



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF GUERNSEY

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT

COMMITTEE

Education, Sport and Culture
Public Hearing

HANSARD

Guernsey, Thursday, 22nd November 2018

No. 4/2018

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

*Published by The Scrutiny Management Committee, Longue Rue,
St Martin, GY4 6LD. © States of Guernsey, 2018*

Members Present:

Panel Chair: Deputy Chris Green – President
Deputy Jennifer Merrett – Member
Advocate Peter Harwood – Non-States’ Member
Mrs Gill Morris – Non-States’ Member

Business transacted

Procedural – Remit of the Committee3
EVIDENCE OF Deputy Matt Fallaize, President; Deputy Richard Graham, Vice-President;
Mr Andrew Warren, Director of Education; Mrs Colette Falla, Chief Secretary,
Committee *for* Education, Sport and Culture3
The Committee adjourned at 11.15 a.m. and resumed at 11.20 a.m. 25
The Committee adjourned at 12 noon. 36

Scrutiny Management Committee

Education, Sport and Culture Public Hearing

*The Committee met at 10 a.m.
in the Moulin Huet and Petit Port Rooms, St Martin's Community Centre*

[DEPUTY GREEN *in the Chair*]

Procedural – Remit of the Committee

The Chairman (Deputy Green): Good morning, I make it 10 o'clock, so I think we will make a start.

I would like to welcome everybody here today, our elected representatives, our witnesses, senior public servants and members of the public.

5 Our session today is one of our public hearings looking at issues of transformation across the States and obviously the focus today is with the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, it is the third in that series.

10 The panel that we have today comprises myself, Deputy Chris Green, President of the Scrutiny Management Committee; SMC Member Deputy Jennifer Merrett; and two non-States' members of the Committee, Mrs Gill Morris and Advocate Peter Harwood. Following this event the Committee will decide whether any further review activity will be commissioned on this area.

15 Turning to the arrangements for today, I can confirm that the *Hansard* transcript from these proceedings will be published and access to a video recording of this session will be made available in due course. Please can I ask anybody who has any mobile devices to please put them on silent so that the panel can hear from our witnesses without any interruption from the Public Gallery.

EVIDENCE OF

**Deputy Matt Fallaize, President;
Deputy Richard Graham, Vice-President;
Mr Andrew Warren, Director of Education;
Mrs Colette Falla, Chief Secretary,
Committee *for* Education, Sport and Culture**

The Chairman: If I could just turn to our witnesses first of all, and if we could have some introductions please, starting this end with Mrs Falla.

20 **Mrs Falla:** I am Mrs Colette Falla, Chief Secretary to the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture.

The Chairman: Thank you.

25 **The President (Deputy Fallaize):** Deputy Matt Fallaize, President of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, and I apologise for my voice which is slightly giving up – it probably will last.

30 **Deputy Graham:** Deputy Richard Graham, Vice-President of the Committee. It must be infectious, I have got voice problems too, it goes with the territory of the Committee! *(Laughter)*

The Chairman: We will expect nice, short, succinct answers. *(Laughter)* And Mr Warren.

35 **Mr Warren:** Andrew Warren, Director of Education within the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture.

The Chairman: Thank you very much and thank you for attending.

Just by way of introduction, I think what we are going to be endeavouring today to discover is fundamentally quite straightforward. By the end of this session we are hoping that we will know
40 firstly, how much more the States will be spending on the two-school model above the do-nothing option and, secondly, what extra benefit we can expect to get from that spending.

So, without any further ado I think the first topic, by way of introduction, really, will be about financial savings more generally for the Committee. I will start with one question on that and Mrs Morris will come in.

45 Deputy Fallaize, your Committee inherited an overspend of £3.8 million but the forecasts now seem to suggest that the overspend might be more in the region of £3 million for the end of 2018. How exactly has that position been achieved within the year for 2018?

50 **The President:** A combination of reductions: one-off reductions which are clearly not repeatable; one-off reductions which may be repeatable, although we could not classify them as recurring savings but they have a habit of recurring more often than not; and a combination of genuine recurring savings. For example, in the third category, there have been savings in running costs of the Education Office which are repeatable and in that sense bankable.

55 So the underlying overspend being carried forward is going to be somewhere between the £2.9 million and £3.9 million, and that is how roughly the £1 million reduction has been achieved in the past year.

60 **The Chairman:** Can you be more precise on what the overspend will be by the end of the year? We are almost there.

The President: There is some uncertainty because it can fluctuate in the last few months of the year and we are operating on Quarter 3 figures. But we are looking at £2.9 million, is the nearest I can come to a forecast.

65 **The Chairman:** £2.9 million overspend? **(The President: Yes.)** Who is accountable for that?

70 **The President:** Well, the Committee is. You know the history of the position was that when the States debated the 2018 Budget in October or November 2017, the previous Committee made it clear what their anticipated expenditure was for 2018. They did not try to amend the cash limit which was proposed and accepted by the States and I think it is fair to say this sort of somewhat soft arrangement was reached between the previous Committee and the Policy & Resources Committee whereby the Policy & Resources Committee would have delegated authority to increase the budget or the expenditure of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture in line with the anticipated expenditure at that time, which was £3.9 million more than the cash limit

75 approved by the States. So it is still an overspend but we have reduced it to, we hope, less than
£3 million.

Mrs Morris: So it is not an unauthorised overspend?

80 **The President:** It is not an unauthorised overspend, no, certainly.

Mrs Morris: Okay.

Do those recurring savings on running costs include the savings with moving from Grange
House to Charles Frossard House?

85

The President: There are savings associated with that, are they credited to our budget?

Mrs Falla: There are savings from moving out of Grange Road, which are included; although
our budget has been ... it reflects that as well.

90

Mrs Morris: Okay. Are there any ongoing costs of leaving the building empty? Because it is
still empty?

The President: Not to our budget there is not.

95

Mrs Morris: Okay, so they are being picked up by STSB?

The President: Yes, because we have no more involvement, as a Committee we have no more
involvement in that building.

100

Mrs Morris: So is there actually an overall saving to the States of moving from Grange House
to Charles Frossard House, given that you are not responsible any more but STSB is?

105

The President: I believe there is. The States Trading Supervisory Board would be the only body
who could answer that; they will have access to all of the detailed figures. I believe there is but it is
not something of which we have any knowledge and we did not have anything to do with the –

Mrs Morris: So it was not your idea?

110

The President: No, the office had already moved to Frossard House by the time we were
elected.

Mrs Morris: Has it impacted the effectiveness of the Department by moving into Charles
Frossard House?

115

The President: Colette is probably best placed to answer that.

120

Mrs Falla: I think it has not negatively impacted the effectiveness of the Department's
operations. I came into the office, obviously, after the move so I cannot really comment on what it
was like previously but I think it is certainly really helpful to have all staff to sit in together. It
encourages more collaborative working than the previous arrangements and I think it has had a
good impact overall because it means that people can talk and confer more easily and see more
easily what is going on in other areas that might be relevant.

125

Mrs Morris: Okay.

So as part of the move, the change in Committee and the transition that is coming up, I understand there has been some restructuring of the Education Office, is that correct?

130 **Mrs Falla:** That is right, yes.

Mrs Morris: Have any staff been made redundant as a result of that?

Mrs Falla: That was before my time, I believe.

135 **The President:** Okay, Colette was appointed as Chief Secretary in – (**Mrs Falla:** July.) and commenced in September. I think there have been redundancies.

140 **Mrs Morris:** As a result of all this change? And this is kind of a shadow of what is to come, have there been any people who handed in their notice because they just do not like the changes, so far?

145 **The President:** I suspect there may have been a small number although they have not volunteered that information to me. There has been a significant change in staff at the senior level. Not so much in the sort of middle and the junior level at the office, but certainly the senior management team that serves the Committee has changed very considerably in the last nine or 10 months. Some of those people have retired; some are employed by the States in other areas.

Mrs Morris: Okay.

150 Do you think that you have got enough staff left in the Education Office to actually support your vision of transition?

The President: No politician ever thinks that they have got enough staff! (*Laughter*)

155 I would say in terms of numbers, yes. What we try to do in conjunction with, now Colette, and her predecessor, who was the Chief Secretary until the summer, was to build a senior team who together had all the range of skills necessary to advise and support the Committee. I think that has been a successful process and so I am comfortable with the resources the Committee now have in terms of advising and supporting. I am sure there will be further opportunities for restructuring and some personnel changes in the ordinary course of business but I think they will now be driven much more by business as usual, led by Colette, rather than any particular need to resource the office in order to drive through the transformation changes.

160 **Mrs Morris:** So you are happy with where you are now and there is not anything that you would have done differently to set yourselves up for success?

165 **The President:** No.

Mrs Morris: Okay.

170 You stated that your Committee would move into a new era of realistic cash limits, having had some comment earlier about the former Committee not quite getting there, which will not result in an overspend. How confident are you about achieving that and why?

175 **The President:** The point about realistic cash limits I think has now been achieved. My criticism of the former Committee was not about their level of expenditure. Actually the expenditure on education has been going down, if you take a look at the long-term picture. But more so that cash limits were being accepted annually which everybody knew were unrealistic and that inevitably created overspends which I do not think was terribly healthy.

So from 2019, our cash limit approved by the States at the recent budget debate will be adequate for the expenditure needs for next year. It is not quite what we requested but we will live within it, so that is what I meant by realistic cash limits.

180

The Chairman: There is an alternative interpretation of that though. Obviously, in essence, you have been given a big cash injection into your cash limits going forward from 2019 certainly. The expectation that that level will be the baseline thereafter, but you could see that actually as an indication of the failure of the Committee to transform hitherto, do you accept that?

