



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 28th February 2020**

*All published Official Reports can be found on the  
official States of Guernsey website [www.gov.gg](http://www.gov.gg)*

**Volume 9, No. 8**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,  
St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. © States of Guernsey, 2020*

**Present:**

**R. J. McMahon Q.C. Deputy Bailiff and Deputy Presiding Officer**

**Law Officers**

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

**People's Deputies**

**St Peter Port South**

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

**St Peter Port North**

Deputies C. N. K. Parkinson, L. C. Queripel,  
M. P. Leadbeater, J. I. Mooney

**St Sampson**

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

**The Vale**

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

**The Castel**

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

**The West**

Deputies A. H. Brouard, D. de G. de Lisle, S. L. Langlois

**The South-East**

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

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and A. Snowdon

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

J. Torode, Esq. (H.M. Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)  
Deputy J. A. B. Gollop (*relevé à 9h 38*); Deputy M. K. Le Clerc (*relevée à 10h 00*);  
Deputy P. R. Le Pelley (*indisposé*); Deputy J. P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 9h 38*);  
Deputy A. C. Dudley-Owen (*relevée à 9h 38*); Deputy E. A. McSwiggan (*relevée à 9h 46*);

## **Business transacted**

Evocation .....	558
X. Requête – Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – Debate continued.....	558
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.32 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m. ....</i>	<i>596</i>
Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – Debate continued .....	597
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 6.02 p.m. ....</i>	<i>639</i>

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## **PRAYERS**

*The Greffier*

## **EVOCAATION**

### **X. Requête – Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – Debate continued**

**The Greffier:** Article X – Requête – Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – Continuation of debate on amendment 1.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Langlois.

**Deputy Langlois:** Thank you, sir.

Contrary to Deputy Ferbrache I thought Deputy St Pier's opening statement was excellent. I am afraid I cannot say the same about the amendment itself though, in particular Proposition 3.

5  
10 Full business cases are a hurdle committees have to get through and to weaponise them in the way Proposition 3 does by making a committee bring two full business cases for P&R approval is I think deeply unsatisfactory.

15 But my real objection to the amendment is the same as my objection to the Requête in the way it interprets what might be called community opinion. Almost any controversial issue by definition divides the electorate into two near equal-size groups then inevitably once the States has made a decision on the issue up to half the electorate ,potentially 15,000-plus Islanders, will be up in arms protesting that their opinion has been ignored. It is simply a fact of life in a democracy such as ours.

20 With large numbers protesting it is only too easy for States' Members on the losing side of the vote to claim the people or the community object to the decision and therefore it should be reconsidered. In the case of the educational reforms just over a sixth of the electorate signed a petition calling for pause and review, that is a large number even more than called for the E&I Committee to resign over the speed limits adjustment. However, it is not the community who is considering the five sixths, about 75%-80% of the electorate, who either support the current educational reforms or who did not feel strongly enough about the issue to sign the petition.

25 There has been much talk about leadership, but all States' Members are in that role, we are the Government. Leadership is about making considered informed decisions for the common good and then implementing them, often in the face of criticism and protest. It would be an abrogation of our responsibility to be blown like a reed in the wind in the face of protests over controversial decisions.

30 The disapproval of teachers is of course another matter. They want – and I quote from the unions' latest statement:

... consideration of a range of possible options ... a full options appraisal in which the best solution would emerge from detailed consideration of the now well-understood issues ...

Yet they do not appear to acknowledge that there are only five generic options on the table – three if one wants the Guernsey Institute to proceed as currently planned; or that there is simply no point in exploring the variations of any of those three generic options if that particular option has unacceptable characteristics. They give us little guidance. They are – and I quote again – ‘not convinced by a three school model’:

In particular, that any timetabling, staffing and resourcing advantages deriving from sixth form provision should not be conferred upon just one 11-16 co-located school

That appears to cast serious doubt on their support for one of the three options, a sixth form attached to only one of our 11-16 schools.

They do not mention the second option, the stand-alone sixth-form centre, possibly because it is generally acknowledged as being unviable with only 450 sixth formers. That leaves only the variations on the third option to be explored with the teachers: a sixth form attached to each of our 11-16 schools.

The truth is the outcome of further consultation with Islanders and teachers on the three options will be that the baton is handed back to us. That there is further information out there to be gleaned to guide us is pie in the sky, it is just an excuse for not making a decision, for not acting like a government.

I will not be voting for this amendment and I hope we move on to further debate on more substantive amendments.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq, Deputy Gollop, Deputy Dudley-Owen, is it the wish of each of you to be relevé?

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Yes please, sir

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

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you very much.  
Deputy Graham, thank you for waiting.

**Deputy Graham:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

Members of the States I am not going to go into the business of the political dynamics that go on within P&R nor within the Assembly, it is what it is as far as I am concerned, and I am trying to detach my remarks totally from that.

Instead and I hope Members of the States will forgive me if I read a speech, which is unusual for me, I am having voice difficulties these days and it is a bit easier to do it whilst reading.

I want to go straight to the heart of why I cannot even begin to consider supporting this amendment and I have in mind the sentence which is printed significantly in bold which seeks to introduce for our consideration the most egregious of all possible models for secondary and post-16 education, namely that of two 11-16 schools and one 11-18 school. There must be a shorthand for addressing this particular model, I am tempted to christen it the Trott model but I think that would be considered too provocative, so let's just call it the 'comprehensive-grammar school model'.

Why is it the most egregious? Well for a starter it is the cynical attempt at deception on which it is constructed. The notion that the one 11-18 school would not be an 11-18 school but would instead be an 11-16 school, just like the other two, except that it would just happen to occupy the same buildings as a separate sixth-form centre is so obviously ludicrous that I fail to see how any

intelligent person could even think of attaching their name to it. But they have done; they have done.

80 In recent weeks and days we have heard politicians, teachers and members of the public embracing this model with all the desperation of a crew climbing on board the life raft of a sinking ship. They have been running around telling us in effect that a camel is not a camel but simply a horse that happens to have a hump attached to it. (*Laughter*) Somehow this hump or these humps are quite separate to the horse whilst at the same time being central to enabling the  
85 horse to function as it does by being able to cover huge distances across the desert without refuelling.

We all know that an 11-18 school at Les Varendes, however we might dress up the language around it, would have to function as an 11-18 school. So let us stop right now the ridiculous charade of pretending that it would not be. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

90 There is another layer of cynicism attaching to those advocating this model, and that is to couple support for it with any claim to have the interests of students at the heart of it. The model and the interests of students are simply mutually exclusive. How could they not be? For those who on the one hand recognise that 11-18 schools provide students with the best school experience, how could they possibly plan to offer that optimum experience to one third of our States' students and deny it to the other two thirds and claim to have the interests of students at heart.  
95 By the same token, how could those who believe that 11-16 schools offer the best secondary education seek to deny that superior education to one third of our students and offer it to the other two thirds?

I say this whether to politicians seeking an easy way out with the election in mind, or teachers clutching for any model that will allow them to stay broadly as they are, or members of the public desperate at all costs to stop the Lisia School project in its tracks. If you tie your green ribbons around this particular model you have lost any right in my view to claim that you are putting the interests of students first and foremost.

Now, much of the criticism of the Lisia School model has centred around the alleged lack of due process in putting it before the States and also the alleged lack of consultation with key stakeholders. So how does the comprehensive grammar school model offered in bold by the P&R amendment stack up against those criticisms? Where is the business case for this model? Okay, it is early days, if not the business case where is the most rudimentary analysis of it; what it would like; what the teachers would be doing; where the students would be taught and what would they  
105 be taught? Where is even the pretence at logic being advanced by its advocates? As far as I can see the only cursory analysis was done by the previous ESC Committee and we know that they concluded that it was so flawed that it was not worth spending any time or money on investigating it.

