970's the difference was even worse, as we know from research. But I think we have to play with a fair bat. We on Education held an open day, at the 11th hour really, on Tuesday. We had one or two very interesting people who came along and put forward arguments of the disruption this transition causes. Not just because their beloved schools or ideas are out of sync, but for the very reasons some of the Members have hinted at which was sibling changes. One child has made it, another child will not. That always will be the case wherever you draw the border. But clearly the brave new system that we were having of integrating La Mare and the Grammar School at Les Varendes, of going forward with rebuilds has been delayed. Perhaps for a better scheme, perhaps not. But we have therefore got more of a limbo, more of an interim stage.

Now, I do not always want to have to accept the party line of what I am told by other Committee Members, or States' Members, or senior civil servants and so on, and I know there is a voice within Education that probably would not welcome every element of this amendment, because amongst other things it might need a new contract on the 11-plus papers and developing that, and will make their jobs even more complicated in the short term.

But I think when we look at the impact this had across the community, and the arguments Deputy Meerveld has ably made, not just now but earlier about attracting the best people to stay or work here in terms of economic development that we should commit ourselves to this amendment now.

I have not changed my position on selection. This Committee, the Committee I sat on, most of the Members were in favour of selection but clearly have changed their position in terms of moving forward. I do not think you should elect a new Committee or membership entirely based on the selection issue anyway.

But I think this amendment, given the situation we are in, should be supported.

The Bailiff: Deputy Yerby.

Deputy Yerby: Sir, one of the most disappointing features of an amendment drafted by a lawyer, in this case, is its lack of specificity. At what stage are we going to know whether this amendment has been fulfilled and whether we can therefore remove the 11-plus? For example the

working up of detailed transition plans, that may not necessarily be something that actually requires Assembly approval. It would much more properly be the purview of the Education Committee, and therefore in order to fulfil this amendment are we introducing another step into the process that would not otherwise exist? Or in terms of when the plans are fully costed, is that at the outline business case stage or the very final stage of signing off those plans?

Notwithstanding the broader question of whether or not this is a battle over bringing back the 11-plus, it is just not an amendment that it is possible to determine whether or not we have achieved it. So for an amendment that attempts to remove uncertainty from the situation, it achieves exactly the opposite.

Moreover the fact that it is only being brought after the two school proposals have been successful when the situation, as others have said, is exactly the same regardless of whether the three-school proposals or the two-schools proposals were accepted, suggests that it really is not about what it is about.

I would encourage all Members to stick to their guns, to stick to the decision that we have already made and not to support this amendment.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

I understand the idea of changing and removing selection and saying that there is no system to replace it. However, there is a system to replace it, there is also a transition model already to four schools. Deputy Fallaize has already pointed that out. And indeed that work has already been done by the Education Department, and there is a reason why once the all-ability system kicks in from 2019 and children transition to their catchment area schools. Yes there might be a slight shift in the catchment areas, but that is not the same as reintroducing selection to the Grammar School. Because those children will be able to transition to their schools, to the catchment area schools, and by the frequently asked questions on the States' website, for the transition to an all-ability system, how will it be better than what we have now?

At the moment, children have access to different courses and options especially at Key Stage 4, depending on which school they attend. In reality those that go to the Grammar Stream end up being able to access triple sciences and other things and those at some of the high schools, for instance Beaucamps are able to access BTech, different vocational courses. Now part of the reason why we are moving to an all ability school is they will be able to access a broader curriculum.

I doubt that Members of the Education, Sport & Culture Committee will be able to stand up and say that that will not happen because we have now decided on a two-school model. If that is the case, I would like to hear from them, and please explain to me how they could be saying that an all-ability system from September 2019 would have had all these things, the frequently asked questions, and how simply by choosing to move instead of three schools to two it would mean that we would not be able to still give those children the same breadth of curriculum for the transition period where they are going to four schools before they move to three schools, until the completed rebuild.

I give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you to Deputy Hansmann Rouxel for giving way.

I think that we are in limbo land completely, we are now in a vacuum in terms of where we go from here on the Committee, because under the three-school model the idea is to give that parity of curriculum access across all three schools, but now you do not know which of those three schools will be closing. So therefore does it make financial sense to put extra science labs or extra

3955 facilities in one school whereas you do not know that that schools may not be the one that is earmarked for closure in a couple of years' time.

The assurance that Deputy Hansmann Rouxel asks for from the Committee today, I do not think can be given, and this is the whole concern about moving to the alternative model, is that there is absolutely no certainty that the Committee can give any parents, any of their children, any
3960 of the wider community about what happens going forward, because we just do not know which schools are going to close.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: So the curriculum modelling around the transition period for four schools all ability is already half way there, and I do not believe that you would not be able to still
3965 do the broader curriculum within the four schools. Yes one of the reasons why we have chosen to go to two schools is because it is more sustainable and value for money to do it within a two-school model, but it is not impossible to do it in a four-school model. It is just more expensive.

Yes, it might be more expensive during transition there are already idea – during the transition the pupil to teacher ratio will remain at 12.4 –
3970 I give way to Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you Deputy...

It is just a small thing. What I just need to get my head around is that if the model is brought forward before 2019 then there will be no need for the option, it will just stop. But if the model is
3975 not there by 2019 it will give parents more sort of fall back.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Deputy Oliver is correct, but under the existing three-school model the estate would not have been moved around until 2023 when La Mare de Carteret was fully rebuilt. So if you are just looking at the estate and waiting for the full idea of where and
3980 what ... we are still able to do the curriculum – I will not give way – we are still able to do the curriculum in an all ability system in a four-school model. It would just be slightly more expensive. There is no uncertainty.

I can see that the Members of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture who by their own literature possibly do not believe their own literature ...
3985 So I will sit down.

The Bailiff: Deputy Langlois, were you rising?

Deputy Langlois: Thank you, sir.

3990 When I saw this amendment I thought it was about the most disruptive one I have ever seen. It is proving to be so, even before we have voted on it.

It does not refer to any previous States' Resolutions, so we have got a States' Resolution saying that selective admission shall be replaced with effect from September 2019, and there is nothing in this amendment to rescind that. So we are going to have two extant Resolutions, if this was
3995 passed. One saying that selective admission will end September 2019, one saying it will not end until, as Deputy Yerby pointed out, some very vague parameters involving the development of the new estate.

In addition to that, there is no reference to the college funding which we spent best part of two days debating and fine tuning our States' Resolutions regarding college funding, which will
4000 be completely disrupted by this, because they are all based on that previous ... Resolution one from March 2016 was that September 2019 date.

So I was going to say it is laden with unintended consequences, but I am rather suspicious that the consequences were actually intended, (*Laughter*) and Deputy Fallaize pointed out one which I do find alarming, which is regarding the population of the Committee, the willingness of people
4005 who fought long and hard to get rid of the inequities of selection, their willingness to take up vacant seats on the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture.

These sort of things, we have just come to the end of three days of debate, and suddenly at the last minute there is this amendment which could be extraordinarily disruptive and I think bring the States into disrepute.

4010 So I am hoping that a majority of States' Members reject it, because that is what it deserves.
Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

4015 **Deputy Trott:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, the previous alternative proposals, now the substantive proposals, mean that – and it is a fairly long list, so bear with me – we do not know when it will happen; we do not know how it will happen; we do not know where it will happen; we do not know how much it will cost to make it happen; and we do not even know whether it will have significant public buy-in. Now that, Members of the States, is about as uncertain as any political climate can or ever will be. Those are facts.