185

The President: I think you could see it as a failure of previous Committees, and to a lesser extent this Committee, given its time in office, to cut spending, but I think there is a difference between transforming and cutting spending. The alternative to where we are now with realistic cash limits is not to have done transformation in a different way, because it does take some time, the alternative would have been arbitrary cuts in expenditure and that would have had an impact on frontline services. And we made it very clear at the time we were elected that we were not prepared to do that and we still are not prepared to do that.

190

The Chairman: Deputy Merrett.

195

Deputy Merrett: Thank you.

I am interested in the clawback that your Committee has done. You mentioned a certain amount is continuous, you can use continuous savings and one is a one-off. What is the percentage of the savings, the clawback that you have achieved so far that have been one-offs and what percentage has been something that you can sustain? Because I do not think that has been made very clear, what is the balance?

200

The President: I think the balance is probably more in favour of those which are not recurring savings but there are non-recurring savings and there are non-recurring savings. In other words, there are non-recurring savings which if you look back over history tend to arise almost all the time, but which you do not plan for. And there are non-recurring savings which you know are only in relation to one year. For example, if you carry vacancies you save money. They are not truly recurring savings because you do not intend to carry them forward, but if you look back over the last x number of years and you have always carried them you can be pretty sure that they will arise in the future. There are other obviously non-recurring savings like, for example, the previous Committee made a decision temporarily to cut the grant to the Guernsey Training Agency, that was that was a one-off, that delivered some savings in that particular year but obviously is not a recurring saving in any sort of meaningful sense of that term.

205

210

The Chairman: Can you give an example of a recurring saving? You are saying the balance was in favour of non-recurring but, brass tacks, what exactly is an example of a recurring saving that you have achieved so far?

215

The President: Most of the savings made in the 2018 Budget in relation to the central office costs are genuinely recurring savings. So that pushes the recurring savings immediately over £200,000.

220

The Chairman: Why weren't they spotted before?

225

The President: Before we were elected you mean?

Mrs Morris: By the former Committee.

230 **The President:** I do not know. I cannot provide any information about that or be held responsible for it.

Mrs Morris: Okay, I have one that I hope you will be able to provide me with.
Can you provide us with more detail regarding the anticipated savings under the new agreement with the grant aided colleges, please?

235 **The President:** Yes, the agreement reached with the colleges, which have now been concluded –

240 **Mrs Morris:** But not made public.

The President: I think they have not been made public, I think that is correct.

The Chairman: Why not?

245 **The President:** I do not know, but I suspect that that is not at our request. It is a contractual arrangement with (*Interjection*) a third party. If the question is do we as a Committee have any problem with that being made public, the answer is no.

Mrs Morris: It has been made public before.

250 **The President:** Okay, well I will happily investigate why they have not been made public on this occasion.

Mrs Morris: Thank you.

255 **The Chairman:** We are still talking about significant public monies, (**The President:** Yes.) even in the event of transformation, aren't we? (**The President:** Absolutely.) So there is an expectation that that should be made public, I think.

260 **The President:** So the savings, which are genuine recurring savings, are in the order of £2 million per year. The position that we inherited was the States had resolved, broadly speaking, what the new grant arrangement should look like. We then had to negotiate the details with the colleges, in conjunction with the Policy & Resources Committee, and this we have done and the agreements have now been concluded.

265 **The Chairman:** Peter Harwood.

Advocate Harwood: Sorry, are you saying that there is an additional £2 million a year savings?

270 **The President:** In addition to what?

Advocate Harwood: Well, in addition to the level that had been previously agreed by the States?

275 **The President:** No.

Advocate Harwood: So that £2 million is inclusive of that previously agreed.

The President: Yes.

280

Advocate Harwood: Thank you.

Mrs Morris: I was going to move on to civil service reform.

285 **The Chairman:** Please.

Mrs Morris: Do you anticipate that the forthcoming changes in the management of the civil service, as proposed by the Chief Executive, will affect your Committee and its own transformation agenda?

290

The President: I am answering these questions but is that the way I ought to be doing it?

Mrs Morris: It is up to you. *(Laughter)* You can palm it off if you like!

295 **The President:** Are you going to direct all your questions through me or are you going –

The Chairman: We normally do a mixture. We start off channelling them through the President, but you are at liberty to bring in Mrs Falla.

300 **Mrs Morris:** As you have done.

The Chairman: Or indeed Deputy Graham insofar as you want, but we may then just start firing questions to them.

305 **The President:** Okay, that is helpful to know. Deferring to others is not my strong point. *(Laughter)*

Mrs Morris: Are you aligned, is what I am after?

310 **The President:** I am concerned that if the reforms are rolled out too quickly or in a way which does not recognise that each Committee has different needs, then there is some risk to our transformation programme. But I have had now several hours of discussion with the States' Chief Executive to try to get to a position where those risks will not be taken.

315 **Mrs Morris:** Okay, so does that mean you have agreed the number of staff that might be shed and where or is it a little bit more nebulous than that?

The President: No, I am not concerned about the broader civil service reform programme; I am talking about how at a very senior level the Committee is advised.

320

Mrs Morris: So back to the Chief Secretary problem.

The President: Yes and I think there is some risk, which includes if the offices which serve Committees lose their senior most executive post, I think there is some risk of lack of leadership. If you have a very flat structure, I think in that sort of context there is some risk of Committee Presidents being drawn into sort of quasi chief executive roles, which I do not think would be very healthy. But I think, in fairness, there is now a recognition within the Policy & Resources Committee and by the Chief Executive that each Committee's needs are different and that the reform programme will have to look slightly different in relation to each Committee.

330

Mrs Morris: Do you think that each Committee is going to be doing something similar?

The President: I expect most of the Committee Presidents have probably had discussions with the Chief Executive, yes.

335

The Chairman: That is the problem, isn't it, because if you are successful and there are less cuts, for want of a better word, falling on education then it means some other Committee potentially, soaking those up? But I think my question on this would be something slightly different which is we have had this indication that 200 posts from the organisation are going to be removed, is there any indication as to how many posts could potentially disappear from the services which come under your umbrella as the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture?

340

The President: By the way I have not negotiated that fewer posts will be lost under our Committee at all. The discussions I have had with the Chief Executive have purely been restricted to power at a very senior level that the Committee is advised.

345

No, there has been no indication provided, as far as I am aware, to any committee about the number of lost posts which it is expected to absorb, within the overall figure of 200.

Mrs Morris: So would you expect – I know you do not know the number – but are you concerned that a significant cut would impact your ability to transform education?

350

The President: It depends what you mean by significant.

The Chairman: I think the way I would put it is if you do not know the scale of the removal of posts from the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, how can you really assess the impact on transformation and what your programme for transformation will actually be?

355

The President: We cannot. So as further details are developed by the Chief Executive and his colleagues we will have to very carefully monitor whether any of those changes will have an impact on transformation. If we feel at any stage that they will then we will robustly defend our position because the States have accepted the need for transformation. I think there is a wide acceptance of it and I think we cannot not deliver it so we have to have the resources to deliver it.

360

The Chairman: Deputy Graham.

365

Deputy Graham: I would add a personal view here; it may not be that of the Committee. In terms of the overall scale of posts to be lost, I think it is principally a matter of the time frame and the pace at which it is done. As far as our Committee is concerned and in the field of education we are aiming to have a new Education Law, that may take some time to get in, until it is in there is a limit to how much we can devolve from the centre down to the sharp end of the operations.

370

Once that devolution of authority is underway it is too early really to anticipate the effects of that, for example, on the Education Office. But it seems to me that it is now obviously quite clear that there will be potential losses of posts in that field. So for me it is a question of how soon these posts expect to be lost because I think within say a two year frame, assuming we have got the new law in and we have been able to begin the process of devolution ... The catchphrase is 'local management of schools' but it is actually more complicated than that or even more straightforward than that. But there will be posts that will shift from one area to another. And I would be surprised if there were not savings of posts in the process.

375

The Chairman: Mrs Falla.

380

Mrs Falla: I think it is important to add as well that in the context of the Chief Executive's reform there has been a lot of talk about the 200 posts, but actually that is not where our focus should be. It is not on the 200, it is about improving the service that we offer as an organisation to

385 our customers. That is really what transforming education is about and so it would be illogical if
they were to take away these very resources that would enable us to put the customer at the heart
of everything we do.

The Chairman: Yes, I think that is what we were driving at.

390

Mrs Falla: So I think that gives us a measure of confidence.

The Chairman: Yes.

395

Mrs Morris: A slightly different angle – are you confident that the centre can provide the
required level of financial IT project management and HR support that you are going to need for
your programme of transition, given the context that we are working in?

400

The President: I am confident that we already have in place plans for the necessary level of HR
support and I think the States have some experience of HR support being very effective. Good
practice is not universal, but I think there are examples of good practice, and we have a very
competent HR business partner in whom we have full confidence.

405

I am less confident about the capacity of the States to address all of the IT challenges, which is
not a commentary on the individuals involved, but is simply based on experience. I think it is
generally accepted that IT provision across the States is pretty woeful for an organisation of our
size. And until sustained improvement is practiced, at least in some parts of the States, it is
difficult to have full confidence in the future, but I hope that my lack of confidence is misplaced.

410

The Chairman: Is there any indication as to how much it would take in terms of capital
investment, purely within education, to sort out the ICT challenges? We are certainly talking a
large figure globally across the States, but is there any indication as to what you might be on the
line for in terms of extra capital investment purely to sort out the computers?