Members of the States, if you ever wanted an example of how asinine it is to design your educational model simply around available buildings this is it.

115 What about consultation? Have the politicians and teachers singing the praises of this model consulted the key stakeholders? Have they sounded out the parents of the children who will be affected?

This is what it might look like on the ground, you would have two 11-16 comprehensive-secondary schools at Les Beaucamps and Baubigny, and at Les Varendes you would have this 11-18 as I call it comprehensive-grammar school, the children going to the school at Baubigny would almost certainly, if you follow the logics of feeder schools, go from Hautes Capelles, St Mary & St Michael and the Vale Primary Schools. The children going to the comprehensive-grammar school at Les Varendes would come from La Mare de Carteret and from the three Town schools Amherst, Vauvert and Notre Dame. The children currently in the primary schools of St Martin's, Forest, La Houquette and Castel would go to the 11-16 comprehensive secondary school at Beaucamps.  
120

125 Well, those advocating this model when they come to do the consultation with the parents, good luck with that one.

130 There are a number of reasons why I oppose this amendment and I have dwelt solely on the reason at the very heart of it. There are many but I ask the States to dismiss it.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy McSwiggan, is it your wish to be relevée?

135 **Deputy McSwiggan:** Yes please, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Before we move on can I just remind Members of the Assembly that when referring to another Member of the Assembly, a current Member, it is customary to refer to them as either Deputy or Alderney Representative even though it might be convenient from time to time simply to use a surname when referring to a particular document such as an amendment or a Requête, it should not be done. It should always be Deputy or Alderney Representative, please.  
140 Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Thank you very much, sir.

145 Apologies for being a few minutes late but I have already had half a day before coming here, because I went to an interesting energy talk and then one on disability, which shows the difficulties of cramming in so much key work in a tight timeframe, shall we say.

I agree, as always Deputy Graham is extremely erudite and eloquent and I agree with much of what he said and his conclusions. I am not supporting this amendment but for slightly different reasons and I will go into why.

150 He has passionately advocated if you like an egalitarian argument that we have heard from Education, Sport & Culture ever since really the two-school model on one site was created, because I would be the first to admit that it does give a certain breadth of curriculum and it does also provide equality between the two campuses albeit one perhaps is situated in a more suitable traffic area of the Island and one we know will have the Baccalaureate maybe not both. But in  
155 broad terms the idea that the 11-18 school would be replicated equally across two sites is of course correct. A flaw here, as Deputy Graham has pointed out, is that one site might be argued for, say, the Deputy Trott amendment or Deputy St Pier amendment would very much create a hybrid school at Les Varendes.

160 Now, I would argue that school already exists, it might have a different name but of course as Deputy Sherbourne pointed out to me in a previous States the irony of the selectionist perspective was that children were selected at 11 to perform in the colleges or the Grammar and then were reunited at 16 by the stars of the high schools, the secondary schools, joining them and maybe outperforming them. So the sixth form may have been –

165 **Deputy Merrett:** I thank Deputy Gollop for giving way to me.

I hope he would agree with me that it does not make you a star if you happen to go to the sixth-form centre of if you do not.

**Deputy Gollop:** Well, I withdraw that remark, but you will find it inasmuch that there are pupils  
170 who have capabilities from all kinds of backgrounds and all sorts of areas. The point I was making though was that the sixth form may exist as a component and integral part of the Grammar School complex but it is a different entity with a different culture and a different mix of people, and it has been extremely successful academically and in other ways in that respect.

175 So I would not dismiss the Deputy St Pier amendment on those grounds alone because I am, to a degree, a fan of diversity and difference and one of my criticisms of the whole education debate is that we have tried to create a one-size-fits-all.

180 Nevertheless, I do concede that Deputy Graham has a point that some teachers, maybe many parents, would be concerned rightly or wrongly about the possibility of two schools being 11-16 and one 11-18 and that would not necessarily, like Goldilocks' porridge, satisfy anybody; which is why I should probably have voted actually for Deputy de Lisle's amendment, because I think

Deputy de Lisle's amendment is closer to where we will end up. But we need to go through the process of proper consultation and consideration and pausing and reflecting to avoid any more of the issues Deputy Graham has raised. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

185 But I actually stood up today to focus on just one aspect that many Members have mentioned, including Deputy Langlois today, about the sixth-form issue. I mentioned earlier that I popped in to the IoD talk on energy where we had an interesting perspective on changing shifts of full climate change of how Guernsey Electricity works, and the managing director pointed out that it is quite hard to get total competition etc. in a community with 30,000 customers when in the UK they have 30 million. It is sub-optimal to use the jargon. It is inevitable in a community like  
190 Guernsey that many things, from the size of an airport to the size of a financial services regulator, to the size of a hospital of course with full facilities for many diverse kinds of specialists and operations will be sub-optimal, and we would not have these facilities if we were just a town of 60,000 or 65,000 people. We have to adapt, we have to be flexible. That is actually the secret of the Island's success as well as a challenge on occasion.

195 We have heard from several speakers the sixth-form college standing alone would be sub-optimal. Yes, in the sense that they would not fit the England model of 60 colleges, but I would point out that there are reasons to challenge that assumption before we just accept it as fact.

The first reason is that in the UK, after nine years of austerity and many other issues, they have a very complicated and perhaps inefficient funding mechanism whereby it is fair to say perhaps  
200 schools get more funding *per capita* than sixth-form colleges. That is a bureaucracy that thankfully we have not got to worry about in Guernsey. We know, Deputy Trott has pointed this out on many occasions, not only do parents and families get a good deal in terms of education in Guernsey wherever they are, but also the cost *per capita* not just because of Alderney but for other reasons is very high here. That is probably because we are sub-optimal in some respects  
205 and maybe other factors as well.

My point is you can have smaller sixth forms. Take the Elizabeth College and Ladies' College whose results are often really second to none. They have a sixth form combined of 230, admittedly from a selected background, admittedly many of the parents perhaps have relative affluence.

210 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Graham.

**Deputy Graham:** Sir, this point of correction is meant to be very helpful. I am told the up-to-date figures for those two sixth forms joined together is 198.

215 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop to continue, please.

**Deputy Gollop:** Actually I do think that is pretty helpful because it might suggest there has been a slight drop in take-up because of the excellence of Guernsey's Sixth-Form College which is a model that works. The other reason it is helpful, is it shows that the colleges feel proud of what  
220 they are achieving with a very small sixth form in real terms.

Now, I was reading up when I had some time about places in the UK. There is a college in Blackburn, I think, St Mary's College which has had challenges in terms of its viability with around 600 or 700 students. It is the smallest of its public sector kind. It had good results though with over half doing well and 100% pass rate. The problem is one of Government funding; it is a  
225 different situation from where we are at. There were certainly two or three colleges that are more like private sector niche providers in London – Ashbourne in Kensington would be one and the New House Westminster model linked to Westminster Public School but separate would be another – whereby they have 150, 250 sixth formers standing alone. It can work. Yes, it may be slightly more expensive *per capita* but there are ways around it.

230 I think another aspect to this argument is may be our sixth form quantum of around 511, I think in the Sixth-Form College, is relatively small but that might change, we might have a population increase on the Island, Jersey have had so. There is another reason as well, perhaps



there will be a greater take-up because somebody mentioned, they were right, that at least one if not two of our primary schools are larger than the entire sixth-form centre. That suggests that a lot of students in Guernsey at 16 still pass into employment or go to College of Further Education or perhaps into the private independent sector.

My point is that there is potential to expand the sixth form and I believe that for those reasons we do not need to follow sheepishly the directed nature of this amendment; and I also do not think we should rule out looking at rebuilding La Mare de Carteret campus because that has been a promise and an idea for at least 20 years.