4020 But let me talk for a moment about what we do know, because it is always nice to look on the positive side. Well, we do know that we sold the ending of selection against a proper transition plan – others including Deputy Meerveld have made that point very clear. What else do we know?
4025 We know that our community was fairly evenly split over the ending of selection, and what I do not know personally is how much of that sort of even split was a consequence of them being able to identify a proper transitional plan. I suspect that attitude towards the ending of selection would have been somewhat harder had there been no transition plan.

4030 I will tell you something else we know with absolute certainty. We know that there are huge savings to the taxpayer for in particular the special place holders to the colleges. Let's also remember not only is that very material indeed – about £10,000 per pupil per annum – but in addition to that we know that the colleges will remain irrespective. They are one of the only bastions of continuity and guaranteed success that we have at the end of this process for now at least.

4035 We also know that special place holders at the colleges ensure that they remain; they are populated not only by students who have sponsors with the ability to pay.

So it seems to me, sir, that the only way to ensure a modicum of stability at this time of unprecedented change is to maintain a process that has been in place for decades until, and only until, such time as the future has otherwise created, maintained, arrived at a modicum of certainty itself.

4040 I wholeheartedly support the Ferbrache/Kuttelwascher amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

4045 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Thank you, sir.

The head of law enforcement recently asked the populace not to speculate over a particular issue, as soon as somebody says something like that all they do is speculate like mad.

4050 It is amazing how much of the debate, especially some of the comments made by Deputy Fallaize, are nothing more than speculation. I will tell you why, I will speculate in another direction: to me this amendment I think would ensure a couple of things. One we must realise that if we want this two-school model to progress we need a Committee, hopefully five of the 21 who voted for non-selection to be on it to drive it. Deputy Fallaize was speculating that if we had people who wanted to retain the 11-plus they will put their foot on the brake pedal. We do not want them there. I do not want to be on it. I would not want Deputy Ferbrache to be on it. I would like to see five of the people who basically voted us into this situation – I am not giving way just yet – voted us into this, to lead the charge on this issue. That way I think you will get a chance of getting some way near the finishing post.

Now, in the meantime I completely agree with Deputy Trott. Deputy Hansmann Rouxel was saying, 'Ah, we can have a non-selection process with a four school model.' I think you have just been told that is not going to happen easily without a lot of disruption and a lot of costs. So to me it is common sense –

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.
Can you put your microphone on?

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Sorry, sir.

We have not just been told that it would not happen with a lot of disruption and a lot of costs. The three-school model and all the transitional arrangements will not change so radically and they are already halfway done.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Our hearing is of a different standard.

What Deputy Dudley-Owen said was not quite that, but anyhow, we can read *Hansard* later. I see a body rising to my left – I give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Let me confirm from my extensive period that I spent on Education that trying to do the full curriculum on the existing four sites in a non-selective all-ability entry would be extremely difficult and extremely expensive.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, I appreciate that.

The only other thing I want to say is this is not any sort of attempt to try and reintroduce selection. All it is doing is – (*Laughter*) No, all it is delaying ... all it is doing – (*Laughter*) No, you can laugh but listen, because you are making a bit of fools of yourselves. All it is doing is extending the period at which we are going to stop it. Selection is there today, and all we are saying is because it is difficult in the current uncertainty to know quite how to deal with any transition to non-selection until we have something more definite in place. Just keep it for now.

If you have got a team in place, and I presume Deputy Le Pelley will not be leading that team, because not long ago when Deputy Brehaut suggested that the Committee had brought forward a two-school option he stood up (*Interjection*) and at least twice said, 'Never, never!' Well, you cannot have somebody with that state of mind leading the charge, and that is the problem.

We need a Committee, hopefully, at least four of the 21 who voted for this, to get in there and lead it, and believe me if you get an enthusiastic Committee leading the charge, you will get things done a lot quicker than people dragging their feet or trying to put their foot on the brake.

I would love to vote for some of those people who voted for this to be on that Committee and get on with it, and that is the whole point of this amendment. I think that if you have this date and it has become suddenly not quite so certain, it would enthuse people to reach it. Get on with it! Do it! I welcome them coming at this date, but if you are not at that date you are going to have problems, and they will not be easily resolved, period.

Vote for the amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

4110 For those worried about uncertainty, I would urge you to remember what Deputies Langlois and Fallaize said in their speeches, which I thought were very clear in explaining why this amendment would actually – and Deputy Yerby in fact – why this amendment would actually introduce more uncertainty, not reduce that uncertainty. I think another crucial element is that it reduces flexibility of options. It reduces and restricts the options available for the transition period.

4115 I think one of the most difficult questions I have ever had to answer in my political career was fielded by a nine-year-old, who asked me in the summer term last year, I suppose it is, 'If you decided to move away from the 11-plus, why do I still have to sit it?' I could give her all the rational arguments in the world, but I tell you what, it made no more emotional sense to me nor any of her class mates.

4120 I think there are practical implications as well as ethical implications for this, for the cohorts of students and their families who have been assured however many times that they will not be sitting the 11-plus.

4125 That brings me on to the final point that I would like to make is I have lost count of the times that we have been assured by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture that they will not be bringing back selection. I have literally lost count. Most recently in fact in the public meeting I was at last week, where Deputy Le Pelley actually explained that it would be impossible even if we wanted to, and I would appreciate if he could explain why that would be so –

I give way to Deputy Le Pelley.

4130 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: Thank you very much for giving way, Deputy de Sausmarez.

4135 There is no intention by the current Education, Sport & Culture Committee to make any kind of amendment to the arrangements that have been made. Promises have been made, promises will be kept. That is me. I make a promise, I keep it. I am not going anywhere else.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you. I do thank Deputy Le Pelley, sir.

4140 I think I am right in assuming that Deputy Le Pelley will not be voting in support of this amendment in that case?

The Bailiff: Are you speaking through the Chair, you seemed to be asking him directly?

Deputy de Sausmarez: I am speaking through the Chair, and I would invite Deputy Le Pelley to advise the Assembly if my interpretation is correct.

4145 **The Bailiff:** Well, he will have his chance to speak in a moment.

Deputy de Sausmarez: It probably affects what I am going to say though, so I would appreciate if he could confirm now as I speak.

4150 **The Bailiff:** Are you giving way to him?

Deputy de Sausmarez: I give way to Deputy Le Pelley.

4155 **Deputy Le Pelley:** Mr Bailiff, would you like to tell Deputy de Sausmarez that I will not be in support of this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

4160 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Sir, I thank Deputy le Pelley through you (*Laughter*) for that confirmation, and I am delighted to hear he is a man of his word, because he has assured us on so many occasions, and not just on behalf of himself but in fact on behalf of his Committee as well. So I am delighted to hear that news.

Thank you, sir.

4165 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

4170 Just a short speech here really. It was sort of listening to this and the incentive that I think this amendment brings, because it would give incentive to the new Committee to actually get on with the work.