415

The President: Well, it is it is a centralised operational service in that sense, isn't it? So I think
the Policy & Resources Committee will probably have a better handle on that than we do. What
we have is something called a digital roadmap, which was commissioned by the previous
Committee and developed in conjunction with a UK-based IT company. And we have been waiting
for a draft of a report written with a lot of input from them, which ought to set out the future IT
needs of education. I understand that report has been received in draft form.

420

Mrs Falla: Yes.

425

The Chairman: Is there any indication, Mrs Falla, of what the cost would be purely in terms of
education's remit?

430

Mrs Falla: I have not had that information as yet and, as Deputy Fallaize said, we do not
actually have an IT budget, it is something that is held centrally and the digital road map is really
focusing largely on the strategic direction.

435

Advocate Harwood: Can I just follow up on that. The digital roadmap you say was
commissioned by the previous Committee, was that on the basis of their three school model? To
what extent has it been adapted to reflect the current thinking of a two school model?

435

The President: It was not specific to any particular number of secondary schools as I
understand it. And the people who have been developing it have not at any stage indicated that

their terms of reference were unable to cope with the shift in secondary school policy agreed by the States.

Advocate Harwood: Thank you.

440 And is it too early to know whether or not in their digital roadmap they are actually indicating the timescale that would be needed to deliver the upgraded IT that you need for your transformation?

The President: I do not know because I have not yet seen the draft report but, Colette, do you know if there is a timeline in it?

Mrs Falla: There is a timeline in it, yes.

Advocate Harwood: Does that fit in with your timeline for your transformation of secondary project?

Mrs Falla: I have not scrutinised it, but I believe so, yes.

The Chairman: Okay, can we turn to the selection of the two school sites from the one-school two-site model. You recently announced, Deputy Fallaize, that the sites proposed, the preferred sites, will be Les Beaucamps and Baubigny, subject to extensions.

I think I will start with this question, Deputy Fallaize: didn't Design Engine in your alternative model policy letter originally suggest that Baubigny and Mare de Carteret were obvious candidates for further development but they were somewhat less enthusiastic about Les Varendes and they pointed out some certain challenges in relation to Les Beaucamps? What was changed since then?

The President: So Design Engine were commissioned by the previous Committee to carry out a feasibility study of the four existing sites and their flexibility for further development. I think it is fair to say that the present Committee does not accept many of the assumptions which that report was based on in relation to any of the four sites, so that has changed things slightly. I do not think that Design Engine concluded that the other sites were unusable and that only La Mare and St Sampson's could be used. They did, I think, provide enough indication to indicate their preference would be for St Sampson's and La Mare de Carteret. (**The Chairman:** Yes.) Of course, at that time, La Mare de Carteret was and had for some time been identified for development. Design Engine were heavily involved in that project and I think also there was a certain assumption of space standards applied to those studies which none of our school sites at the moment meet. So in terms of external space, if you apply national space standards, none of our schools at the present time meet the external space standards. That is not uncommon, even nationally, although they are the recognised space standards there are many schools having to make many compromises—

The Chairman: Can I ask –

The President: – on areas of land far smaller (**The Chairman:** Sure.) than the two sites that we are going to use.

The Chairman: You have made the decision. You have announced that the two sides are going to be Baubigny and Les Beaucamps. Can I ask what factors the Committee assessed before making that decision; what were the factors, what were the criteria?

490 **The President:** Well, there was a range: likely capital cost, although we are not able to nail it down to specific figures, but the likely capital cost was one factor. Geography was one factor. La Mare de Carteret is actually the school furthest north in Guernsey, so that was one factor. *(Interjection)*.

The Chairman: Yes, could I just pick you up on that. You just said La Mare de Carteret High School is the most northerly school, is that right?

495 **Deputy Graham:** It is. Secondary.

The Chairman: Sorry, secondary.

500 **The President:** So my Vice-President tells me, who is better at reading maps than I am!

The Chairman: More northerly than St Sampson's, Baubigny?

Deputy Graham: By about 300 meters, approximately. *(Laughter)*

505 **Mrs Morris:** I have been going the wrong way home! *(Laughter)*

The Chairman: So that was one factor, geography.

510 **The President:** One factor was the existing facilities. So, of course, at La Mare de Carteret we have a high school which, despite our recent investment of around a million pounds in it, I think everybody accepts it is not truly fit for purpose. At St Sampson's and Beaucamp we have two schools built within the last 10 years or so with modern facilities and standards, so all of these things have played a part.

515 **The Chairman:** That is four factors. What were the weightings given to those particular factors, were there any particular weightings? Was more weight given to one factor over other factors?

520 **The President:** No, we did not go through a sort of scientific assessment of the sites in that sense. The decision was much more finely balanced than that and it is a matter of which compromises you are prepared to make because I think there are compromises in relation to all of the permutations. So, no, I cannot give you a weighting because that was not the way in which we assess the criteria.

525 **The Chairman:** Deputy Graham.

Deputy Graham: I think a good example of how difficult that might have been would be Les Varendes. There were a number of factors there, one was that they were advised that it would cost roughly £21 million of updating on that building if it were to continue to be a school beyond the next four or five years. The additional non-cost factor was that it would be almost impossible to have conducted that upgrading whilst the school continued to function as a school. And I think that is a very typical example of how we were having to weigh the factors, really.

The Chairman: Okay. Peter Harwood.

535 **Advocate Harwood:** Could I just pick up on one point. You mentioned change of assumptions and space standards. I seem to remember as a matter of public record that we have been very ... well they used the word 'extravagant' in internal space and standards when compared with the UK for example. So to what extent have you factored that in, you have mentioned the external space

540 standard but the internal space standard, are you looking actually to be closer to the UK going forward in your two-school model than hither to?

The President: Extravagant is your word, I am not sure I would say the internal space standards have been extravagant, but they have certainly been larger than is typical in England. We, in conjunction with the Policy & Resources Committee, have commissioned an independent study of internal space standards so that well in advance of the States debate on this issue we can reach hopefully an agreed position on the size which is required internally. Because previously, typically what has happened – and Chris will remember this better than anyone – education committees have proposed schools which the Treasury Department in its various forms has considered far too big and on that problem the proposed redevelopment of La Mare came unstuck several times. We do not want to find ourselves in the same position.

Advocate Harwood: Can I just quickly follow up on that, because you mentioned capital costs as one of the factors, the States of Guernsey, through various committees, has got a notorious reputation for back of the fag packet calculations of initial cost. How comfortable and how assured are you that your estimates of capital cost, when looking at the various sites, actually will bear any resemblance to reality when you get the final figures?

The President: Quite confident.

560 **Advocate Harwood:** Is it quite or very? It is quite, is it?

The President: Quite and –

Advocate Harwood: There is a caveat?

565 **The President:** And they are also coming down. The only figures which have been published, as far as I can recall, are figures which were provided by the previous Committee, at the time of the January 2018 debate. The figures which we are now looking at from our advisers, although they require a lot more work for us to have a higher level of confidence about them, are lower than the figures which were being bandied around at the time of the January debate.

Advocate Harwood: But is that before or after you conducted your survey on the space standards being met? Because that would have an influence on the figures.

575 **The President:** That is before any reduction in space standards is applied as a result of this review.

Advocate Harwood: So both you and the previous Committee are rather whistling in the wind on capital costs, at this stage?

580 **The President:** I would say that we do not have a sufficient level of confidence in the figures to be able to publish them and for them to be useful. But all the indications are that they are coming down rather than going up.

And by the time we ask the States to provide any money to get on with them, obviously we will have much firmer confidence around the costs. That is the work that is going on between now and the presentation of the Policy Letter in June or July.

Mrs Morris: How unusual, that costs are coming down not going up.

590 **The President:** Let's hope it remains that way.

The Chairman: Are you able to give us any sort of ballpark figure? I think on the radio the other day you were talking about tens of millions, but are we talking approaching £100 million in terms of capital investment?

595 **The President:** In relation to the two extensions? (**The Chairman:** Yes.) I would be disappointed if it got too close to £100 million.

Deputy Merrett: So the figure that you quoted was for the whole package that you were intending to bring to the States next June?

600

The President: No. Clearly extending two schools of the size they are to the size they need to be is going to cost tens of millions, and you are right that I have not been any more specific than that and that is because until we have a reasonable level of confidence over the figures it is pointless to speculate.

605

Deputy Merrett: I would agree.

The President: And actually if you think back to a fairly recent example in the States over inert waste where a relatively speculative figure was published, which later analysis proved to be wholly inaccurate and all that does is generate lack of confidence.

610

The Chairman: On any analysis we are talking about substantial capital investment though, aren't we? I suppose what I would like to get at is, okay, we are not able to talk about specific sums but we are talking about tens of millions to extend the two schools in question. But does that include matters like potentially having to develop road infrastructure around sites? Does it include the purchase of extra land for sports facilities? Does it include everything that will be needed to provide this solution or is the tens of millions purely about extending the building infrastructure?

615

The President: No, it includes everything that will be necessary in terms of capital expenditure to deliver the capital works in and around the sites necessary to deliver two 11 to 18 colleges. It does not include the capital requirements in the area of professional and technical studies, so the successor to the College of Further Education, but it does deal with all the capital expenditure requirements in the secondary sector.

620

625

Advocate Harwood: Including purchase of additional land?

The President: Yes.

630

The Chairman: Can I just come back to your analysis of the different sites. Are you in a position to say that developing Les Beaucamps and developing Baubigny is a more cost-effective solution than, for example, rebuilding La Mare de Carteret High School, can you say that?

635

The President: Yes, based on the financial analysis carried out by our officers, the option that we are putting forward is the least expensive capital option.

The Chairman: The least expensive capital option.