So I am not prepared to support the Policy & Resources amendment.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Tooley.

**Deputy Tooley:** Thank you, sir.

I just want to address some of the comments raised by Deputy Graham in his speech. I will not speak for long because I absolutely agree we need to move on to the amendments which I feel are more useful to this debate than this one which I cannot support in any way.

Deputy Gollop has said that we have tried to create a one-size-fits-all solution and that quite simply is not the case. The current model recognises and provides for difference. There are communication and autism specialism bases on each site, co-located services provided with Health & Social Care in order to enable us to provide for the individual needs of children and students. We are offering the widest possible breadth of provision that is narrowed in any other model we look at.

There are wide-ranging enrichment choices narrowed in any other model we look at. The more a model is diluted the less difference can be embraced.

Deputy Gollop challenged the non-viability of a stand-alone sixth form and talked about the UK funding mechanism and he talked about the numbers at the Elizabeth College and Ladies' College sixth form, which is *not* a stand-alone sixth form, it is not a comparable model.

He also raised the fact that this might be slightly more expensive *per capita*. Well, it is true to say that we can have any model of education we want, any model of education and we can make any model work, provided we have the financial resource to put behind it. That is not to say that we are compromising on the best possible education because we are trying to hold the purse strings tight. There is a limit to what this Island is able to afford to pay for education; there is a limit to what this Island is willing to pay for education and other services; there is a limit to what this Island is willing to pay in its taxes in order to create those pots of money to be spent.

We are providing what is not only the best possible education model for the size of community we have. It is one thing to say 'Well, this is not England'. No, it is not England, but people are people, students are students and the best possible model is the best possible model wherever in the world you happen to be.

Deputy Gollop has also said we might have a population increase like Jersey did. Well, we might, but all the forecasts are that though we will have a bit of a bubble coming up there will be a *decrease* in our population. We also know without a shadow of a doubt that fewer children move into the sixth form from schools where children are in an 11-16 than in schools where they are 11-18. So if we went into a model where two thirds of our children were in 11-16 schools we would also not see the projected increase in numbers in sixth form. This increase that Deputy Gollop is imagining does not exist under any of the possible ... It is not to say it is impossible but it does not exist in any of the possible forecasting for the future.

He also said we should not rule out rebuilding La Mare de Carteret. This is not a debate about which buildings we should use, and anyone who thinks that they would feel differently about the model which is the current agreed States' model if we were putting it into other buildings, needs to have a jolly good look at whether they are really thinking about what is best educationally, because if those people's opinion was that if we put it in a different building it would definitely be best, then they are not thinking about the children, the students, they are not thinking about the

285 education they are thinking about the buildings and that is not the basis on which to make a  
decision about education.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Le Clerc would you wish to be relevéed?

290 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Yes please, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you very much.

Well as no-one else is rising I will invite Deputy Dudley-Owen as the lead requérant whether  
she wishes to exercise her entitlement to speak in this debate before turning to the proposer of  
295 the amendment to reply to the debate.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** No thank you, sir, everything that I feel has been said already.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you very much.

300 So Deputy St Pier as the proposer of the amendment to reply to the debate, please.

**Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, thanks to Deputy Inder for his support, he gets it. He understands that, as he puts it, P&R  
have done all they could do under the circumstances and that leadership in our system is about  
305 trying to find compromise. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Our system of government can function effectively if it is comprised of individuals who are  
willing to compromise and work together to achieve an outcome, even where they do not agree  
on policy. It works less effectively if we lose sight of the outcome and stick rigidly to our own  
preferred policy position.

310 It is so much easier and perhaps more fun for some personality types to stand on the beach  
and throw rocks at a drowning person than to try and help by crafting a lifebelt from the debris  
around. We would rather try and fail than not try at all. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) Even if we fail  
because the person drowning refuses the help offered whilst at the same time being pelted by  
spectators on the beach.

315 Those who aspire to senior office, or even purport to hold responsible positions, need to prove  
they have leadership skills or they will continue failing demonstrably until they learn that bombast,  
bluster, bullying or just plain bull is not the same thing as leadership. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) By  
way of example, whether you agree with her or not, Deputy Dudley-Owen has demonstrated  
more leadership with her Requête than those who just indulge themselves in a warm bath of  
320 vacuous personal criticism in the generic pursuit of political advantage. **(Several Members:** Hear,  
hear.)

Deputy Lester Queripel said that he thought this amendment is superfluous to the Requête. It  
is not. This amendment does not pause and review which as Deputy Le Tocq has said will not lead  
to nirvana, but instead intentionally allows work to continue to the full business case stage on the  
325 two-school model albeit whilst requiring at least one three-school model comparison but allowing  
for more three-school model comparisons if the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture so  
determine. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) It allows more time for dialogue with the profession and  
engagement with the community, and it allows this Assembly to give Policy & Resources a strong  
political steer as to whether or not it wishes Policy & Resources to use its delegated authority by  
330 voting for or against Proposition 5 in the final voting.

Deputy Ferbrache did not understand the timeframe of this amendment. Sir, the timeframe is  
linked to that of the full business case. As we know much analysis has already been undertaken by  
this Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture and its predecessor on the various alternative  
models, which I would expect would form the basis of the comparisons to go into the full business  
335 case.

Deputy Fallaize said that there is no clarity on what would be required in the full business case if this amendment succeeds but he acknowledged, as Deputy Ferbrache was speaking, that there has been a very high degree of contact between our two Committees on this issue and, sir, he knows that that would be the practical mechanism by which the detail of what information would be needed could be readily ironed out.

As I said opening this debate nobody will win from this situation. If this amendment is rejected by the Assembly I have no idea, and I do not think anybody else does either, where this debate will end up. It is a kind of policy Russian Roulette, we will pull the trigger on the final votes and then wait to see what happens with all the consequences that means for the children in the system.

But if this amendment fails, my conscience will be clear that my Committee fulfilled its role and tried to find a route that would not throw away another £3 million of taxpayers' money; **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** that *will* allow the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture an opportunity to maintain their timeline; whilst at the same time allowing for three-school model comparisons to be undertaken, that will allow time for more dialogue and engagement with the profession and the community; that would not derail the development of the Guernsey Institute and that allows this Assembly to signal whether or not it wishes Policy & Resources to use its delegated authority.

Using Deputy Inder's language we have gone for a walk, he is following and we encourage others to do so by supporting this amendment.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States we will now turn to the vote on amendment number 1 which is proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Trott, which will have the effect, if approved, of substituting eight Propositions for the original two Propositions. Is it a request for a recorded vote Deputy Lester Queripel?

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Yes, sir, please.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** We will have a recorded vote then. Greffier, please.

*There was a recorded vote.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, I will announce the voting in a moment but it looks to me as though that amendment has been lost.

As I indicated yesterday, now that you have all had time to read and digest amendment 7 I am proposing to take amendment 7 next. It is almost spot the difference with amendment 6a but there are some differences.

*Not carried: – Pour 10, Contre 26, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 1*

**POUR**

Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Le Tocq

**CONTRE**

Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy McSwiggan  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Leadbeater

**NE VOTE PAS**

Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Pelley

Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel  
Deputy Graham  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey

370 **The Deputy Bailiff:** The voting on amendment 1 was, there voted *Pour* 10, *Contre* 26, 2 abstentions, 1 absentee, and therefore that amendment is lost.

I invite Deputy Le Tocq to open debate on amendment number 7 in respect of the motion under Article 7(1) that is required first to suspend Rule 24(2)(b). Do you wish to speak to that first Deputy Le Tocq?

375

**Deputy Le Tocq:** I do not believe there is a need to, sir, in the sense that I hope that my colleagues in the Assembly will vote the same way and support it in the way that they did for the Deputy de Lisle amendment earlier. But I would encourage them to do so, so that we can properly deal with this amendment in an appropriate manner.