4175 Now we are hearing very much about the delays and how long it will take. We heard from Deputy Fallaize that his family chose, that is his choice to still allow his child to go through the selection process even though he does not agree with selection, that is his choice, that is his family. But also there is a sibling. Now having this here, this amendment, that still gives siblings the opportunity to continue to be able to take the selection process until there is a definite time where everything is in place.

4180 Interestingly enough, there have been some quite interesting emails that I received today, I had a couple when it was first launched, but especially today from people who were totally against having selection, so they were in the camp that actually succeeded in removing selection. They are coming through today saying this is one of the most sensible amendments that they have seen in the whole of the Education debate, (*Interjections*) because it allows ... If you want to laugh at your electorate, please feel free to do so, but these are the emails that I have had today. I am sure some of you will have had them or not, but I can only reflect on my surprise at some of

4185 these emails from people who were staunch supporters of getting rid of selection, and the sibling thing I think is key.

If you have got a young family with one or two years apart, at least you still give your siblings that opportunity, for exactly the reasons that Deputy Fallaize said. Deputy Fallaize said his son wanted to actually take it so he could have the choice whether he went with his friends or not.

4190 Well, that is fine, but if you have got a brother or sister the next year, saying 'Actually no, I did not want to support that because I do not want to give the same choice to the sibling or the other child.'

4195 So I think for continuity, until we know exactly what is what, we have no idea how long these plans are going to be taking. We hear all sorts from ... We are talking here anyway, this is sort of 2019, which is only next year. But we are hearing that the development of these plans could take anything from we have heard from one year to five years. That is a long time to be in no man's land without anybody knowing what they are actually doing by the time we go through the plans.

4200 It would also make sure actually that you will have pupils going into Year 7 at the Grammar School, because if it stops and we have got three or four years before it goes through you will not be having any children going to the Grammar School which will actually make it emptier than ever.

So I will be supporting this amendment and I thank Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy Kuttelwascher for bringing it.

4205 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: I suspect I am not alone in feeling that I cannot quite believe we are having this conversation again. (*Interjections*)

4210 I have stood up because I think there is a misunderstanding about the position of those parents who in the current climate have chosen for their children to take the 11-plus. At times I think that is a wilful misunderstanding but I am going to give the benefit of the doubt to the

people who seem to be misunderstanding, and assume they actually just genuinely do not understand why parents like myself would choose to have their child take a selection test that they have absolutely decided, beyond any shadow of a doubt, is not a suitable assessment of their child's abilities, or a suitable way of determining what their educational paths should be, or their future.

If I were given a choice of the education system for my child to enter, I would choose a comprehensive education system where he would enter a school with his peers from the local area and go to school which would offer him the broadest curriculum of subject choices that he could take on to GCSE or technical studies or A-levels as was right for him. That choice is not available to the parent of any child in the current Year 6. It was not available to the parent of any child in the current Year 7, and before that, unless of course they were in a position to be able to pay for entry for their child into one of the grant-maintained colleges. That choice was not available.

For those parents who are in the same situation that I am, and that Deputy Fallaize has already described, the choice is not between a non-selective system and a selective school. It is a choice between a selective system which admits those it considers academic and a selective system which admits those it does not consider to be academic. I would really like us, if there is anybody who is still in any doubt about the nature of what a selective system is and the choice it does and does not offer to parents, then please come and see me because I will happily spend as many hours as it takes explaining it, but please can we stop the misunderstanding, wilful or otherwise, of the situation as it applies to parents in the selective system.

And please can we not place all the parents of those children to whom we have made quite clear in two debates that the best system we can offer for their children – the evidence-based best system that could be offered to their children – is an all-ability system ... I understand why people get upset when we use the term 'all-ability' because there will always be children whose personal situation and difficulties does not necessarily let them access that full mixed ability system and they need to have separate provision made for them. So I understand why people get upset about that.

But we have already delayed the better system for several years of our children, because we made a decision in March 2016, before I entered the States, and we still have not got to it. Let's not delay it any further. We have decided what the best system is for our children: it is a non-selective system; we do not need to put any more through the wrong system.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you very much, sir.

Sir, Deputy Roffey said that he found this an odd amendment from an odd source, and so I agree with that, albeit for different reasons.

Deputy Ferbrache is on record on many occasions in this Assembly, sir, since his return saying that he abhors flip-flop government. He of course will not, I am sure, concede that this amendment is flip-flop. I have no doubt that both he and Deputy Kuttelwascher have brought this amendment in good faith, and not to be disruptive, or indeed to flip or flop back to the *status quo* before the votes in November 2016. However, sir, I fear disruption is the impact of it, and I would therefore urge all Members to take that into account when they consider how to vote.

Deputy Lowe, sir, said that she had received emails today saying that parents and others supported this amendment. She is of course correct we have received those emails. Equally of course, sir, we have received emails urging us to do precisely the opposite.

Sir, there is a very good reason why we have Rules such as 24(2)(b) that ensure that these amendments are laid in good time to prevent late amendments which frankly, sir, have been badly drafted for the reasons that others have drawn attention to, and the level of uncertainty that will

be created if this is passed. So for Deputies Prow and Gollop and others who have expressed concern about the uncertainty, I have come up with four types of uncertainty expressed in this debate.

We have the Langlois uncertainty of the fact that we will, if this amendment passes, have two completely conflicting Resolutions. That can only be resolved, I would suggest, and I am sure Madam Procureur may wish to correct me if I am wrong in this statement, but the only way that that can be corrected with certainty is for a further Resolution to be passed by this States to decide which one to rescind. So we will have a debate on this issue yet again. So that is the Langlois uncertainty.

The second uncertainty is the Yerby uncertainty in the way that this is drafted, we have no certainty as to when - it is not sufficiently objectively defined as to when its terms will have been fulfilled.

Sir, we then have the Fallaize uncertainty of the complicated transition which will follow, and I think that is quite obvious.

We also then have what I will call the St Pier uncertainty, because I do not think it has been mentioned – and if somebody else has already mentioned it then forgive me, you can claim it as your own, it is not a proprietary claim. But it is this: right now every parent and child in the system knows exactly how the system works, whether they are in or outside the selective process. They either have already been selected if they are above Year 7, they are about to be selected if they are in Year 6 and they have opted in. And if they are in Year 5 or below they will not have that. So there is complete certainty in that regard. If this amendment passes, then 11-plus will continue until an indeterminate date in the future. So every year group from Year 5 and below and indeed into the unborn because we have no idea how long it will go on, will have complete uncertainty.

So Deputy de Sausmarez, sir, and indeed others, may have considerable difficulty seeking to explain to nine-year-olds, or indeed many adults, what the situation is going to be in relation to their children or grandchildren.

So there are four types of uncertainty.

Sir, in relation to the costs, Deputy Trott and I had a conversation about this in relation to whether this Rule did indeed challenge Rule 24(2) and he is of course quite correct in relation to the statements which he frequently makes in relation to the cost of education and the cost of grant aided colleges. But equally of course the statement that I was seeking to make, sir, why Rule 24(2)(b) was engaged is that of course if the special place holders continue to be awarded after this year, then that will take the commitment beyond 2026, which was the point that Deputy Langlois was making, which will increase General Revenue expenditure in support of the colleges in those years and beyond.

Deputy Trott also said that selection had been ended on the back of a proper transition plan. I do not recall that existing at all actually. The transition plan subsequently followed and of course was part of the Committee's proposals themselves. But at the time the decision was made, a transition plan did not actually exist.