640

Deputy Graham mentioned the Les Varendes site just a moment ago and you gave some explanation as to why that site had been excluded. I just want to pick at that slightly, if I may, because to the layperson Les Varendes is an excellent site in many respects: it is in the centre of Island, it has got good infrastructure, it has got a functioning sixth form and it is a large site, it has sports facilities and playing fields around it already. Are you also saying that it just would not have

been cost effective to have Les Varendes as one of the two sites, for the reasons that Deputy Graham gave, is that what you are saying, Deputy Fallaize?

645

The President: Yes, as I say, the figures that we have seen show that the model that we have set out is the least expensive. I think what tips the balance in relation to Les Varendes is that it requires more than £20 million of refurbishment to the existing building. And, as Deputy Graham has said, in addition to simply having to bear that cost all the advice – from the independent folks who were commissioned by the previous Committee and from our own advisors – is that that work could not be carried out while the students remain in situ. And we are not at all keen on the idea of moving students out while the site is refurbished only to move them back in at a later date.

650

655

The Chairman: So it is a significant practical issue as well as a financial one. (**The President:** Yes.) Mr Warren, is there anything you would like to add about the analysis that was done, the factors that were looked at in terms of the decision making process which resulted in the two sites going forward?

660

Mr Warren: I think probably I just want to re-emphasise this issue about the potential disruption to pupils who would have been in these sites while the work was being carried out and that being such a key factor at Les Varendes. Whereas we are confident that at the two sites that we are looking at now actually the work can be carried out and separated away from the pupils who therefore can continue to use those sites while the work is in progress.

665

The Chairman: Was disruption to pupils another of the factors that was looked at in the matrix, as it were? (**Mr Warren:** Absolutely, it was.) So I have got that now as likely capital costs, geography, existing facilities and disruption would be the fourth. (**Mr Warren:** Yes.) Fine.

670

Deputy Fallaize, has the decision on the two-school sites been signed off or validated by officers at P&R?

The President: No, but it is not their decision.

The Chairman: No, it is your decision, but have they validated it?

675

The President: The officers? No, we have not asked them to validate it.

The Chairman: Do you think you should have done?

680

The President: No, I mean that is not the way it works, is it? We have shared with the Policy & Resources Committee the criteria that we were taking into account to make the decision. And we are frequently in discussion with them, I mean not least of all because we have oversight groups or an oversight group which meets at least monthly. And so we are working closely in partnership with them on all of this.

685

The Chairman: But you mentioned before how previous Education Committees have run into deep waters with T&R, for example, Treasury & Resources in a previous States. I mean that is why I asked the question.

690

The President: Oh, so the question really is how are we working with them to avoid the same thing happening? (**The Chairman:** Precisely.)

Well, we have jointly commissioned this review of space standards. And I think in the past the problem has been not quite so much where schools will be built but what will be built what the

695 size of the schools will be. So we hope to avoid any conflict over that having jointly commissioned this independent review of space.

We have also obtained from the Policy & Resources Committee all of the necessary funding for the preparatory work to be carried out, which they know is based on the selection of the sites we have made. And, unless we fail to comply with the necessary procedures when submitting capital projects, I do not see any reason why there will be any lack of support from the Policy & Resources Committee. I think in the development of the projects we are also working very closely at a staff level with their officers.

The Chairman: Mrs Falla and then Mr Warren.

705 **Mrs Falla:** Yes, Deputy Fallaize has just started alluding to the point I was about to make which is at senior officer level we are working very closely indeed with colleagues in Treasury and Policy & Resources exactly to avoid some of the issues that we have all seen arise in the past.

The Chairman: History repeating itself.

710 **Mrs Falla:** Yes, and I think we are very confident that we have got a robust working relationship, because it is about them being able to challenge us at the appropriate times and that is what we are encouraging through their involvement and thus far it is proving very successful, I would say.

715 **The Chairman:** Mr Warren.

Mr Warren: It just amplifies really what Mrs Falla has just said, which is that we have at officer level a programme board which is giving oversight and providing the governance at officer level for this project and there are two P&R officers on that board.

The Chairman: Deputy Merrett.

725 **Deputy Merrett:** Thank you.
I would like to pick up when you said it is our decision, I am assuming you mean it is the decision of the States, is that correct?

The President: Yes, what I meant was that is the decision of politicians, not officers.

730 **Deputy Merrett:** Yes, exactly, so what are the dangers that you as Presidents have recognised, because you have set out the transition model to members of our Community and parents, but the States have not yet agreed to those two sites and the associated costs, so what dangers have you recognised in stating that it will be these two sites before it has even been agreed by the Assembly, because it is our decision.

735 **The President:** Yes, I think that this is always a problem in the States because Committees, their executive powers are more limited than their equivalents would be in other jurisdictions so it is harder to make decisions and announce them, in the knowledge that the States could later overturn the decision. And Chris has written and spoken extensively on this subject (*Laughter*) I think that the problem is if you only ever publish anything in the form of a proposal and never make any subsequent decisions on a project like this, when we are not going back to the States until the summer, I think the whole programme would just take many years longer than it needs to.

740 We have not shied away from saying that the transition model and the selection of sites is dependent on receiving the approval of the States for the capital projects in July. And clearly, if

the States do not provide those approvals then the transition model cannot possibly be rolled out in the way that we have set out. But in that case, presumably the States would have decided to go for a completely different model of secondary education and I think the States would be back where they were in January of this year.

750

The Chairman: Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: It may not be that the States want to change the model but they may wish to have more information and more content with the two sites that you have identified. So my question, Deputy Fallaize, was very much about you have announced to our community that these would be the two preferred sites but until you have had the assent from the States the danger, that I perceive, is that the States could win an amendment to say actually look at this other site in more detail please, if you are not willing or able to provide that detail to the States during the July debate. That is one of the dangers that I see, so my question to you was you have announced it to the community, there is a mass of expectation now it is these two sites, but what are the dangers? I have identified potentially one, I believe, are there any that you believe you have got in place?

760

The President: No, I think that you correctly identify the only material risk, which is that the States may not approve the capital investment in those two sites.

765

Right from the beginning, we have said that we are we are not fixated on the sites. We are interested most of all in the model, having two 11 to 18 colleges operating as a single school. If the States wish to choose a pair of sites which would cost more and which would work less well geographically and would leave recently built schools without a use, then they are free to do so and they could do so without undermining the central objectives of our model. But clearly, that would then delay the transition period and I do not think the community wants to see the transition period delayed any longer than absolutely essential.

770

The Chairman: Okay, I think ... sorry, Deputy Merrett.

775

Deputy Merrett: Yes, if I can just move on to post-implementation reports.

The Chairman: Actually, just before we ... The flip side of the coin of capital costs on one side, the other side is the projected savings to the general revenue, if any, that that may be realised by going to a two-school model. I just wanted to ask if there was any indication, at this stage, with what those potential savings to general revenue recurring savings could be in the event of this two-school model, one-school, two-site model being fully realised.

780

The President: At the time of the January debate, because the Committee that was then in place proposing the three-school model had set out the anticipated revenue costs, we felt in our alternative report that we ought to do the same. So we asked education officers to do that, which they did, and based on the same assumptions around pupil-teacher ratios and length of the school day and all of the ingredients of an education system, we were advised that the revenue savings in our model were broadly the same as the revenue savings in the three-school model. Now, clearly, when we return to the States in the summer we will want to have carried out a lot more work so that we can give the states a higher degree of confidence in relation to that. And as the work is going on to refine the capital costs, so the same level of detail of work is going on on the revenue side.

785

790

The Chairman: Are you able to put a figure on that?

795

The President: Well, the figure in the report was around £2 million.

The Chairman: Per annum?

800 **The President:** Sorry?

The Chairman: Per annum, recurring?

805 **The President:** Yes, but it depends on how you organise the system. I mean if you just flick a switch and you say what are currently high schools will be turned into all ability schools – if you remember that was at the very start of the journey, moving to a non-selective system. If you just flick a switch and do nothing else then you are going to realise the maximum possible revenue savings. Whether that is in the best interest of the students is another matter, because issues like enrichment activities and the length of the school day start to push the cost up.

810

The Chairman: But are we moving to a one-school, two-site model because of the perceived educational benefits or are we moving to it because of that and because of the financial savings? It is an aspect of transformation, transformation normally has some sort of boom to general revenue, if I can put it that way, how do you see it, politically?

815

The President: We are moving to the new model for educational reasons. The grounds on which we made our proposals in January of this year were entirely educational grounds. The PWC report which, as you remember, was a report on potential efficiency savings, cost savings, identified even in the previous model of reform that was considered the drivers needed to be educational drivers because any expectation of revenue costs was insufficiently certain on which to base such major reform.

820

The Chairman: And that is the same with your model?

825 **The President:** That is absolutely the same as ours.

I believe that the new model will be less expensive than the existing model. Running secondary education in two schools, two sites will be less expensive than the present model. But if it is not less expensive the Committee would still be promoting it because it is being driven on educational grounds.

830

The Chairman: Are you saying in a roundabout kind of way that you guarantee that there would be any revenue savings from this move?

835 **The President:** No, I am strongly of the view that there will be revenue savings, but I am not going to put an exact number on it, beyond the analysis that was carried out ahead of the January debate, because I think we need to do further work –

The Chairman: You need to do more work on it.

840 **The President:** – between now and the States debate, but clearly the States will have an expectation that by the time of the debate in June or July those figures are clear.

The Chairman: Peter Harwood.

845 **Advocate Harwood:** Can I just follow up on that? Deputy Green focused on the long-term cost saving. The flip side is that inevitably, and I think you must realise this, that during the period of transition the actual running costs again potentially will increase, because you are going to be running down one school, at least one school, to a sub-optimal level because somebody will have to staff it and so therefore when you come back to the States in June or July will you actually be

850 able to quantify, if you like, that cost of transition? Because I think that is important, not just the capital cost but potentially increased revenue cost.