380

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, I am going to put – Deputy Brouard do you formally second that?

**Deputy Brouard:** Yes, sir.

385

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you very much.

Members of the States I am going to put to you the motion under Article 7(1) of the 1948 Law proposed by Deputy Le Tocq seconded by Deputy Brouard to suspend Rule 24(2)(b) to enable amendment number 7 to be moved. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

390 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I am going to declare that duly carried and therefore invite Deputy Le Tocq to open the debate. Would you like the amendment read Deputy Le Tocq?

*Amendment 7*

*For the Propositions, substitute the following:*

*1. To rescind the following Resolutions of the States:*

*(a) numbers 1 to 6 and 8 to 12 on item III on Billet d'État No. II of 2018, "The Future Structure of Secondary and Post-16 Education in the Bailiwick" – P.2017/110, made on 19th January, 2018, and*

*(b) numbers 1 to 4 on item V on Billet d'État No. XVI of 2019, "Transforming Education Programme & Putting into Effect the Policy Decisions made by the States in 2018" – P.2019/66, made on 6th September, 2019.*

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

*(a) one school – three college model encompassing three 11 to 18 Colleges which shall be federated as one School and will be based at St Sampson's, Les Beaucamps and Les Varendes;*

*(b) the Guernsey Institute incorporating the College of Further Education, the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and the GTA - operating as one organisation providing vocational,*

*professional and technical education for full-time and part-time students, including apprentices at Les Ozouets;*

*(c) St. Anne's School in Alderney; and*

*(d) Le Murier School and Les Voies School operating as Special Schools for students with special educational needs.*

*3. To agree that any legislation replacing the Education (Guernsey) Law, 1970, must provide for genuine devolution of governance and leadership from the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture (and by extension from the 'Education Office') to the 11 to 18 Colleges, and the Guernsey Institute (the latter as described in proposition 2(b)); and further to agree that it must provide for the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture (supported by the 'Education Office') to focus on 'central government' functions – for example, education law, strategy and substantial policy, curriculum, funding arrangements and the accountability of performance and standards in schools and colleges.*

*4. To agree that the development of the replacement legislation provides an ideal opportunity to consider the most appropriate long-term relationships and governance arrangements between all providers of secondary and post-16 education, including in relation to provision for students with special educational needs; and further to agree that in any event there must be a firm requirement for the strongest possible collaboration between all providers of secondary and post-16 education, including strengthening collaboration between the 11 to 18 Colleges, and the Guernsey Institute (the latter as described in proposition 2(b)); for the benefit of students of all abilities and interests.*

*5. To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to return to the States before the end of 2020 with costings for secondary and post-16 education organised in accordance with Proposition 2 and those extant resolutions of the States that are not rescinded by Proposition 1.*

**Deputy Le Tocq:** No, sir, I do not think there is a need for that, I will explain some of the differences, but as you said in the introduction in introducing this amendment this is very similar and some may look at it to begin with and think it is just a reincarnation of Deputy de Lisle's amendment.

395

Sir, it does not give me a great deal of pleasure to lay this amendment and particularly not at this stage. However, it needs to be done because we have a divided Assembly, we have a divided Island, a divided teachers' profession; and those divisions are not just binary.

Sir, the late Deputy Perrot said during the debate on the States' reforms this was a last-chance saloon for consensus government. Sir, I believe this amendment is a last-chance saloon for an opportunity for fairness and bringing together the various factions around a system for our secondary and tertiary education which we can work with in the future. It will not be the end result but it will be a step forward in the right direction, and that is what Deputy Brouard and I have looked to seek to do.

400

There have been demands for leadership here and it is very difficult to lead where you have got different people pulling very strongly in different directions, but this is an attempt to try and bring together the best of what the current Education, Sport & Culture Committee have put together so that we do not waste resources, time, effort and finances that have been put towards that, but at the same time previous Committees have put together. This somehow brings that together and similarly, sir, I believe that this amendment enables us to move forward in a constructive way, primarily because to let the Propositions of the current Requête go forward would be, as I have said before, irresponsible.

405

410

I read somewhere I think Deputy Parkinson said that pause and reflect unfortunately 'p' and 'r' in that actually probably stands for prevaricate and re-debate. Deputy Lowe and others said yesterday for some of us who have been in this Assembly long enough we know full well that there is not a solution, a way of modelling education that will satisfy everybody. We have been through this again and again over a number of years.

415

420 Sir, this amendment puts forward a proposal which has been looked at but has not been given the opportunity to be voted on by this Assembly. That is to restructure instead of on two sites or on four sites, which would have been the case with the Deputy de Lisle amendment, this is to restructure on to three sites of 11-18 – three sites of non-selective schools on an 11-18 basis. This amendment therefore addresses some of the concerns, and that is where I think there were common concerns between some of the teachers and some of the members of the public even if they could not agree on a solution, regarding the size of schools and the particular sites.

425 We are suggesting that because Les Varendes is already there, it needs some work on, that that should be a third site for an 11-18 school and therefore in Proposition 2(a) you will see that we are suggesting one school with three colleges effectively – and I will come on to that in a moment as to why we are using that terminology – to be federated on three sites in the Island, one of which we are very familiar with, the size of which would probably not change very much.  
430 The others would have to be increased in size but they would not be the sizes that some of our community have found to be excessive. The rest largely remains the same.

Sir, the immediate criticism of this will be that the sixth forms will be too small to be effective to give the breadth of choice that they should give. So I want to say a few things about that. First of all this is a compromise, this is trying to bring us together in some sort of way that we can  
435 move forward instead of going round in circles.

By federating the sixth forms, as has already been alluded to, we can achieve much better choices and we can certainly maintain a sixth form that can work here in the Island and the 11-16 part of the schools would benefit from that. There probably would need to be some specialisation and yes it will cost more in terms of the annual revenue costs, but we are outside of that arena  
440 where we can flick from looking at it from a cost perspective to what is acceptable from educational outcomes.

I believe this would enable the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture to come forward with proposals, that would have to be far more dynamic than they are at the moment, in terms of using teaching staff appropriately and in terms of using those three sites which are not very far from  
445 one another.

Sir, it is true to say that the private schools on the Island, or public schools as we call them, have sixth forms that will be much smaller than each of the individual sixth forms in these schools. Therefore, by working a system that will enable specialisation and choice to take place we keep equality of opportunity available for each young person in our community, and we can enable  
450 through best use of the sites we have got available and the resources we have got available a step forward in the right direction.

Sir, that primarily is why I am laying this amendment. We need to have a step forward, we cannot ... There is no standing still we will only slip back. I certainly do not want to see that happen. So this amendment primarily is laid to enable us to bring the best out of all the bits that  
455 we have seen over the last few years and to move forward on three sites of 11-18 colleges federated in an appropriate way which can make the best and the best opportunities for our young people both at 11 and then after that when they enter into sixth form or go on to further education elsewhere.

Sir, I could say a lot more on this but I do not want to take up more time. This is, as I have said,  
460 a last-chance saloon. I think it gives an opportunity for us to work together. There has been much criticism – and perhaps not surprisingly – of the divisions and the personality politics that sometimes have been associated with this. Let's, I suggest, sir, seek to work together to something that whilst we might not each of us have proposed this to begin with, this is something we can agree to that is reasonable and we can take the majority of our community and more importantly  
465 the teaching profession with us.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard do you formally second the amendment?

470 **Deputy Brouard:** Yes, sir; and I reserve my right please, sir?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Sir, I would like to invoke Rule 24(4).

475

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Very well.

Then I invite all Members who wish to support debate on this amendment to stand in their places. There are significantly more than seven Members standing therefore the motion under Rule 24(4) has failed.