So I hope actually, sir, that all of those who voted to retain selection and then stood up after the event and said, 'Okay, this has now been through the Assembly twice: we have to accept that decision, we and the community have to move on and get on with implementing it,' I hope, sir, that they will follow Deputy Le Pelley's example, which I think is an extremely honourable one. He and I have clearly had some disagreements since May 2016 in this Assembly, I am sure he will agree we have always maintained a civil relationship. It has never become personal. But I think, sir, I should acknowledge here and now that I think his decision on this issue is very honourable, and I hope that others will do the same for that very reason, that we cannot reintroduce uncertainty into the process.

It is now time, sir, for the G4 and indeed those I think – as Deputy Kuttelwascher said – for the G4 and others who supported the amendment which has been successful, the two-school amendment, to get on and implement it as swiftly as possible without disruption.

4315 So I think their intentions are good and honourable. I have no doubt about that. But this will have the effect of being highly disruptive, not least, as I say, returning to the four forms of uncertainty, and in particular the fact that we are going to have this debate again if this passes to resolve those two extant Resolutions.

Please reject this amendment.

4320

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

4325 **Deputy Inder:** Sir, no one who understands anything about systems, structures, deployment, would switch off a system without knowing even what hardware would be installed, or what software it would be running. Two days ago we knew what servers we were going to be ... or how many servers we were going to install. We knew what software we were running, but today I do not think we do really. So I am tempted to vote for this amendment.

4330 Having said that, I am not the IT manager any more, and I take on board – I do not want Deputy Fallaize to have any more excuses not to run the project that he has promoted. I do not think I am going to be able to vote for this amendment. I am tempted to out of irritation – (*Interjection*) I am tempted to out of irritation, and I completely understand why you would not dump one system for another, but I think the decision by the 24 has been made, and I do not think I am going to be able to vote for this amendment, sir.

4335 I have got to leave them to it, if they are going to start claiming they cannot do it ... I have heard enough nonsense about the people who railed against the 11-plus and tutoring who then sent their children through the 11-plus, making some nonsense argument about secondary education. There is only so much more I can take. So I am just going to let them get on with it.

4340

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley – I think no-one else wants to rise – do you wish to speak on this amendment before Deputy Ferbrache closes?

4345 Then, I know it is 5.30 p.m. When we have voted on this, we will then have to take a decision as to whether we rise or continue to sit to deal with general debate, but let's at least get through this amendment before we decide.

Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: Sir, I wish to talk personally on this amendment if I may, and allow the other Members of my Committee to vote according to their conscience.

4350 Sir, Members, I am disappointed that Deputies Ferbrache and Kuttelwascher have decided to bring this amendment so late in the day. But I appreciate that they appear to have the interests of our children and young people at heart.

4355 Under the Committee's recommended structure we had a detailed transition plan for both children and teachers that is fully worked up and costed, and all schools, parents, carers and children had been informed about this transition. We even had a contingency plan in place should the necessary building works not be completed until 2022, this contingency had also been published within our policy letter.

4360 As I have explained previously under the alternative model, we do not have any sort of transition plan, and so I can see that Deputy Ferbrache's amendment may have some attraction, if this is the structure finally approved at the end of this debate.

4365 However, parents and children know that the last group to sit the 11-plus tests are those who sat the papers earlier this week, and who will sit the second paper next week. Parents of children in Year 5 and below have been told that their children will not be going through the selective system in line with the previous States' Resolution. We have made them this promise and I do not feel that we can now renege on this promise, even if it might be easier to plan the transition to

one school on two sites if our admissions to secondary schools by ability continues beyond the date agreed by this Assembly and the previous one.

Are we really suggesting putting selection back on the table? Even if this amendment is just suggesting we continue it for another couple of years whilst detailed building programmes and the associated transition plans are drawn up. How long would we continue to run it for? How would we combine selected year groups with others further down the line? Would we promise to keep those in the selective intakes together until they complete their GCSEs as we have done under our Committee's proposals? This could mean the 11-plus selective system running for many more years. Not just the one or two that maybe envisaged by those thinking of supporting this amendment.

Of course this comes at a cost. We have commissioned the tests and the marking that we need for an independent company for this year, but no further beyond that.

But most importantly I would question whether this really is in the best interests of our children and young people. Does extending the selective system really promote their positive mental health and wellbeing? Does it really help those parents who may have been in favour of our selective system but have come to terms with the decision taken in March 2016, and reaffirmed by this Assembly, that we would move to an all ability system from September 2019?

This States decided only a few months ago to a new funding agreement with the grant-aided colleges, which is based on special place holders ceasing from September 2019. Are we really suggesting we are going to bring this back and re-negotiate another funding agreement?

Didn't I hear Deputy Ferbrache at the very start of this week's States' meeting criticising how slow Government is at making decisions, and chastising us for re-debating stuff 17 times over? Sir, Members, please be careful what you wish for.

There is really no need to extend the 11-plus system. Yes, there is a need for a fully costed and detailed transition plan. My Committee had one, the alternative model will need to provide one, but we really do not need to throw into this mix the complication of extending the selection process as this amendment suggests. You have already broken enough promises to parents – do not break this one too. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Please vote against this amendment.

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

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache will reply.

Deputy Ferbrache: Well, sir, I am not sure if people are applauding Deputy Le Pelley's speech or me standing up. (*Laughter*)

But in connection with that, Deputy Le Pelley said, I did not count it, three or four times the word transition in his speech, and Deputy Gollop made that point. What we have now got instead of a plan which the States had had sight of in relation to a transitional policy we now do not have one. We have no transition.

As Deputy Dudley-Owen said, we are in limbo land. So if we are in limbo land, what do we do? I am a pretty ... no, take away the word pretty, certainly not that! I am a robust person, I dish it out so I expect to take it. But where I take offence in relation to Deputy Lowe when she was saying she has had people who were not in favour of selection saying they think this is a common sense amendment, and then people chortling – how arrogant are the people that chortled! It reminds me of the Jeremy Corbyn-type of approach about 'You are just the peasants, we know better than you because we are the intellectuals.' Now that is arrogant in the extreme.

Deputy Kuttelwascher I know extremely well from the last 20 months, a person of absolute integrity, and I think I am a person of integrity – I know I am a person of integrity. So if we say this is not a backdoor attempt to extend selection or to reissue selection, we are telling the truth. I do not need people chortling or clapping or saying in relation to that – if they want to say that outside in a non-public way let them say it. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I am a person of integrity, he is a person of integrity.

Deputy Fallaize I respect as a person, I like as a person, I like as a Deputy, and I am going to break a confidence now: he has occasionally sent me emails saying people will be surprised how much we agree on most matters. That is true, we do agree on 80% probably of most matters. But we do disagree in relation to this.

I would like to take you to the words – I already took you in my opening remarks to the words of Deputy Trott, Vice-President, senior politician both now and previously, about we are not sure that this system, the two-school system, will ever come to the finishing post. I would like to quote the uncertainty. If this is not uncertainty, then I would ask somebody who is far cleverer than me to define what they mean by uncertainty. Because Deputy Trott said we do not know when, we do not know how; we do not know where; we do not know how much it will cost; we do not know what the public backlash will be; whether there will be a public buy-in of all of this. If that is not uncertainty, I do not know what uncertainty is. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) So bear in mind his words, because what people want is certainty.