The President: Yes, we will be able to quantify the costs. And I think it is generally accepted, under any model of reform which reduces the number of sites, that the transitional period will be more expensive than the present model. And the previous Committee therefore included in their original proposals a significant sum of additional investment during the transition period, which we included in our proposals as well and which was approved by the States.

The Chairman: Deputy Merrett.

860 **Deputy Merrett:** Thank you.

The Scrutiny Management Committee have requested sight of the post-implementation report from when Beaucamps was built. Has your Committee had sight and consideration of those recommendations?

865 **The President:** Richard wanted to come in to answer a previous question, can I return to that in moment?

The Chairman: Deputy Graham, yes, sorry.

870 **Deputy Graham:** Sorry, it was just germane to revenue costs. There is a potentially contentious issue, because of that I better raise it as an individual Member rather than on behalf of the Committee, because I do not have the authority to raise it. *(Laughter and Interjection)* But there needs to be a question asked, irrespective of which model we have. And the question is really why does it cost, in terms of per pupil annual cost, why does it cost in Guernsey almost twice as much to educate an 11 to 16 child as it does in the United Kingdom? The costs here are that it costs about £10,000 a year, those costs are revenue costs and they include the proportionate share of that section of education in the benefit they get from central services and so on. So the whole caboose really is included and comes to around £10,000. The equivalent figure in the United Kingdom, at the moment, is around about £6,000 a year and, of course, that includes some extremes where additional support has to be put in for social and demographic reasons.

880 Interestingly, one of the schools we visited in the United Kingdom recently was a comprehensive school, completely non-selective, with a grammar school not too far away, surrounded by public schools as well, a school of 1,350 kids with a demographic and a social makeup very similar to ours who are completely autonomous in running their school, they are an academy school, they are given a fixed budget every year. That head teacher has to educate his 11 to 16 kids at a rate of £5,000 a year and he does it and achieves outstanding results. Now there are probably lots of answers as to why there is this huge disparity. I have yet to hear a sum total of explanations that really justify the enormous difference.

The Chairman: Could I look to perhaps, Mr Warren, as Director of Education?

895 **Mr Warren:** I was expecting this! *(Laughter)*

The Chairman: Are you able to comment on why it is so much more expensive to educate here?

900 **Mr Warren:** I think we have a grasp of some of the factors but by no means all, and this is a piece of work that clearly we need to do and fits actually very well into the transformation agenda as part of that.

905 There are areas where we provide service which would not necessarily be available free in the UK, and our music service is an example of that, we have the peripatetic music service. There are factors possibly surrounding class sizes in our schools, but we need to look at this in considerably more detail than we have done so far.

The Chairman: Having raised the music service, I declare an interest because my wife works for them. Thank you.

Deputy Merrett.

910

Deputy Merrett: I think Deputy Fallaize has had plenty of time to consider our question. *(Laughter)*

The Chairman: Do you remember what it was? *(Laughter)*

915

The President: I remember what it was but I cannot provide a very enlightening answer because I have not seen any request made by your Committee for any post-implementation review.

920

Deputy Merrett: Our Committee has asked for post-implementation reviews, reports. We obviously asked for them on Beaucamps because lessons need to be learnt.

925

Mrs Morris: Just to be clear, we mean the build of Beaucamps, so it is a post-implementation review that has already been done; we are not talking about what we would expect from your Committee when you have done the work.

The President: Are you saying that you have requested to see a report?

Mrs Morris: No, we have seen it.

930

The President: Oh I see, okay.

Deputy Merrett: The question to you is –

935

Advocate Harwood: Have you seen it?

Deputy Merrett: – have you seen it because if you are looking at extending and building schools then clearly lessons can and should be learned from the Beaucamps experience and have you requested sight of that and have you taken note of recommendations into consideration?

940

The President: Yes. Sorry, I thought you meant that you had made a request to see it and had not seen it. Yes, I have seen it and yes we are taking into account the recommendations in the planning of the two extensions.

945

Deputy Merrett: So the future operational practices and teaching model for the one-school, two-sites, your Committee has clearly defined prime provisional costings be requested for the board requirements for those two sites. You have clearly requested them?

950

The President: Okay, so the forecast capital costs up to this point, which as I say are changing and happily are coming down, are based on the assumptions around what will need to be provided in those schools and those assumptions are based on information provided by educationalists. So at each stage we are testing the assumed space standards against the information which the educationalists are providing and, following receipt of this independent

955 review of space standards, which I referred to earlier, and we are expecting to receive that next
month, we will go through another round of testing and challenging exactly what it is that needs
to be provided in the two colleges before determining exactly what size they ought to be and. Out
of that, of course, will come the clarity over capital costs.

960 **The Chairman:** Can you share that review with us when you receive it?

The President: I do not see any reason why not at this stage, but I am not going to give you
an absolute assurance because I might at some point learn of a reason why we should not.
(Laughter) But on the face of it –

965 **The Chairman:** Could you think about it?

The President: Certainly. On the face of it I do not see any reason why we should not.

970 **The Chairman:** And indeed if it could be made public then at least give that some
consideration.

The President: We will.

975 **Deputy Merrett:** People know then what recommendation 1 was or is and in broad terms it
means that there will be an advanced stage of capital and revenue impacts that will be in the
policy paper to the States with very little scope for variance after a decision on the two sites has
been agreed, is that the stage we can expect to see the policy paper in; a very advanced stage of
capital and revenue impacts?

980 **The President:** No, because in order to accelerate the building programme we are pursuing a
different method of procurement, design and building. And if we try and use the conventional
States' procedures it will take a lot longer to realise the project and we will also have this problem
where we go out to tender at a point when the tenderers already know what the States are
985 prepared to pay. So we will go out to tenderers saying would you like to tender for a project
where the States have already determined that the cost is something, something, point,
something, million, and surprisingly the tenders might come in at around about that figure.

Advocate Harwood: Are you saying that Policy & Resources are happy to set aside their entire
SCIP process to enable you to progress?

990 **The President:** No.

Advocate Harwood: Well, that is the implication behind what you are saying.

995 **The President:** I do not think the SCIP process necessarily requires one particular procurement
method but –

Advocate Harwood: It establishes a clear set of gateways through which you have to go.

1000 **The President:** And we will have to go through all of those gateways.

Advocate Harwood: Whereabouts on that timeline by the SCIP process do you believe you
are now?

1005 **The President:** I believe that we are a few months, less than six months away, from presenting the outline business case.

The Chairman: Deputy Merrett.

1010 **Deputy Merrett:** So for clarity, Deputy Fallaize, are you saying that when the Policy Letter comes to the states Deputies will not know, the Assembly will not know, the potential capital and revenue costs of the decision that they are going to be making?

1015 **The President:** No, I am not saying that about revenue costs. I think it is likely, in relation to capital costs, that we will provide a range of figures, primarily because we want to try and get away from this process of asking the States, in advance of tendering, to approve a particular sum of money because you cannot possibly obtain best value for money if you adopt that approach.

1020 **Deputy Merrett:** The concern I have is that we cannot obviously make an intelligent, informed decision on the potential cost of agreeing a policy paper if we do not understand what those figures are. So I understand it is a cart-and-horse situation but the expectation on the recommendations from the post-implementation report is that the States do have the information to be able to make an informed, intelligent decision, so that is the concern I certainly have.

1025 I understand what you were saying, but what reassurance can you give to the Assembly and to our community that there will be an understanding of the capital costs involved?

The President: Well, there will be an understanding because if we provide a range there will be an upper end to the range. If the States take the view in the worst case scenario that they are not prepared to live with the upper end of the range then they can make an informed decision to withhold approval at that stage, if they wish.

1030 **The Chairman:** I understand the case for having a range of figures but it is slightly problematic, isn't it, from an individual Deputy's point of view? Because you never know exactly what that figure is going to be, you are kind of potentially assenting to a course of action that you cannot pinpoint what the cost will be. As you say, there may be an upper limit but in a sense it is a kind of blank check, isn't it?

The President: No, if there is an upper limit and the range is relatively narrow I do not think it can be seen as a blank cheque.

1040 **The Chairman:** Is that what we can expect, a narrow range?

1045 **The President:** I would expect a relatively narrow range because I think by that stage we will have sufficient clarity beyond what we have at the present stage. But I think if we adopt the conventional approach, the States will end up paying more and the taxpayer will not get value for money.

Deputy Merrett: It is certainly a fine line to try to walk, isn't it?

1050 Sticking with the policy paper, the policy paper that I am expecting to see, will it have an independent financial assessment for the refurbishment of any investment that will be required, for example, at the Grammar School site, so that the States can understand why the Committee has determined these preferred sites?

1055 **The President:** Whether the Policy Letter itself will contain the independent analysis I am not sure it will, because if we include all those sorts of reports it will be a million pages long, but certainly that information can be made available to States Members at the time of the debate.

Deputy Merrett: So I am asking, I suppose, will we be expected to make a binary choice: these are the two sites, these are the costs, this is the revenue cost etc., yes or no; or will we be informed enough to understand why the ESC have come to the conclusion with these two.

1060 **The President:** The States can expect to be informed about why we have come to the conclusions, in some detail. And if your question is would the States be able to substitute two different sites, I think that would inject some delay to the programme, but I do not think it would be a fatal blow to the programme. So there will be sufficient information for the States to select different sites, if they want to.

1065 **Deputy Merrett:** And that information will include, for example, the upgrading of road infrastructure around sites?

1070 **The President:** If any of it is necessary, yes.