480

Who wishes to speak in debate? Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** Sir.

485

I am going to refer back just slightly to the email of 25th February that we got from NASUWT, Prospect and, remind me, it was the NEU. It is related to the interview that was on *Radio Guernsey* today with Mr Wayne Bates from NASUWT, it went on about ten past eight. What he said was that the issues with the two schools were insurmountable; I do not know what they were but he said there were issues within the two schools that were insurmountable. He also went on to say, I remember in my speech on the initial amendment which probably went into general debate, he went on to say that he had been around education for a number of years, a lot longer than me, and he said the four schools to three schools came out of the blue, without any consultation with the unions. He then went on to say that the two schools came out of the blue, without any consultation with the unions; and, had we voted for the Deputy de Lisle and Deputy Le Pelley amendment, that again would be something coming out of the blue. And we are here again.

490

495

There is a lot within the efforts from Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Brouard that I actually personally feel that I can agree with, but we have been told time and time again to keep politicians out of education.

500

**Deputy Le Tocq:** I thank Deputy Inder for giving way and I respect his views of taking note of the professionals, and it is certainly true from my perspective, that there should have been far more engagement with the professional body.

505

But I am involved in negotiating with unions all the time, you cannot please every union and if you speak to one particular union representing lecturers and the College of FE or one group of teachers from the current Les Varendes site compared to say the La Mare de Carteret, you will not get agreement. Consultation can happen still with this amendment, but if he thinks that there will be some way in which you can bring all of that together by extending the time of discussion with them to find a solution then frankly he is living in a different parallel Bailiwick.

510

**Deputy Inder:** Well, I am only repeating what was said on the radio today and Mr Bates went on to say that – I will give way to Deputy de Lisle.

**Deputy de Lisle:** Thank you.

515

I would just like to say that there was nothing coming out of the blue in terms of the amendment that I put forward yesterday. That is totally incorrect because it had gone through *substantial* work by the actual Department and the former Committee for Education.

520

**Deputy Inder:** Okay. Well I do not think that Deputy de Lisle has understood what I have just said. What Mr Wayne Bates said, I am only repeating what he said, and I will try again, that the running from four schools to three schools has come out of the blue. So he was talking about the amended – I think he was talking about when Deputy St Pier laid an amendment to get four schools down to three, that is what he was talking about, he was not directly referencing what came out of the three schools, he was referencing the original amendment of four to three.

He then went on to say, and I will try again for Deputy de Lisle's benefit, that the two schools came out of the blue.

So, where are we?

525 Deputy Le Tocq suggested that you are never going to get a consistent view from all the unions. But actually this letter of 25th February is from all three unions NASUWT, NEU and Prospect. They have called for a pause and review. Mr Wayne Bates has told us on the radio today that that there are problems within the two-school model that are insurmountable. He has then gone on to effectively say 'Do not design anything on the floor of the Assembly'.

530 More positively is what he said: if the Requête gets through, his Union – and I am assuming that will include the NEU and Prospect – will work *immediately* with any Committee to try and facilitate a model that all teachers can work with.

535 So if the de Lisle and Le Pelley amendment had got through we would be falling foul of designing on the floor of the Assembly and even though there are elements within the Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Brouard amendment, which I suspect are pretty good ...

540 Me personally, and this is only my personal view, if there are people far more professional than me – i.e. all of the teachers in the world – that believe that a sixth form split over three sites is a good idea, and I cannot personally see it myself, but if I am told by the professionals keeping the politicians out of education I could support that, but only if that bubbles through from a pause and review which has been asked for by all of the professionals within our education system.

So to that end, sir, for all the genuine efforts made by Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Brouard to get something out of this, I will not be able to support it.

Thank you.

545 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Stephens.

**Deputy Stephens:** Thank you, sir.

I do not intend to speak in general debate. I will try not to broaden this speech too far away from the amendment, and exercise discipline, and I hope to be brief.

550 First, sir, through you, I would like to comment on something that Deputy Dudley-Owen said yesterday. She made a remark about there being no practising teacher in the Assembly at present and I want to assure her that although I am not paid for teaching in schools I do use my professional skills almost every day; and I although I cannot step out of my persona I hope she will admit what I have to say as being relevant. It is not possible to take the teacher out of this particular politician.

555 I want to talk about the amendment and its potential to meet with opposition. Now, that may seem to be a strange way to introduce my support for this amendment, but I have been thinking about education professionally for a very long time and there are certain truisms that I can share after my long consideration.

560 First is that education will change, is constant. Schools change all the time and schools should not become static. I know through my association with schools inspection that the readiness of schools to adapt to change is one indication of a vibrant and effective school.

565 Second, there is a phenomenon particular relevant to the public sector and to schools that was much explored by an academic and researcher named MacDonald, and was much quoted in required reading for those who were seeking extended qualifications in managing educational change and designing effective schools. MacDonald who, when referring to change in education and the difficulty of instigating and maintaining change programmes, used the phrase 'One man's bandwagon is another man's hearse'. A change proposal will have some who support it and see it as an opportunity and some who see it as a negative. It is human nature for individuals to reflect on direct and indirect impacts when a change proposal is laid before them. It is well recognised that moving organisations particular educational organisations through a change agenda is challenging and the advice from the theorists is: work with those who will work with you. And it is good advice.

570



575 So that is one view of the theory. I suggest it is not at all a surprise that ESC have met with resistance to their model because it does not matter what is proposed there will always be resistance from some people.

580 As some politicians have discovered, coalescence around a proposal can disappear very quickly once that proposal become a real contender. Sometimes what the workforce say is a good way forward one day, is dismissed very soon after, and this illustrates a real weakness in the pause and review agenda. There is nothing in the Requête that ensures that after pausing there will be any more unity over what to do than there is now. There is nothing in the Requête that will divert us round the bandwagon versus hearse difficulty.

Now, will this amendment guarantee wholesale acceptance? Well, no, it will not; but it does offer a workable alternative if that is needed.

585 What I want to talk about now is balancing opinion and comment. Now, Members have been bombarded by expressions of 'We do not like the two-site model'. But it is important to give visibility to those messages received by Members endorsing the ESC model and importantly the messages from teachers who have said 'Just get on with it; we will make the two-site model work'.

590 Members also know that some senior managers in schools have distanced themselves from the surveys and action that happened during the last half-term holiday period. So I would suggest that there are some people to work with out there in the schools and, whatever the outcome of this debate, ESC needs to work with those who will work with them. They have committed to do so but it will not quell all dissent.

595 The positives in the Le Tocq amendment for me are that it allows for a clear endorsement of the principles that ESC have previously described, and which I support, and the provision of 11-18 schools satisfies much of the concern about recruitment and the quality of teaching and learning.

600 Now, I want to talk about compromise as an insurance mechanism. Members and others are saying it is the children we are concerned about, and quite right. It is the children in the schools and for me particularly those in the primary school pipeline that I am thinking about when I say that in my view the Assembly should reduce the uncertainty and potential for delay by recognising that fact.

605 Also the staff in the schools need to know for certain what the direction is and return all their attention to the day job. I suspect pause and review increases risk to the principles that ESC have described. There is nothing offered in it as a practical way forward, nor is there anything offered in it that identifies costs.

I am not convinced that pause and review will deliver within a timeframe that acknowledges the trust that parents in the community have put in the principles and the non-selective transfer last September and the transfer in 2020 of the current Year 6s and then the Year 5s and then the Year 4s from primary school into secondary school.

610 Now I think I heard yesterday that a Member suggested that the return to selection is written very large on their banner. I do not have a banner. Pause and review increases the risk of let's return to selection at 11 and for me that is a red line.