I start going through the speeches with Deputy Graham, because I have already made it very clear on various times that I have spoken on various matters that his integrity in my opinion is beyond question. He said he would hate the integrity of the group of four to be undermined. So would I. I do not believe that is the intention of this amendment and it would not be undermined. But I appreciate that the people who brought the proposals that the States accepted would feel their integrity undermined if they voted for it. I accept that, but it is not the intention of the amendment to undermine their integrity.

He said it would allow the Committee to take their foot of the gas. In fact just the opposite, just the opposite is what Deputy Kuttelwascher said, the idea would be that the Committee and frankly, living in the real practical world, it is likely to be a different Committee shortly, because I cannot see how it can be, how the Committee could be anything other than energised to get things done, because that is what we want, we want people to be energised to get things done, not take their foot off the gas.

Deputy Roffey said it is a strange amendment from a strange source. I may be a strange source, I may be a strange person, but he said we knew then when we passed the second debate in 2016 that selection would stop. We knew in fact from March, I accept that, I am not dissenting to that. But what we do not know is what form it is going to take, where it is going to be, and when it is going to be. So I do not see if we had had ... and I have said this in previous speeches, if we had had the 21 come up in November 2016 and say, 'This is our blueprint', or even if there were two or three variants of that blueprint, 'These are our blueprints' ... They came up with nothing except, 'We have taken down selection', and that is fine, I accept that. I do not like it. I never, ever will. I do not think it is in the best interests of the youngsters of Guernsey, but it is a system that is going to be carried forward, and I accept that.

But it is not a matter of saying, as Deputy Roffey said, that we have got certainty because we have decided to get rid of selection. The only certainty we have got is that we have decided to get rid of selection. There are so many unanswered questions. He said flip side of the coin education a number of parents would go ballistic, back around the mulberry bush. Well, I would rather that we got ... the Romans they did not worry about planning permissions, they just built roads straight along,, a bit like the Chinese now, I think Deputy Meerveld said – none of the 86 planning inquiries that we would have to have, none of the considerations that we may well have to have in the due passage of time with the two-school model about compulsory purchase of some people's land, etc. None of those, they did not have it.

I would rather we got from A to B very soon. But realistically we are not going to get from A to B very soon. In fact because of the integrity of people like Deputy Fallaize they cannot tell you when we are going to get to B. They are very hopeful that we can and they have got a States' Resolution by a very clear majority saying that is the route that we are going, that is the way to Damascus, as quickly as we can. Damascus could take us a long time, we are on a mule train rather than an express train in getting there and that is the trouble in connection with these points.

4470 Deputy Fallaize listed various points: where are the children going, transition arrangements more difficult, we do not know what the transition arrangements would be. I think this is very disappointing, it is almost throwing his toys out of the pram, if this amendment is passed you are not going to get anybody who is pro non-selection to sit on the Committee. Why on earth would that be the case? Because what you would want to do would be to get on the Committee and get
4475 the project that the States have agreed just three or four hours ago, get that fixed and up and running as quickly as possible. But, if your decision is, if Deputy Fallaize's decision is, others' decision is, they do not want to sit on the Committee because there is an amendment passed that they do not like, well tough. If they cannot be grown up and accept decisions they do not like, that is tough, that is down to them. I would respectfully say that is self-indulgent, but that is a
4480 matter for them.

Uncertainty: well, game, set and match to Roger Federer and Deputy Trott in relation to proving what uncertainty is, because he has done that six – love, six – love, six – love. Obviously I am not going to mention those that say the pros of the system, pros of the amendment, because I have said that.

4485 Deputy Langlois said it conflicts with current Resolution. Deputy St Pier said we may have to have a subsequent Resolution to rescind the previous Resolution, if we pass this. This would be the most recent Resolution. My understanding is that it would be all right not to take precedence but I accept that we would want that uncertainty resolved. Pretty easily resolved because if the States decide today that this is an amendment, it is not going to take a very long in a couple of
4490 weeks' time or a months' time or whatever it is to make that decision if that is really necessary.

There is no reference to college funding. Deputy Langlois said no there is not, because all this would do would be to delay the implementation age of that for one year, two years, three years, whatever it may be. It is not going to put it off the rails; it is just going to keep it at this particular station, for a bit longer.

4495 Deputy Yerby said – oh sorry Deputy Tindall wants to ... No, I am not going to give way, I am making my closing speech. No, I am not giving way. If it is a point of correction or something – we have had enough giving ways and sideways and whatever.

So in connection with this, as regards Deputy Yerby, she said it would create uncertainty, it is not well drafted. Hang on, it says, and it is a point made by somebody else earlier – Deputy Roffey
4500 I think –

To agree that the current selective admission of students to States secondary schools and the grant aided colleges based predominantly on the 11 plus ... shall continue until such time as the States assembly has approved fully costed plans ...

If that does not give certainty I do not know what does, because it says when those fully costed plans are approved, that is when the amendment provisions end. So to me that is pretty
4505 good certainty. But I appreciate you can argue differently if you really want to.

I am disappointed but I fully accept the points made by Deputy Inder, he has had enough of it. He has put a lot of effort into it over the last year or so, and he is fed up of it and he sees certain inconsistencies with what people say.

Now I will go back to Deputy Fallaize he is a good man, a good Deputy, a good parent and he will do the best for his children, as all of us will try and do for our children. Both inside and outside
4510 this Assembly. I wish he could persuade his son to support Spurs rather than Arsenal but that is his decision, and I fully accept that, and that is an error that I will let him get away with. But what will he do – and I am not expecting him to answer this question – if his son's friends go to Elizabeth College and his son does not. What will he then do? Because he will then be in a difficult
4515 position because he will want ... The prime reason he says, and I accept it as a man of integrity that is what he says, he believes it, that his son will go with his friends. If they go to St Sampson's or the Grammar School or whatever. But let's say his son's 'bestest' friends go to Elizabeth College and his son does not, what will he do then? He will be faced with a dilemma I would have

thought. But no doubt he will make that choice, and I am not expecting him to answer that question.

Now, it is up to you. I think I gather where this amendment is going to end up, but I am very pleased that Deputy Kuttelwascher has seconded it. I am very pleased that it has been brought forward, because it gives the overwhelming and as I said it was not unique but the overwhelming number of people that have contacted me since the amendment was laid in support of the amendment, from both sides of the selection process. They will at least have been heard.

The Bailiff: We vote then on the amendment. Amendment 7 proposed by Deputy Ferbrache seconded by Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Tindall: Sir, unfortunately Deputy Ferbrache did not allow me to make a point, I have a question –

The Bailiff: Sorry, it is too late now, he has closed his speech.

Deputy Tindall: No, not for Deputy Ferbrache; for HM Procureur.

The Bailiff: Well, it is too late the debate is closed. Because you will ask a question, the Procureur will give an answer, Deputy Ferbrache may wish to then address that answer. So I think we have closed the debate. I think we need to go to the vote.

Deputy Tindall: It was on the effect –

The Bailiff: You could have risen and spoken during the debate, Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: I beg your pardon, sir.

The Bailiff: Debate is closed.