Deputy Merrett: Traffic assessment reports, environment, they will all be included?

1075 **The President:** They have already been made public, in advance of the January debate the previous Committee commissioned very detailed traffic studies, I mean they are that thick together. They commissioned the Design Engine report on the sites, which Deputy Green has already referred to, they commissioned mechanical and engineering studies on the sites. All of those documents were made public in advance of the January debate.

1080 **The Chairman:** Your schools will be quite considerably bigger than the analysis that they produced.

1085 **The President:** No. The previous Committee used most of the £93,000 which it requested to carry out the analysis on the two-school model on those sorts of reports. So traffic studies in relation to the two-school model were carried out, mechanical and engineering studies were carried out, building studies were carried out by Design Engine, as you referred to, were done. All of those reports were done, there were a whole suite of them, and they were all published in advance of the January debate. And as far as I know, they are still online but you would remember them because they were all made available to States Members before we had the January debate.

1090 **The Chairman:** Deputy Merrett.

1095 **Deputy Merrett:** Yes, last question. Will the Policy Letter that goes to the States also include preventative maintenance schedules for both the sites so we will have a real understanding of preventative measures, so bringing in some longevity into the maintenance of these sites?

1100 **The President:** Well, I am certainly happy that we consider doing that, if you feel that would be helpful. That is not the conventional approach other than it was employed on one school redevelopment project at Les Beaucamps when the Committee of the time, at the request of the then Treasury & Resources Department, set out a maintenance programme and established a sinking fund effectively into which some money was transferred each year to pay for future maintenance. That was the advice of the then T&R and subsequently a later Treasury & Resources Department took it all back, collapsed the sinking fund, and adopted a new practice whereby maintenance costs were not to be considered as part of a capital project and moreover that the concept of a sinking fund was dispensed with, a proposal which I think Deputy Green and I voted against it.

1105 **Deputy Green:** Yes, I did, sir, that is right.

The Chairman: Shall we take a break for five minutes?
Thank you.

*The Committee adjourned at 11.15 a.m.
and resumed at 11.20 a.m.*

1110 **The Chairman:** Thank you, we can resume. Who's next? Peter Harwood.

Advocate Harwood: I am picking up on the one-school operation in the context of one-school, two-colleges. Before we broke Deputy Graham in the first half emphasised the importance of the Education Law change in the devolution. I really want pick up on that because the whole structure that you are proposing very much depends upon devolving down to two colleges. How quickly do you think you can get the Education Law into place that will permit you to do that?

1115
The President: I do not think the model depends on devolution. I think the improvements, some improvements, can be secured in the absence of devolution, but I think the full benefits will not be delivered without devolution which, as you say, requires repealing the Education Law and enacting a new law.

Advocate Harwood: But will you be able to progress to the one-school, two-colleges model even before you have got the Education Law changed?

1125
The President: Yes, but I don't think we will need to because by the time we are operating in two colleges, so long as the States provide their approvals, we will have a new Education Law in place, including devolution.

1130
Advocate Harwood: The other sort of timeline issue, I think, is the IT digital roadmap and, again, Mrs Falla referred to it before we broke. One of the concerns, and going back to the post-implementation report on Les Beaucamps, one of the criticisms was the whole process of getting everybody into the new site was accelerated because of the significance of having to disconnect one particular IT project and putting it onto another one. I am concerned because the extent to which you are able to deliver this one-school, two-college operation is going to be very much, I suspect, importance to the IT, digital issue, is not to be underestimated. I am concerned at the timeline. Again I come back to this path. I mean you said that you had got the draft report, you thought it would fit in with the timeline for delivering the two colleges. Can you be more specific on that, because that seems to be time critical?

1140
Mrs Falla: I cannot be more specific on the timelines because we have not had the final version of the report, but the digital roadmap was developed in the knowledge of the programme ongoing and the need to be delivering in the timescales given, therefore I think that was one of the drivers for it and I would be very disappointed if it proved not possible to deliver in the right timeframes.

Advocate Harwood: Again, I would urge you to make sure you have got adequate contingency planning in place because at Les Beaucamps there were issues because they had to move into the new building before all the snags and everything else had been dealt with, because they were driven by an IT timetable. And I would urge you to look very closely at that.

1150
Can we just go back then to the one-school, two-college, why this particular model? What benefit do you think it gives, I suppose, as to having one-school, one-college or two schools?

The President: Well, of course, the starting point was the decision of the States to remove selection at 11, which was a decision made in March 2016. And from that moment, certainly in the

period of this States term, the States have been focused on how best to deliver all ability schools. Two of the most significant problems we identified if we had three or four 11 to 16 schools was the absence of a sixth form –

1160 **Advocate Harwood:** Yes, I know, can we move on from that? The States has decided you want a two-school model. What I am saying to you is why have you actually got the model of having one school with two colleges?

The President: Oh I see, I am sorry.

1165

Advocate Harwood: Yes, it is that part of the answer.

The President: I misunderstood your question, sorry. You mean why one school rather than two schools? (**Advocate Harwood:** Yes.) Because we have limited resources: financially and in terms of people in Guernsey, and we feel that the organisation can be stronger if it is led by a single board of governors and a single executive head teacher, that is essentially what has driven the concept of one school operating in two colleges. But the States resolutions are clear that there will be a principal at each college and that each college will have some scope to develop its own identity, so they are not going to be identical twins.

1175

Advocate Harwood: But in retrospect is that not a statement, if you like, contrary to the concept of having the one school? I mean why have this idea of having two different identities and what benefit does it give?

1180 **The President:** Because we feel that it is important for the students, in particular, to be able to identify with what they will see as the school or the college that they attend. So the way we are seeing it is that identifiably we will have two 11 to 18 colleges, we will give them different names. But at an organisational level, they will operate as one organisation, under the leadership of a single board of governors and a single executive head teacher.

1185

Advocate Harwood: But are you not in danger of creating a situation where parents will want to choose which of the two their children will be going to, because they perceive them to be having separate identities?

1190 **The President:** I do not think they will simply because they have slightly different identities. I think if the offer is substantially different between the two colleges or if the reputation of the two colleges in the years ahead differs significantly then there is likely to be some parental preference expressed. We are working hard to ensure that does not happen and that there is equality of opportunity and equality of provision. And I do not think, actually, that this is a new challenge because it exists in the present system. I do not think that all of our four secondary schools are perceived in exactly the same way by all parents.

1195

Advocate Harwood: For example, will you be publishing one set of results across the school, rather than identifying results per college?

1200

The President: Yes, we are. In terms of the key assessment measures we are moving, over a three or four-year period, away from five A* to C GCSE, which England has already moved away from, and we are moving towards a model known as Attainment 8, which we can get into the details on if you wish, but that is what happening at a policy level.

1205

The Chairman: Maybe not for now, no.

1210 **The President:** And the intention is to publish those results as a single school, because what matters actually is not the performance of each individual school, what matters is our performance as a jurisdiction.

1215 **The Chairman:** Is that not problematic though? I mean it was not that long ago when we had in 2011 the situation at the La Mare De Carteret, for example. A cynic could say that having one school is a way to avoid any semblance of there being a better school and a less good school. There are dangers with that approach aren't there?

1220 **The President:** It comes with some challenges, but I think the risks on the other side are greater. Remember, we run an admissions process based, at the moment on catchment areas, and in the future on feeder or partner primary schools. We do not have a competitive admissions process so I think that where league tables and results are published on a school by school basis in England, very often those results are informing parents' choices of school. We do not have a competitive admissions process or choice.

1225 **Advocate Harwood:** But under your new model will you have a competitive admissions system?

The President: No.

1230 **Advocate Harwood:** So there will be no parental choice?

The President: No. The primary schools will be fed by catchment areas, as they are now, and the two colleges will be will have allocated partner primary schools. That is all set out in the transition model.

1235 **The Chairman:** Isn't the absence of choice quite problematic in that respect?

1240 **The President:** No, I do not think that allowing parents to choose their children's school has a system wide effect in boosting performance, no doubt it results in greater variance of performance. So you have some schools which, it is a sort of circular effect, isn't it? The results of some schools improve so parents prefer them. If you look at England those schools tend to be dominated by children from relatively affluent households, but there is a greater variance in the performance of schools. It does nothing for results across the whole system, which is what we need to be interested in.

1245 **The Chairman:** Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you.

1250 My concern is that we have referred to quality of provision and potentially you may need to purchase some more land for a particular site for sports facilities. So if that is not attainable then how are you going to ensure there is equality of provision? So if, for example, a child is particularly sport orientated and that catchment area happened to be that particular school, but there was an inequality of provision why then would there not be the opportunity for parental choice?

1255 **The President:** Well, that is happening now in the primary sector, isn't it? We have schools of a vastly different size, particularly in relation to their external space, and we run a catchment system, partly for the reasons that I have just outlined. In the secondary sector we have the opportunity – because we are essentially starting, not quite with a completely blank sheet of paper, but a sheet of paper with less on it – to ensure that every student has access to equality of opportunity and

1260 equality of provision, certainly up to the end of Key Stage 4. We set out in our report in January
that there may be some variation at sixth form, but certainly up until Key Stage 4, every student
should have access to the same provision and offer.

Advocate Harwood: The concept of having, as I understand it, you will have an executive
1265 head for the two schools, you will have one board of governors for the two schools?
(**The President:** Yes.) Again, how are they going to be able to manage this sort of separate
identity do you think, in practice?

The President: I do not think that that is a new challenge. That happens in other contexts
1270 where boards of governors operate in other jurisdictions looking after –

Advocate Harwood: But normally they are just over one school, aren't they?