615 So in relation to principles of equal opportunity, no selection at 11, the potential in the ESC plan for increased opportunities for students – I am really with ESC, I want all of those changes to progress and to be effective and to benefit our children.

620 I agree with Deputy Le Tocq that to drop the ESC model entirely at this time could mean that the community will get a less good deal for more costs, and Members can try offering that to the electorate. The children might get a less good deal, and their parents and their grandparents and everyone else on the Island who pays taxes might year-on-year be losing the value of an extra spend from other essential services.

625 Far in my distant past on my first independent journey into London I stood very nervously outside of the Victoria Coach Station trying to get my bearings and I heard an evangelist proclaiming to passers-by with great conviction, 'There is only one way to heaven, but there are others'. It took me a moment or two to work out the contradictions in that statement, but the transformation of education reflects those contradictions. Members have agreed one way forward

twice, it is clear that there are other ways. What really worries me though is a return to a blank sheet of paper and years of delay.

630 So I will finish with a plea to Members not to vote to stop the process of reform for years, by voting in the Requête without amendment; and suggest that to vote for this amendment as an expanded approach to taking three sites may be better than voting for something that is unspecified.

635 What this Assembly really should not do, and what I hope it will not do, is what the Requête demands and leaves schools and children and families in a suspended state while Members think up more combinations of the best way to do it. We have trawled through the alternatives many times and really there is nothing new out there.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

640 **Deputy Prow:** Thank you, sir.

I can be brief. I do not want to repeat the points that I have made.

645 What I think is important to draw out is that in the debate that has gone before, where options have been presented by Deputy de Lisle, Deputy Le Pelley and this amendment brought by Deputy Le Tocq, we are on the floor of this Assembly discussing the options and that is not what the Requête is designed to do. It is a pause and reflect.

I give way to Deputy Le Tocq.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** I thank Deputy Prow for giving way.

650 I understand his logic, but the point is even if we did pause and reflect – whatever that means: prevaricate and re-debate – it will come back to this Assembly and we will have this all over again, because that is what I have lived through for the last 20 years. I do not think the next Assembly or – (*Interjections*) I do not think it is. It was 2000-2001 when I was first elected and we were discussing the very same issues.

655 Now, all I want to say is I have no faith – I have very little faith in this current Assembly and I have no faith that the next one will be any different than the past and therefore we do need to make a decision. Ultimately it is this Assembly, this sovereign Assembly that makes the decision.

Now, I said before, I am not very happy to have to bring this amendment but it gives us an opportunity of working together and bringing things together.

Thank you.

660 **Deputy Prow:** Yes, I think Deputy Le Tocq is starting to make my point for me. The point is we are in a very bad place, this States is in a very bad place, and there is opportunity for us to move this forward.

665 What I was going to say was, there could very well be in the comparators that the Requête asks for some great merit in the proposals that appear in this amendment, and some great merit in the proposals that Deputy de Lisle has put forward, and the Requête allows this to happen.

670 Now, we have had a lot of talk about leadership. Deputy Le Tocq in his address to the amendment accuses the requérants of being irresponsible. Can we change this debate? Can we change this terminology? Let's talk about what is responsible. I will tell you what I think is responsible, is that we heed what the public are saying. We heed what the majority of teachers and the unions are saying to us. They are saying on the present model that we have put forward 'We do not think it is workable. We are the people that will be standing in front of these classes with a model, with an undeveloped business case which is being dripped out to us, and it has become apparent to us –'

675 **Deputy Fallaize:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

680 **Deputy Fallaize:** I was going to correct Deputy Prow when he said that a majority of teachers had said that it was unworkable, which is not true, it is workable. They have not said it is unworkable, I understand and respect the concerns they have raised.

685 But when he says that the business case has been dripped out to Members, I mean that does need correction, sir, because the Committee has applied itself to the standard process for developing business cases proposed by the Policy & Resources Committee and accepted by this Assembly that it includes the initial stage, the development of a programme business case, then the development of an outline business case, and eventually the development of a final business case. That is what the Committee has done.

690 If the States want a different approach, and I have a view on this and I would like to make some comments on this when I speak on Deputy Le Tocq's amendment. I have a view about the way in which we now progress capital projects, but that is what the States process is and that is what the Committee has applied itself to. There has been no drip-feeding of information. Most of the information which Deputy Prow and other critics of the model have asked for, we have had to refer them to previously released information and then they have said 'Oh, this is now being drip-fed out'. It might be that they did not read it originally, sir.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Point of correction, sir. (*Interjections*) Oh, sorry.

700 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I do not think you can correct a point of correction, Deputy Meerveld. Let Deputy Prow continue, please.

**Deputy Prow:** Thank you, sir, for letting me continue.  
In my humble opinion that was not a point of correction that was a speech. (*Interjection*)

705 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Prow, it was a point of correction. I accepted it as a point of correction. I will say whether it is a point of correction or not. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Please continue your speech.

710 **Deputy Prow:** I entirely accept your judgment, sir.  
I would answer that by saying again referring to, and I did not want to have to refer to this again, the letter of 25th February. This letter is from the unions and it says:

That ESC had not made sufficient strides to address their concerns about the implementation of the 'one school, two site model' for them to have confidence in the plans that are being progressed so that educational outcomes would be improved;

715 It is quite clear that they are saying that they have not had sufficient stakeholder engagement. As far as the business case is concerned, I have been involved with a business case in Health & Social Care around hospital modernisation which started well before this process and it was the previous States in March. It is because of going through the process in the so-called Green Book, that process is not complete because of the detailed stakeholder engagement, and that has not met the controversy that this has.

720 Anyway, returning to the point that I am trying to make, is that the options that are in the amendments before us can in the Requête be considered very quickly as options in the comparators that the Requête craves for.

725 Can I just again return to trying to turn this debate and the Requête into positives? Not considering what is irresponsible, not accusing the requérants of being irresponsible, but by saying what *is* responsible. I think it is entirely responsible that we do pause and reflect, but that very quickly we show leadership and we take forward the options that are in these comparators together with the one school on two sites, and work out as quickly as possible what is the best

option and not to do it on the floor of this Assembly, and this is what the point of the Requête is. And I ask Members of this Assembly to reject this amendment. Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

730

**Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you very much, sir.

This is not pause and reflect, this is disrupt and delay – that is what it is.

735

I understand the *very* seductive appeal to 'Let's just have a pause, let's reflect, it won't take a moment'. This idea that you pause and reflect and you have the comparisons in front of you, such as the two-school model and the three-school model and the requérants would say 'Actually, on reflection, after the pause and reflect it has been proven that the two-school model *is* the best model for our children!' Well you have convinced us that the public do not want the two-school model so why would you go against those who appear to be supporting the case?

740

I have walked in this building at times with 500 people jeering out there; with 600 people. I have stood on the North Beach Car Park at the receiving end of a tongue lashing of in excess of 2,000 people. (*Interjection*) People opposing States' decisions is not new, it is not new at all. It is how you react to that and you react by taking control and leading, because that is what you are elected to do.

745

People vote for politicians in the round. When you used to appear on their doorstep and make your case to them, they did not think 'I will not, or I will vote for Barry Brehaut because of one issue'. They look perhaps at your voting record and they vote for you as an individual in the round, knowing that you might have a shared family interest that interests them, and you may have a child with a similar dependency that they have, and that their family member might coincidentally be a nurse. There are a thousand reasons why people vote for you; and occasionally some of those are politically related.

750

Now, I have never known an Assembly so receptive to unions! How hard has it been to get the union voice heard in this Assembly? How many people have stood up and said, 'Why aren't you listening to the unions? Why aren't you listening to the representatives?' Well, which one? Which group should we be listening to?