We go to the vote on the amendment 7, proposed by Deputy Ferbrache –

Deputy Le Pelley: Recorded vote please, sir.

The Bailiff: – seconded by Deputy Kuttelwascher and there is a request for a recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 13, Contre 25, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

POUR

Deputy Paint
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Alderney Rep. Jean
Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Lowe

CONTRE

Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Yerby
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Merrett

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater

Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Inder
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

The Bailiff: Well Members, the voting on amendment 7 was 13 in favour with 25 against. I declare the amendment lost.

So that concludes debate on the amendments, and we now come to general debate. I know it is usually a poor indication to ask people to stand, last time I asked five people stood and then I think 13 spoke. (*Laughter*) But could we perhaps have an indication of the number of people who at this moment in time would intend to speak in general debate. Just one, two, well even if it is three times that. I put to you then the Proposition that we continue to sit to conclude debate on this Article. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: We will continue and I will call Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

Sir, I will be voting against these Propositions on the grounds that I am not convinced that supporting them will result in improving educational outcomes. I see no evidence of that in these proposals.

As I said in my speech on the Deputy Fallaize/Deputy Graham amendment, even the professionals are divided on this. Some teachers have said they favour the two-school model, others have said they favour the three-school model. As we know neither model is perfect and both models have advantages and disadvantages. I am of the view that the two-school model has more disadvantages than the three-school model. In addition to that, I stand by saying that I completely disagree with anyone who has said that our focus during this debate should be on educational outcomes exclusively.

I disagree with that view because it is a blinkered view, and it is a tunnel vision type of approach which excludes every other issue that is associated with transforming secondary and post-16 education in the Bailiwick.

I have said it before and I will say it again, my belief is that we should be looking at the issue holistically, and I took great comfort from Deputy de Sausmarez telling the Assembly she thought I was absolutely right to say that. Because that gave me an assurance that I was not the only Member of the Assembly to have that view. I am not afraid to be a lone voice, but I would rather not be.

When I said I felt we should be looking at educational issues holistically and not in isolation, I asked my colleagues to respect my views, and also the views of every other Member of the Assembly during this debate, and I commend the Assembly for doing that, sir, because in general Members of the Assembly have been respectful during the debate. Yes, passions have run high at times but there is a big difference between being passionate about an issue and being disrespectful to colleagues.

So I will be voting against the two-school model this time around, for the same reasons I voted against them the first time round.

I just want to spend a moment listing those, not because I think that I am going to change the minds of colleagues who voted in favour of the two-school model but because people listening to the radio today may not have heard my speech on the amendment.

The Bailiff: The Rules do prevent tedious repetition, Deputy Queripel. So if you are merely repeating what you have already said, that would be contrary to the Rules.

Deputy Lester Queripel: I am just going to list them, sir – it is not tedious; it might be repetition.

4600 **The Bailiff:** It may be repetition but not tedious, (*Laughter*) in which case I think, subjective though that might be, it is an interpretation of the Rules, yes.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Might I just say what they were, sir?

4605 **The Bailiff:** You may say what they were, that would not be tedious – I think.

Deputy Lester Queripel: The three-school model took buildings into account; it took social issues into account; it took environmental issues into account, it had a timeline attached to it and it was costed. The costs of this two-school model are completely unknown, and there is an enormous amount of work that needs to be done to establish those costs. That will result in delay, and as Deputy Meerveld said in his excellent speech, the two-school model is going to cost a lot more than the three-school model.

Now some of my colleagues who are in favour of the two-school model said such things in their speeches as 'take a leap of faith', 'take a chance', in other words, 'take a gamble'. Sir, I do not think we should be gambling with the education of our children, and I do not think we should be gambling with taxpayers' money.

And on the issue of recruitment and retention of teachers, I am slightly confused about that because it has been said by some Members during their speeches that a two-school model will attract far more teachers, but how can that be when so many teachers have told us they are very much opposed to a two-school model? Are those teachers going to work within a model that they have said they do not believe in? If they do take that view, then will we not have a problem with recruitment and retention?

Sir, there are those out in our community, and also some Members of this Assembly, who are of the view that we should not put a limit on the cost for education. In other words education should be given a blank cheque. I certainly do not agree with that, sir. I do not agree with it because in my view that is an irresponsible approach, and it would drive a coach and horses through the economic and fiscal policies of the States. The States have only got so much money to spend, and every department knows exactly what their budget is at the beginning of every financial year, and every Member of this Assembly knows exactly what policies the States has in place. Also every Member of this Assembly knows exactly what they have to do in order to comply with those policies.

On that note, sir, I was really shocked when three Members of P&R voted in favour of the Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Graham amendment. I say that because as we all know P&R are mandated to promote the States' overall policy objectives, and advise on the implications of other Committee's proposals and in particular whether they accord with States' policy objectives or not.

Now, sir, we have all heard my good friend Deputy Trott say in his speeches that we should never seek, under any circumstances, to drive a coach and horses through the economic and fiscal policies of the States. Yet when he spoke on the amendment, even though he expressed grave reservations, he still voted in favour of the two-school model, knowing full well there are no costs attached to it. Early on today, sir, as we know Deputy St Pier and Deputy Stephens also voted in favour of the two-school model, which I repeat has no costs attached to it.

A question that springs to my mind, sir: is that not an example of three Members of P&R seeking to drive a coach and horses through the economic and fiscal policies of the States?

In her speech yesterday, sir, she is not in the Chamber at the moment, but Deputy Dudley-Owen challenged – she is behind me – (*Laughter*) it is probably still pantomime season, sir. So she is behind me. Deputy Dudley-Owen challenged Deputy Trott, and Deputy Trott responded by saying that he most certainly had not in his view handed over a blank cheque. Well I agree. At no time ever did he say he was prepared to hand over a blank cheque, but in reality that is exactly

4650 what he did. And in reality that is exactly what any Member of this Assembly who voted for the two-school model has done, and will be doing if they support the Propositions in front of us. And despite what they say, sir, I believe sincerely they are handing over a blank cheque, and in doing so they are driving a coach and horses through the economic and fiscal policies of the States. And that –

I give way to Deputy Trott, sir.

4655 **Deputy Trott:** I am grateful to my good friend for giving way.

I do not think this necessarily impacts on our economic policies, but with regards our fiscal policies you cannot look at the capital build on a project of this type in isolation. You have to also look at the revenue costs. I think the President was making the point that in evaluating the cost a judgement needs to be made at looking at both. But he is right, we do not know how much the capital cost is going to be. We expect it to be greater, what we do not know is whether there will be substantial revenue savings and that is certainly a discussion for another day.

4660 But he is also right to make clear that there are a number of additional hurdles that this project must go through before it receives final approval of the States. I think everyone associated with the decision today is keen to make sure that the community appreciates that. It is not a done deal until such time as the clarity both in terms of the financial figures and the proposals themselves are brought back before this Assembly.

Thank you, sir.

4670 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

4675 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** I appreciate the clarification from Deputy Trott, sir, but it makes no difference to my view. Because my view is that has now set a precedent. I say that because by disregarding those policies any time, a Deputy tells us in the future in debate that we must pay regard to and comply with policies of the States, another member could counter that and justifiably say, 'But we paid no regard whatsoever to those policies when we gave the go ahead for the two-school model and dispensed with the three school model so why should we pay any regard to them now?'