The President: No, perhaps Andrew could explain?
1275

Mr Warren: Actually, that is becoming less and less the case in England where, as academies
develop, what develops is something called a multi-academy trust, where the governance is
centralised across a group of schools which may actually be geographically spread across the
country even.

1280 **Advocate Harwood:** Right, and again, Mr Warren, you may be able to best answer, the actual
sort of structure and reporting lines the executive head is over the school and therefore will the
principals report to that executive head?

1285 **Mr Warren:** They will, yes.

Advocate Harwood: They will. And then the executive head reports directly to you?

Mr Warren: Well at the moment, yes. But in the future, once we have got the local
1290 management of schools in place they will actually report to the governing body.

Advocate Harwood: So there will be no direct link between the actual executive function and
yourself or the director?

1295 **Mr Warren:** Well, the oversight will be at a different level because obviously what the
oversight will need to be will be in terms of overseeing the governing bodies and the function
that they are carrying out. But what I am very clear about is that there is still a role, centrally, for
the monitoring processes and quality assurance processes that we need to have in place to make
certain that, not just our secondary schools, but all of our schools are performing well.

1300 **Advocate Harwood:** So the role of the Director of Education will be monitoring quality
assurance, rather than actually getting into the nitty gritty of operations?

1305 **Mr Warren:** Yes, it will be less operational but I think there will also be an advisory role in
providing support for the schools.

Advocate Harwood: And again, in order to deliver that model do we have to wait on the
changes to the Education Law, I come back to the same question I asked.

1310 **Mr Warren:** In terms of delivering governing bodies in a meaningful way we do, because the
existing education law actually places that function with the Education Committee at present.

1315 **The Chairman:** Can I just go back to you, Deputy Fallaize, you have asserted very strongly the merits of the one-school approach, but I read somewhere in your documentation that you want the two sides to be able to develop aspects of their own identity. Can you actually give us some concrete examples of where that identity would be allowed to develop, where the differentiation might actually happen?

1320 **The President:** No, partly because I do not think it is really for politicians to set out in any kind of detail how schools operate.

The Chairman: I am not saying you should set out guidelines or dictate what they might be, but what is the thinking that underlines that point about each being able to...? I see Mr Warren has got his hand up.

1325 **Mr Warren:** I am happy to step in, if that is all right.

Let's give you an example of where this will happen naturally, and that is within the field of sport, where obviously it is very likely that the two sites will have their own sporting teams in a variety of sports so that actually there is the possibility then for some competition.

1330 **The Chairman:** Okay, Peter Harwood.

1335 **Advocate Harwood:** Can I just go back to the question of cost. I think in your papers you presented your alternative model, you mentioned in the sixth form phase the alternative model requires six to seven teachers more than the current sixth form centre at Les Varendes, is that still the case? And is that cost associated with those additional numbers of teachers factored into your consideration?

1340 **The President:** Yes, and the latest information I have in relation to sixth-form provision is consistent with what was set out then in our report.

1345 **Advocate Harwood:** Can I just also go back to the issue of the transition from the existing system to the new system. You mentioned I think somewhere, and I think you have gone public, that there will be no reduction in the number of teachers or that there will be no redundancy of teachers I think you have said, is that correct?

Mrs Falla: The Committee confirms that there will be a teaching position for all current secondary teachers who want one, following the reforms.

1350 **Advocate Harwood:** So the position of teachers is very secure, what about support staff, the support teams, people who are providing support to the existing schools? There is going to have to be a phased reduction in those numbers will there?

1355 **The President:** We have not made a similar commitment to the support staff in schools, simply because we are unable to without potentially carrying more costs than we would need to. We are very clear that we need to work with those employees' representative groups to ensure that those staff are properly looked after and properly provided for, but there may be some reduction in staff numbers. It is highly likely that there will be some reduction in staff numbers at the level of support staff. Although one of the reasons why we were able to provide the certainty we have for teaching posts is because of the number of teachers who, in the normal course of events, would be expected to leave employment over the next few years and there is some of that amongst support staff, but obviously you are dealing with fewer people so the effect is smaller.

1360

1365 **Advocate Harwood:** Your predecessors, they came up with some figures on the savings in ongoing costs, to what extent was that saving brought about by a reduction in the number of support staff?

The President: I do not know how many fewer support staff they assumed. I cannot answer that question; you would have to ask them.

1370 **Advocate Harwood:** But has your Committee yet established a programme for dealing with the support staff during the transition?

1375 **The President:** No, we have not yet put in place all of the HR arrangements which we will need to put in place in the event that there is a reduction in support staff, but we will certainly do so before any of those reductions take effect.

The Chairman: Deputy Merrett.

1380 **Deputy Merrett:** You mentioned, Deputy Fallaize, staff leaving after the usual periods of time. Do you as the President of the Committee think the Population Management Regime might be a barrier to the recruitment and retention of teaching professionals with specific regard to the time limits that are currently attached to those permits?

1385 **The President:** Well, this is a question of balance, I suppose. If we had a more liberal regime it would probably make the recruitment and retention of teachers easier. But we have to balance the competing needs of the education system and other areas of the public service with the underlying objectives of the population management system which is to control the size and makeup of the population. So I think we have to take a responsible, rather than purely an education centric view of that. We are in discussion with the Population Management Office in relation to, for example, the conversion of employment permits where permit holder's responsibilities are changed as a consequence of the transformation of education. And we have had very constructive and helpful conversations with the population management office and we are hopeful that the regime will be sufficiently flexible to assist us in that regard.

1395 And Colette may be able to add more on that because Colette had the privilege for a while of being the acting head of the Population Management Office.

The Chairman: Mrs Falla.

1400 **Mrs Falla:** Yes we have been, as Deputy Fallaize says, in discussions with the Population Management Office and they have given us a number of assurances around any teaching staff who may potentially be affected and we are working with them to get some get greater clarity on this, the small number around whom there is still some uncertainty. But they have certainly taken a very flexible, pragmatic approach, and from my previous role I can say that that is really what the new regime is largely based on it. It is very flexible and is able to be responsive and that is one of the great benefits of the introduction of the new regime, and we have been working closely with them.

1410 **Advocate Harwood:** Can I perhaps pull up on the employment issue because under your new model will the staff be employed directly by the school or by each college?

The President: Sorry, could you repeat the question?

1415 **Advocate Harwood:** Under your new structure who will be the employer of the teaching staff, for example, will it be the college, individual college for which they are associated or will it be the school or will it be the Committee of Education?

1420 **The President:** It is likely, although not yet certain, because until we go through the rewriting of the Education Law we cannot be certain, but it is likely that they will continue to be employed by the States.

Advocate Harwood: At a committee level rather than allocated per school?

1425 **The President:** Well, yes, because the teachers by and large are not employed purely on a school by school basis now, are they?

Mr Warren: No, they are not.

1430 **The President:** I think they are at headship level but they are not at teacher level. Bearing in mind though, of course, that we do not have any employment responsibilities any longer, it is a centralised function under the Policy & Resources Committee.

The Chairman: Mrs Morris.

1435 **Mrs Morris:** What training and support is planned for teachers within the high school and grammar to enable them to transition to the new structure effectively and to support the students?

The President: I think that is probably best answered by Andrew.

1440 **Mr Warren:** In terms of training for the actual transition process, we do not envisage that the teachers will be, at that point, changing in terms of the subject areas they teach or things like that. What I do recognise is the fact that at the point where the transition has completed that there may be a need for some teachers to work in areas other than the ones they work in now, not completely, but it might be that there is a need to take an additional subject and so if that is the case then clearly we would provide training to support that.

1445 **Mrs Morris:** I guess what part of my question was about was training people for change. Because as education in Guernsey goes, this is quite large, and it is going to happen over a period of time. So what are we going to do to support the teachers who can then support the pupils in this period of transition?

1450 **Mr Warren:** Absolutely. I recognise that there is a major element of culture change that is going to be involved in this process and that is something that we are already very aware of and our plan is to work with both staff and pupils over the years we have until this transition plan is completed, to start the process of, if you like, putting the schools together. So we anticipate that there will be activities which are run at both staff level and student level where, for example, pupils who are currently at La Mare, in say Year 7 and pupils who are currently at Les Beaucamps in Year 7, will have opportunities to work together in order to try and build up that understanding of the change and, if you like, preparing them for that change. And that applies at staff level as well as with students.

1460 **The President:** And that is one of the reasons why early in the process we have already appointed the executive head teacher and sooner rather than later we anticipate appointing the two college principals, because the sooner we can put in place the senior folks who actually

1465 operate the new model, the better, the smoother, the transition period will be because they will
have longer to work with the staff and the students on the kind of cultural change activities which
Andrew talks about.

Mr Warren: It is also the case that we have within our transformation team somebody who has
1470 within their role the specific task of ensuring that people are prepared for change.

Mrs Morris: I have one very small part of the transition that bothers me and that is the
proposal is that the GCSE ... so Year 11 and Year 13, would remain at the Grammar School so that
they are not disrupted while they are doing such important exams, which worries me in that have
1475 we taken any advice on the potential impact academically and emotionally of these poor kids
being left in a school where there are only two years, where parts of the building may be closed
off around them. Is that really the best environment for taking exams?

The President: Well, I can explain the thinking behind that. The previous two Committees had
1480 given an assurance that in the removal of selection at 11, the year groups which had been
through selection would continue to be educated in selected cohorts. So the Year 7 that you are
referring to at the Grammar School is the last selected cohort. We gave an undertaking that we
would maintain that commitment, it having already been made, and so the choice would have
been to have tried to merge a selective year group and a non-selective year group on another site
1485 or to have retained that selective year group at Les Varendes. We chose the latter option because
we felt that in terms of the education and the well-being of the students it was better for them to
remain on that site than for a selective and a non-selective cohort to be merged on another site.
They will remain there with the Year 13 cohort, as you say, which means there will be around
about 300 students in that school, which is very different from the prospect, for example, of
1490 leaving a single small year group of fewer than 100 students on a site which would not be viable.
But we can run a viable organisation with 300 students. In fact, we have run fully operated
secondary schools with fewer than 400 students.