755

Deputy Inder said yesterday and he told a story, which is accurate, this is not a disparaging comment this is just an observation. He was approached by union representatives to essentially handle a press release and distribute it. Fine. Personally I do not think that was a wise thing to do. The States are the employer, we are one body and we are one employing authority and what we have allowed to happen is lots of little groupings to make their own representations to politicians individually or in groupings, they have side-lined the ESC by some margin, they have sidelined I suppose what they see as their employer rather than the States and they have managed to, if you like, have this rather confused message; because it is odd – I will not be giving way if you do not mind.

760

765

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** It is a point of correction, sir.

**Deputy Brehaut:** I am not giving way –

770

**The Deputy Bailiff:** A point of correction has been called. Point of correction, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

775

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Deputy Brehaut made an assertion that the unions have sidelined the representative of the employer, being the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture. I wrote to the unions to ask whether they had a meeting in the diary with the Education, Sport & Culture Committee and they said they had not at that time met. I also wrote to Deputy Fallaize to ask if they had met at that time, because in the email that they had sent to us or a few weeks ago inviting us all as Deputies to the joint unions meeting, they did mention that they were reaching

out to both the Committee *for* Policy & Resources and also the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture.

780 The response at that time from Deputy Fallaize was that they had not met, and the response furthermore from that particular union representative was that indeed they had not met. So the email I am afraid is contradictory to what Deputy Brehaut has said, it certainly does not sound as if the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture has been sidelined in favour of coming directly to individual Deputies.

785

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut to continue.

**Deputy Brehaut:** As much as I supported or promoted the right to give way, or the idea that we give way and I wrote to the then House Committee at the time, I think it is time that we should review that provision. (*Interjections*) It is not for people I did give way, sir, but I did –

790

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut –

795

**Deputy Brehaut:** Oh, sorry, I beg your pardon.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** It was a point of correction.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Yes, I take your point

800

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen has indicated that you have said something that was inaccurate. (**Deputy Brehaut:** Yes, thank you, sir.) Therefore she has corrected it to that extent.

805

If you had simply sat down and that had been a give way you would be legitimate in making some comment, but it is not relevant to this debate. (**Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you.) Can we please focus on – ?

**Deputy Brehaut:** I will do, sir, and sorry for the misunderstanding, but my point was that there was a disparate group not one single organisation and the States – and I drive home that point, the States is one body, it is the employer that should be meeting with the respective unions to represent the employees. If the employees feel that not using or not approaching the employer directly, and employing individual politicians who will then arbitrate and assist them, I think in doing that it compromises the process and I believe my point stands.

810

815

**Deputy Inder:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** Deputy Brehaut suggested that it was the unions that contacted me. They were individual teachers, as far as I am aware. I do not know how many people were in the unions, and at no point did they say they were union Reply, sir. They were individual teachers from individual schools.

820

Thank you.

825

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut to continue, please.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Well as ever we can dance on the heads of the pins, but I think it is well understood that teachers are represented by respective unions. We have had emails from

830 Guernsey Teachers claiming to represent in excess of 90% of the grouping, and obviously by definition some of those people, the great majority, would be union members.

There is as ever, I have noticed a pattern when I get to my feet I do tend to give way albeit a point of correction, but I just take these points as an effort to disrupt. But what it simply means is I will reiterate and make my point again in more detail.

835 When I spoke to a crowd of predominantly women, actually, when I left the Assembly the other day I pointed out to them the debate would not be taking place on the day that they were at the Court. We had a discussion about that and they felt a bit disappointed that the debate would not kick off that day. I asked them what their main concerns were about the two-school model and a mother said to me 'I do not want my child to be sat in the corridor with their lunch on their lap. Would you want that for your child?'

840 I said, well, you are more than aware of course that there will be a staggered lunch hour that the children will not ... They were not aware of that one fact that there would be a staggered lunch hour. They then fell back on the first point they raised which is that the corridors were too narrow. And we are well aware, having been to the presentations by ESC, that the corridor issue was one of the issues that was dealt with obviously within the planning considerations.

845 So the concerns out there in the community are many and numerous, but as ever there is no consensus over what a group of people may want. There is no consensus. People are clear, and people in this Chamber and some outside are very clear that they do not want the two-school model; but they are not clear, there is no consensus, on what they want if it is not the two-school model.

850 Now, on delay and disrupt for that is what it is, I would ask the requérants that have remained in the room, I would say to them 'Let your yes be yes, and your no be no, now. Just let your yes be yes'. This idea that you can leave, as Deputy Jonathan Le Tocq has said since 2000 debating the issue of the schools development plans, secondary education, the 11-plus, all the rest of it, to do this for 20 years and to send another Committee away for two years – and what is it? How did he describe it? To hold people on – what is the expression in aircraft? A holding pattern for children. There would just be this holding pattern for two years for families not really understanding where their child is going. That is 22 years, then you come back to this Assembly with proposals, and will the States support them? Who knows?

860 I would say to the requérants and other who believe that there is middle ground and believe that this impasse can be dealt with, then I believe there is merit in supporting this amendment today.

865 This idea that we are in a bad place and we are in this bad place of our own making and what interests me is this sequencing of the Requête which I think has been a little bit of reinvention on. I think it is wrong to say that the Requête came from concerns within the – we were listening to the public, we were listening to the teachers, we were listening to everyone and therefore it generated the Requête. That is not my recollection. The Requête was around for a very long time, the Requête has been in play for a long time, and opposition in support of the Requête has been somewhat cultivated.

870 What the requérants have done essentially is picked up the biggest disruptive political boulder they could find, thrown it into the pond and said to everyone 'Look at these ripples! Where have these ripples come from?' Oblivious to the fact selectively that they are the major cause of disruption and the cause of disrupt and delay. We need to deal with this. And the idea that the democratic process, that an election should be used as a threat, which is the language we are using. This democracy that we enjoy, that we participate in, is presented to the community as a threat. If you think you can go to the community after that decision then – I will give way to  
875 Deputy Merrett in the knowledge that I am giving way and it is not a point of correction.

**Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, Deputy Brehaut.

880 The threat at the ballot box I think is what Deputy Brehaut is speaking to, and I had a moment of clarity on late Tuesday evening and I apologise to the members of the community that I shared

by clarity with late at night. It came to my mind that actually we only received this threat, 'I will not vote for you unless you pause and review' from that side of the argument. The other side of the argument of 'Please do not pause and review', I cannot recall any of those correspondents saying 'Because if you do this I will or will not vote for you.'

885 That moment of clarity came to me, so I really resonate with what Deputy Brehaut is saying, but to date – this might change my inbox imminently it probably will – I have not had any 'I will not vote for you at the ballot box, Deputy Merrett, unless you ...' I have not even declared if I am standing yet so that seems to be a little bit of an irrelevant point, but '... unless you vote to pause and review'. I do not know if any other Member has got any other, but it is only from one side of  
890 the argument, sir.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Yes, I take on board Deputy Merrett's observation. But I think it is unfortunate that every debate we have in the run up to an election becomes an election issue. The closing of the Seafront was an election issue. There are 1,001 things at any one time that will  
895 become an election issue. Thankfully we live in a community where the electorate are an extremely sophisticated group; and just to reiterate my point before people vote on individuals generally in the round and not on one single issue because they understand that there is a downside to doing that.

I think we have seen enough of this disrupt and delay, this pretend pause and review, the idea  
900 that you put the two-school model back-to-back with another and it will be duly considered is just something of a nonsense, it is a bit Alice in Wonderland. Let's resolve this issue – I was going to say today, but it may be Monday – but we need to get out of this inertia, this discussion that we have had, this debate that has run on for 20 years.