4680 Having said that, I want to emphasise that I have the utmost respect for all my colleagues. When I think they have got it right I will support them all the way down the line. When I think they have got it wrong then I see it as my duty to question and challenge and oppose them, which is exactly what I am doing now.

4685 In order to save money the previous States decided to close some primary schools. I voted in favour of those closures on the understanding that the children could easily be accommodated in other schools and that a considerable amount of money would be saved. Here we are, just a few years down the line, being asked to support proposals for a two-school model that is not even costed.

4690 So it very much seems to me as though we are saving money on the one hand and then we are just giving it away in the other. Not only does that not make any sense to me, sir, but surely that is not good governance. It most certainly is not the way in which the States should be going about its business.

In closing, sir, when we were at school I am sure many of us had things like, 'Really needs to do a lot better' written on their reports by teachers. Sir, on this occasion I think the States really needs to do a lot better, and it can do better by rejecting these proposals for a two-school model.

4695 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

4700 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, I would agree with Deputy Lester Queripel in some respects. The States do need to do better, and I think we all need to work together more in the next month or two and

kind of bring the difficulties of the last few months to a close and move forwards together.
(**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

4705 I welcome Deputy Lester Queripel coming on to the Committee to help us out in a difficult situation, because he does bring not only sincerity, but I think a great immediacy with, as Deputy Inder would suggest, people from different walks of life and of course a strong interest in the arts, poetry and sports. I think that that has been an area that although extremely important to Guernsey has perhaps gone a bit below the radar in the last year. But of course, Deputy Le Pelley is an amazing person in many ways and a particularly strong politician when it comes to promoting heritage, culture, arts, museums, sports and many other areas. I very much enjoyed
4710 working with him, the team, Deputy Dudley-Owen, Deputy Inder, I found it a very exciting and challenging Committee.

The points have been made by many speakers, Deputy Trott, Deputy Ferbrache amongst the most outstanding, that although they voted, Deputy Parkinson too actually, Deputy Stephens, with a degree of caution for the two-school model, they have on balance felt that it is the better
4715 way for the Island and the States to move forward on.

I think with respect to what Deputy Queripel has just said that I will vote for the whole package as approved, and I think now is the time to support maybe the existing Committee or indeed a new Committee.

4720 Education, Sport & Culture has been a bit of a revolving door in the last three or four months, and Deputy Inder announced his departure today, and I see on social media that most people are very sorry at his departure, as I am, because he brings very much passion and a sense of commitment to everything he does.

But like Deputy Merrett made the honourable decision to give another space on Economic Development I think at a time of change I should stand down. I stood very much as an interim
4725 Member, I am already on four other States' Committees, as the current President of Planning there are issues there, including of course the new school plans which could conflict me, as well as perhaps further changes to pre-school. I have health issues I need to look after and I was already on four Committees and I think five is a bit too much, especially as I also need to set a good example to teenagers and other people and be a role model, and therefore need to set more time
4730 aside to manage my social media and other things. (*Laughter*)

But I very much support the Committee for the future, and indeed if the current or future Committee wants me to assist them, particularly on say the arts and heritage issues, I would very much welcome that opportunity. I will stay on until the most appropriate time for additional people to come on.

4735 **The Bailiff:** Under the Rules, you will of course have to write to the Presiding Officer when you wish to –

4740 **Deputy Gollop:** Sorry, sir?

The Bailiff: Under the Rules, you will of course have to write to the Presiding Officer when you wish to tender your resignation, so although you have done it orally in the States, there needs to be a written letter at some point.

4745 I see no-one else rising. Deputy Le Pelley will reply to the debate.

Deputy Le Pelley: Thank you, sir.

4750 Members, I am saddened at the decision that you have taken today which leaves our parents, children and staff in limbo for many months and years to come. I am saddened this Assembly has effectively signed up to a plan with no price tag, a plan completely bereft of detail, and with so many unknown consequences relating to timescale, transition and delivery.

This Assembly has made commitments to developments, reviews, and wholesale change in nearly every area of education delivery, and yet we have not allocated any additional resources to

carry out all this work and manage this massive change. I could say that I look forward to the conversations with Policy & Resources about the Committee's 2018 budget and those of future years, but I will not.

Sir, I will keep this closing speech quite short as I accept that the democratic process has been followed and Members have made their decisions according to their conscience and their guiding principles.

My own guiding principles remain intact that all our children and young people deserve equality of opportunity; that all our children and young people deserve to have access to a broad, rich, challenging curriculum that enables them to reach their full potential; that all our children and young people feel included and safe.

It is because of these principles that I and my Committee decided not to bring further amendments to you this morning, though we did use the Rules to allow Deputy Leadbeater to discuss his amendment this afternoon. It is not because we agree that the one school, two sites offers the best for our children and young people; it does not, as I am certain will become very clear as the details are developed further. It is because we believe that all of the other options, including the idea of one 11-18 school and two 11-16 schools, just do not deliver a fair and equitable system for all our children and young people. For every problem it addresses, such as sorting out the very real difficulties of operating two small sixth forms, as you have just approved, it creates another problem, such as delivering greater inequality at 11-16 if you have only one 11-18 school and two 11-16s. Bringing such an amendment would not improve things for our children and young people, and that remains my number one priority.

Sir, I will use this closing speech to challenge those who will be in charge of fleshing out the detail of the one school, two sites model. Members should be prepared for proposals which are more expensive but which offer reduced breadth of curriculum in two small sixth forms – effectively offering less service for more money. Is that the best value? Is that making efficient and effective use of our resources?

Those of you who suggested that maybe a tertiary college might be an option in the future need to understand that your support for the alternative model today means that this option is ruled out forever. Those of you who wanted flexibility for the future need to understand that once you have doubled the size of two of our secondary schools you will have exhausted all opportunities for future flexibility on these sites. Once you have created two small sixth forms there will be no coming back if student numbers drop. Under this alternative model we are not going to have equality of opportunity at 16. Not all students will be able to stay at their school until they are 18. They will need to achieve a certain standard of GCSE result to access the sixth form, even then it might not be the sixth form at their own school. Based on current figures more than half of them either will not achieve the entry criteria or will choose a different pathway and so will not remain at their 11-18 school. Is that equality of opportunity?

Members, there is still an awful lot of work to be done before this alternative model is in a fit shape to be brought back to this Assembly. This will take time. How much time we simply do not know. This will take money. How much money we just do not know. This will need staff resource. How much, we just do not know.

But, sir, Members, this will not be under my leadership or that of my Vice-President. We simply cannot be responsible for bringing this back to you, and I would challenge Deputy Fallaize, and the rest of the gang of four, to step up to the plate, for them to sort out these issues. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I will be down there on the back benches making sure that my principles and those of my Committee are not forgotten. They are too important to be cast aside. Sorry, if I upset you Deputy Soulsby.

I would urge those who have been gunning for the existing Committee, and coveting a seat around the ESC table, to think very carefully about the task ahead. They have set themselves a massive challenge and taken on a huge change programme. They will need to bring together opposing views, build confidence, and of course face the inevitable public fall-out when they close two schools.

4805 Of course there is all the other work to be done, and challenges to be faced. I sincerely hope that the rest of the ESC mandate will not suffer as all efforts are made to make this flawed model work.