Mrs Morris: I assume that this is going to involve – having worried about their emotional well-
1495 being and their academic well-being – obviously because I am an accountant, I then go back to
cost, is the cost of having literally a two-year school open being factored into your calculations?

The President: Yes. And I cannot remember whether it was Peter or Jennifer earlier who
alluded to this, but that is where a large part of the additional costs arise in the transition period.
1500

Mrs Morris: Okay.

Deputy Merrett: I think we have touched on this already but, educational outcomes, Deputy
Fallaise has said is the main reason driving this transition and transformation. So what
1505 commitment can you give that academic attainment levels at the new school will be significantly
improved for all pupils compared to the current position?

The President: Well, you know I cannot give you a guarantee because it depends on human
factors like quality of teaching and the academic capability of the cohort etc. and we might be
1510 talking about five or 10 years into the future, so I am not going to walk into giving a guarantee. I
will say our firm belief, and the primary reason why we are driving these reforms is because we
believe that, both in terms of academic attainment and extra-curricular opportunities, we will be
able to offer improvements in the future compared to where we are at present.

At the moment, if you look across the jurisdiction, we are at the current GCSE gold-standard
1515 measure; we are fractionally above the English national average.

1520 **Deputy Merrett:** I am glad you mentioned that, Deputy Fallaize, because in this time period of moving to this new transformation model you have also mentioned we are going to move to Attainment 8, so how is our Assembly meant to be able to make a comparison from the old model of education, which is the five GCSEs, to Attainment 8? Because we are presumably going to be comparing apples with pears.

1525 **The President:** We are going to go through a transition period where we publish both measures to allow for comparison. The problem is if we stick rigidly to publishing the existing measure, first of all, it is not easily comparable because the grades provided for GCSEs are changing from letters to numbers. The bigger problem is that the five A* to C measure is being abandoned in England and if we stick to it we are going to have no jurisdiction against which to benchmark our performance and we do not think that is in the best interests of our school or students.

1530 **Deputy Merrett:** So are you going us some reassurance today that for a period of time there will be Attainment 8 but also five GCSEs because although I appreciate, Deputy Fallaize, we are going to compare it with English schools, we will have to compare it with the old school compared to the new school model, which I think is what I am trying to drive at. So there is some reassurance that over a period of time you will be printing both?

The President: Yes.

1540 **Deputy Merrett:** Good.
Will the new school provide facilities and more integration for pupils with specific needs?

The President: Yes, but Andrew is probably best placed to answer that question, in detail.

1545 **Mr Warren:** Within the alternative model that was put forward there was a commitment given to undertake a review of special educational needs. We will be doing that review in the context of reviewing the Education Law. And one of the parts of that that we will be looking at is whether we are appropriately providing the best possible education for children with special educational needs and in particular, one of the areas that we will have to look at, is the area which falls where a child might be in mainstream or they might be in a special school and look specifically to see how we can best provide for them. I think that review will be undertaken with a predisposition towards the idea of inclusion, wherever possible.

1555 **The Chairman:** And when will that review conclude? Is that going to dovetail with the proposals going to the States?

Mr Warren: The intention is that the proposed design of the schools would allow us to do that, if required.

1560 **Deputy Merrett:** I would like to move on to the school inspection regime, if we may, I know we have only got a few minutes. But the appointment of Ofsted as school inspectors locally was labelled as a 'barrier to recruitment' by the NSUWT union. They suggest it will actively discourage teachers potentially who could get relocated to the Bailiwick, so what consultation was there with the NSUWT or any teachers prior to this being determined?

1565 **The President:** Specifically in answer to that question there was not consultation with teachers in advance.

The Chairman: Why not?

1570 **The President:** There was not consultation with teachers in advance of the decision about which inspection body would inspect the schools at which those teachers work.

Deputy Merrett: Why did you choose not to do that?

1575 **The President:** Because it is a policy decision and the most important thing is that we have an inspection body and an inspection framework which provides all stakeholders, including most of all parents, with assurance about the quality of schools.

1580 **Deputy Merrett:** I am glad you mentioned this. Ofsted is going to, I believe, develop a local framework against which the schools will be inspected but it will be tailor made for the Bailiwick, and I think I could probably summarise it by that. What does that actually mean? Is Ofsted going to look at two schools or are they going to look at one school but two sites and give different suggestions, recommendations and conclusions for the two sites or will it be one school?

1585 **The President:** Once one school in two colleges is operating, the inspection, I am pretty sure, will be organised on a whole school basis.

But the answer to the first part of your question is that there are some things in the existing Ofsted framework used to inspect English schools which just do not apply in Guernsey. They have governance arrangements for their schools, for example, which we do not have at the present time, so it would be pointless asking them to inspect our schools against those sort of criteria. And we are adapting the framework to ensure both that what is inspected is, if you like, inspectable and is relevant to Guernsey and also to ensure that our educational and other. Objectives are properly reflected in the inspection framework. But Andrew and his team are working closely with Ofsted on that.

1595 **The Chairman:** Mr Warren.

Mr Warren: Thank you.

1600 Yes, in fact we are heavily into that work at the moment. There is consultation being undergone at the moment with head teachers but it will go down to unions as well in terms of the content of that framework. But I think it is really important to emphasise that it will be a local framework. So, for example, in Guernsey we have had a tradition of inspection being centred around the school's self-evaluation and the intention is that within the framework that we have there will be a more significant role for the school's own self-evaluation than there would be in the English Ofsted framework. So effectively what you have in that model is that we require all our schools to evaluate their performance on a regular basis and then the inspectors will come in and will inspect the school in exactly the same way as an inspection elsewhere, but in the report will be commenting on how accurately the school is aware of where it is.

1610 **Advocate Harwood:** And it will be one school rather than two sites?

Mr Warren: I imagine that is right, yes.

1615 **The Chairman:** Is that not potentially problematic though if the Ofsted headline assessments are on the one school but one site is clearly doing quite well, the other site, hypothetically, is not doing well at all. Although some of that might be covered in the text, the actual headline assessments will be a mixture of the two and therefore would give potentially a not entirely accurate snapshot headline, is that right?

1620 **The President:** Well, if it is operating as one organisation and one school, which it will be, I think it makes sense to be inspected on that basis.

The Chairman: It might make sense but is that a fair process and is that really in the public interest?

1625 **The President:** I think it is fair and it is in the public interest because the important thing is to inspect the quality, the depth and the range of provision across a school and if it is operating as one school it should be inspected on that basis. I mean there are schools today operating as single organisations out of more than one site and we are not inspecting the sites separately.

1630 **The Chairman:** Yes, I am just thinking you could have –

The President: The College of Further Education, for example, is not inspected as the Delancey Campus, Les Ozouets Campus and the Coutanchez Campus.

1635 **The Chairman:** That is true. It is a cultural change, isn't it, that we are all going to have to get heads around?

Deputy Merrett, I am mindful of the time, we may need to make this the last one.

1640 **Deputy Merrett:** My main concern with that answer, Deputy Fallaize, is that if we only have one secondary school provision being one-school, two-sites, if there was an element of that. Secondary provision that was in special measures then the entirety of our secondary provision would be put into special measures and we would not be able to identify particularly if it is one site or the other site. For example, if it was sciences or sports or whatever it is. So we are labelling the whole of our secondary provision, that is my understanding if we were asked that, with one Ofsted report, is my understanding correct?

1645 **The President:** Your understanding is correct in that is how the Ofsted report will be organised but these are relatively detailed and thorough reports. I think it is inconceivable that we would not be able to extract from the inspector's findings exactly where there are any particular strengths or weaknesses.

1650 **The Chairman:** Ultimately it is about accountability, isn't it, in terms of the schools? So as long as there are safeguards to ensure the accountability I think we would be reasonably satisfied.

Mr Warren.

1655 **Mr Warren:** Sorry, could I just give a little bit more.

I think we need to be quite careful about using terms like 'special measures' because actually that is part of the issue around Ofsted and the way that difficulties within the schools are dealt with in England and it is not our intention to import that part of it here. Our view is that Ofsted are an inspection regime and they will come in and they will provide judgments on our schools. 1660 And then it is our responsibility to sort out any difficulties that there are within those schools.

Deputy Merrett: I was just going to ask a final question, if you do not mind.

1665 **The Chairman:** Deputy Merrett, yes.

Deputy Merrett: My understanding of the proceedings so far this morning is that we are talking about having one-school, two-sites, but for all intents and purposes, Deputy Fallaize, do you not believe that pupils, individual pupils, will just see it as their school, a school, they will not see it as a site, they will see it as a school. So whereas I understand from the governance point of view why we would want to have one-school, two-sites, realistically for an 11 or 12-year-old pupil, 1670 they are going to see it as one school, would you agree with that statement?

1675 **The President:** We were only discussing this in the context of a discussion about uniforms yesterday and I made exactly the same point. I think that the students will identify most of all with the college which they attend.

The Chairman: All right. Is there anything else that our witnesses would like to address?

1680 **The President:** No, thank you.

The Chairman: Right, thank you. Just to confirm there will be a *Hansard* transcript of today's proceedings. Thank you very much.

1685 **The President:** Could you send us the *Hansard* transcript?

The Chairman: Yes.

The President: Thank you.

1690 **The Chairman:** Thank you.

The Committee adjourned at 12 noon.