So, sir, I take this opportunity to announce my plan to resign as President of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture. I apologise to those staff, parents and pupils of La Mare de Carteret Schools for not being able to deliver the news that you have been waiting for about the long overdue rebuild of your schools. I apologise to parents and pupils that I cannot provide you with the certainty that you are looking for regarding the future education of your children, or your future employment. I apologise to our staff that the transition and redeployment process that you have been informed of will no longer be delivered.

4815 I would also like to thank all Members of my Committee past and present for their work and commitment. You were a wonderful team to work with. Thank you.

But I make no apology, sir, for bringing our recommendations to you, and for fighting so hard to try to get them through. I believe our arguments remain valid, and our recommendations deliver the best educational outcomes and they represent true transformation whilst ensuring the needs of the children and young people remain at the heart and decisions of this Assembly. I can assure you, though, that I know that our staff, our teachers, our lecturers, our schools and services will continue to do the best they can for our children and young people. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I know it because they do it every day.

Thank you. (*Applause*)

4825

The Bailiff: We come now to vote on the Propositions as amended. I believe that there is a set of Propositions as amended that can be circulated. So let's just have those handed round.

Deputy Lester Queripel, are you ... ?

4830 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** I rise to ask for a recorded vote, sir, please.

The Bailiff: I am not sure – we may be taking some Propositions separately, I am not sure. I note Deputy Smithies wanted a separate vote on – (**Deputy Smithies:** Proposition 6, please.) Proposition 6. Is that still the case? Well, let's wait until they have been handed around and then I will see if any other separate votes are going to be requested.

4835 Right, everyone should have in front of them 17 Propositions. We have a request for a separate vote on Proposition 6. Does anyone else require a separate vote on any Propositions? Deputy Prow.

4840 **Deputy Prow:** Separate votes please, sir, on 16 and 17.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow would like a separate vote on Propositions 16 and 17. Is that those two taken together or taken separately? (*Interjection*) Together. Taken together.

4845 Right well, what I propose we do then is to vote first on Proposition 6, then we will vote on 16 and 17, and then we will take all the other Propositions together. Deputy Lester Queripel, that will be three votes, do you want a recorded vote on all of them?

Deputy Lester Queripel: Yes, sir, please.

4850 **The Bailiff:** Right, well first of all we will have a recorded vote on Proposition 6, which is:

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.

Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 28, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	Deputy Paint	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Green	Deputy Brouard		Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Dorey	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
Deputy Yerby	Deputy De Lisle		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Meerveld		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Inder		
Deputy Prow	Deputy Lowe		
Deputy Oliver	Deputy Smithies		
Alderney Rep. Jean			
Alderney Rep. McKinley			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Kuttelwascher			
Deputy Tindall			
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Mooney			
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Laurie Queripel			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			

The Bailiff: Members, the voting on Proposition 6 was 28 in favour with 10 against. I declare Proposition 6 carried.

4855 Next we have a vote on Proposition 16 and 17, which I remind you are the two Propositions inserted as a result of the two successful amendments from Health & Social Care, proposed by Deputy Soulsby and seconded by Deputy Prow. Propositions 16 and 17, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 38, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	None	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Green			Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Paint			
Deputy Dorey			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Yerby			
Deputy De Lisle			
Deputy Langlois			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Roffey			
Deputy Prow			
Deputy Oliver			
Alderney Rep. Jean			
Alderney Rep. McKinley			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Kuttelwascher			
Deputy Tindall			
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Lester Queripel			

Deputy Le Clerc
 Deputy Mooney
 Deputy Trott
 Deputy Le Pelley
 Deputy Merrett
 Deputy St Pier
 Deputy Stephens
 Deputy Meerveld
 Deputy Fallaize
 Deputy Inder
 Deputy Lowe
 Deputy Laurie Queripel
 Deputy Smithies
 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

4860 **The Bailiff:** Members, the voting on Propositions 16 and 17 was unanimous, 38 in favour with no votes against and no abstentions.

Finally, we vote on the remaining Propositions – that is, 1 through to 5, and 7 through to 15 inclusive. Again by recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 27, Contre 11, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	Deputy Paint	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Green	Deputy Brouard		Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Dorey	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
Deputy Yerby	Deputy De Lisle		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Prow		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Meerveld		
Deputy Oliver	Deputy Inder		
Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy Lowe		
Alderney Rep. McKinley	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Kuttelwascher			
Deputy Tindall			
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Mooney			
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Smithies			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			

4865 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, the voting on the remaining Propositions was 27 in favour, with 11 against. I declare them carried.

That concludes the debate on the Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick.

**Procedural –
To continue to debate Motion to Withdraw –
Proposition not carried**

The Bailiff: Before we adjourn, you need to approve the Schedule of Business for the next meeting and clearly the unfinished business from this meeting will carry over to that meeting and we will by the sound of it have some elections to add to the agenda for that meeting as well.

I wonder if it makes sense if we take the Motion to Withdraw the Committee *for* Economic Development – Guernsey Economic Vision: Investment, Growth and High Value Employment, vote on that so that Members know whether that will be laid before the Assembly and whether they need to prepare speeches for that.

Deputy Ferbrache: I want to speak on it so it is going to take...

The Bailiff: Oh, you want to speak on the Motion to Withdraw. In that case, I will put it to Members: do you wish to continue to debate the Motion to Withdraw this evening? That is what I will put to you that we continue to debate the Motion to Withdraw this evening, those in favour; those against.

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: We will defer that to the next meeting, in that case.
Which just brings us then to the Schedule of Business. Deputy St Pier.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

**Schedule for Future States Business –
Approved as amended**

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for future States' business, which sets out items for consideration at the Meeting of the 7th February 2018 and subsequent States' Meetings, they are of opinion to approve the Schedule.

The Bailiff: Oh yes, there is an amendment as well that Deputy St Pier and Deputy Trott wish to lay to the Schedule, which is rather technical in nature.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, in the interests of time shall I deal with both at the same time, sir.

The Bailiff: Yes.

Amendment

To insert the following wording at the end of the Proposition –

"subject to moving "P.2017/128 - Committee for Employment & Social Security - The Employment and Discrimination Tribunal (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2018" to immediately before the item in paragraph (d) entitled " P.2017/131 – Committee for Employment & Social Security – Employment and Discrimination Tribunal: Reappointment of Panel Members and Designation of the Convenor and Deputy Convenor" and deleting the reference to '(g1)'."

4895 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, the Schedule as ever I believe is fairly self-explanatory. There is obviously a considerable amount of legislation which is laid before the States.

The item on the amendment is in respect of seeking to move one piece of legislation up in relation to the Employment and Discrimination Tribunal in order that we can then deal with the election that is being proposed by the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security, so it is a technical amendment in that sense.

4900 I believe the rest of the proposed schedule is self-explanatory albeit, as you say, it will need to be subject to the changes which you have already identified, sir.

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

4905 **Deputy Trott:** I do, sir, thank you.

The Bailiff: We vote then on the amendment. Those in favour; those against.

Members vote Pour.

The Bailiff: Any further amendments? No.

In that case we vote on the Schedule as amended. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

4910 **The Bailiff:** I declare that carried.

That concludes the business for this meeting. Thank you very much for the good mannered way in which debate was conducted.

The Assembly adjourned at 6.28 p.m.