Just before I sit down, I have to say a fear of mine at the back of my mind is something Deputy  
905 Ferbrache said incidentally yesterday was that the 11-plus is not on the table, it is not up for debate *today*, and I think we should all be acutely aware of that because with this disrupt and delay when it returns what will the option paper in front of you look like? We will not be listening to the unions then, by the way, we will not be listening to the unions. When the unions come out as they did from 2001 to 2019, 'Please, please end selection' this Assembly ignored those unions  
910 demands.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Smithies.

915 **Deputy Smithies:** Thank you, sir.

I will not speak long because I intend to speak to the amendment. *(Laughter)*

When I saw yet another amendment being placed to this Requête I had a mental picture of *The Beano* and I could not quite work out why until I remembered a character called Billy Whizz. Billy  
920 was blessed with the ability to move at colossal speed and never set out to harm or annoy anybody, the only trouble he causes is usually by accident though this happens quite often due to Billy Whizz's velocity.

Once again through the purist of motives we are being asked to decide Guernsey's educational future on the floor of the Assembly. This is a completely unnecessary amendment, as all the  
925 Assembly has to do is to pass the Requête and all the permutations of two school and three-school models can be taken into account and put into a full business case.

I am inclined against any composition of the school estate of more than two or three schools but a fully costed business case would cover all aspects of future education policy of Guernsey, not just the important academic outcomes but also the other aspects of education, which have  
been fully aired in the debate thus far.

930 I can see one advantage of moving to the three-school model proposed in that we might be able to move away from the rather curious name chosen for the school and the decision to name one of the campuses after a temporary visitor, however distinguished; and we could move to

name the three new schools, and making it clear that I have no individuals present in mind we could name the three new schools the le Tocq, Brouard and Billy Whizz Academies! (*Laughter*)

935

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

940 I have not changed my view that obviously the reforms that my Committee is leading are the optimum way forward and also that the most irresponsible – and I will continue to use that word because I think it is the most apt word to use – outcome from this debate is to send the Committee and the next States away endlessly to review innumerable models which have already been reviewed and rejected.

945 I am beginning to form the view that the Members of the States who are arguing for that just do not know what they want. Or, either they do not know what model they want and they want somebody else to come up with an answer despite having access to all of the information over many years which successive Committees and successive States have considered; or they know that if they put forward a model then it will then garner considerable opposition and they have decided therefore their best way of trying to defeat the current reforms is to try to gather to their

950 side anybody who wants any other model than the one that is currently being implemented.

So I think because of the way the Requête is structured and because of the unimpressive arguments which I think have been put forward in support of it, the unamended Requête is the very worst option the States or we could leave, with other than possibly the P&R amendment which thankfully was very heavily defeated.

955 I would say, sir, in terms of assessing what model of education is going to emerge let that be a very clear message to anybody who wants to advocate one 11-18 school and two 11-16 schools. Because it could not get even then – and I suspect some of the Members of P&R voted out of loyalty – more than, I think it was 10 votes, and that model is going nowhere. So there is no point anybody inside or outside the Chamber trying to coalesce around it before the election or after

960 the election because it is so egregiously unequal that in a non-selective system I cannot see any Assembly ever adopting it.

Now, I think I ought to share some views with the Assembly in terms of trying to advise on the possible considerations that ought to inform this debate, but this has been provided by officers and the Committee has not had an opportunity to reach any kind of considered view on this

965 amendment.

The capital costs of the amendment, I am not sure if Deputy le Tocq refers to any capital costs (*Interjection*) in his amendment but he accepts that they are estimated. Okay, thank you, so the Rule 4(3) information in the amendment says the capital costs ... no, sorry,, this only includes the capital costs of the current reforms and the model that was put forward by the previous

970 Committee. So the view in any event of officers is that the capital costs of three 11-18 schools are likely to be similar to the capital costs for two 11-18 schools or colleges.

There would need to be extensions at St Sampson's and Les Beaucamps, presuming those two schools and Les Varendes would be the three schools – in fact that is set out in the amendment isn't it? At Les Varendes, though the capacity of Les Varendes would accommodate the number of

975 students, successive Committees have been advised that there is a need to carry out quite extensive repurposing and renovation and that there would be a need to move students out of the school while that happened.

Now, that second point would obviously have to be examined very carefully because it would be highly undesirable to start moving students out and potentially moving them back in, particularly when, if you had to do that, one of the other three schools is in such an unacceptable

980 condition and has been for so many years at La Mare de Carteret. So we do not have lots of surplus space – if we try to take the estate down to three schools quickly – at Sampson's, because it is operating at capacity, or at La Mare de Carteret because of the condition it is in. So I think there are some real complications with this amendment in trying to get from where we are to



985 where it wants to get to. But the total capital costs of the work at Les Varendes, and the extensions necessary at Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's are likely to be in a similar kind of region as the capital costs for the extensions at Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's necessary to develop the two 11-18 colleges.

990 In terms of revenue costs, I think everybody accepts that the revenue costs of operating three 11-18 schools would be greater than the revenue costs of operating two 11-18 schools or colleges, and there has not been anything like enough, even high-level analysis, carried out to provide the States with any information beyond that in terms of revenue costs.

I will give way to Deputy Queripel.

995 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Sir, I am grateful for Deputy Fallaize for giving way.

Can I just ask him though could he at least explain that the revenue costs will be less than they are now with running the four schools? Could that at least be stated as something near to the truth as it were? So we will still be saving money even regardless of going from four to three, revenue-wise.

1000

**Deputy Fallaize:** Do you know, I am not convinced that would be the case because running a sixth form over three sites would be very expensive. I mean, clearly running the 11-16 phase across three sites is less expensive than running it across four sites. The current model is hideously expensive – that is partly because of four sites and it is partly because of the way that we are arranging things and the kind of system is configured. So there would be some saving from between the current model and the model in the amendment in the 11-16 phase, but whether that would be cancelled out by trying to operate a sixth form over three sites I do not know, I cannot provide the States with any accurate information. My instinct is that probably it would be slightly less expensive to operate three 11-16 schools than it is to operate one 11-18 and three 11-16 schools, but that is instinct –

1010

I will give way again.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** But there will be at least one less school to maintain and to operate and to run, wouldn't there? So one less site, one physical school would mean there would be less maintenance in regard to there being one less school, so that must be a saving surely. There cannot be any way it cannot be a saving if there is one school less to maintain and to run, in a physical sense.

1015

**Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, the maintenance costs of three sites would be less than the maintenance costs of four sites, but the additional costs in this model arise from trying to run a sixth form over three sites. I mean, trying to run a sixth form over two sites is more expensive than running it over one site, and in our model we are making efficiencies by consolidating on to two sites that are greater than the additional costs of running the sixth form on two sites. But I cannot really say anything that would be any more useful in relation to revenue costs than that.

1020

1025 Now, in terms of student population the three 11-18 colleges would represent schools with approximately 850-930 students at each site, based on current projections, with a peak at each site of 930 in about five years' time. Of this, the sixth form would be between 140 and 170 at each site.

In terms of costs in terms of development of this model and then transition costs. I think it is important to recognise that if the States vote for this amendment and then vote for it at the point it becomes substantive Propositions at the end of the debate, the position that will have been reached will have been not as advanced as the States were in January 2018, when the States *first* voted the model which my Committee is now implementing, because that had been preceded by ... Actually, despite what some critics in the Assembly say, quite extensive discussion with education professionals and there was a report of – I don't know, 100 sides of A4 or something like that – that was put before the Assembly, and it had required quite a lot of engagement over a

1035

period of many weeks with education professionals, some in schools and some at the Education Office. Now clearly this amendment has not benefited even from that and so the Committee in inheriting these substantive Propositions, if that is what they become, would be about let's say  
1040 somewhere between two and two and half years back from where we are now in terms of the development of a school model.

I say that only to highlight the amount of work that would be necessary and the time that it would take in order to move to implementation. So the implementation period for the current reforms which is now in the second year of a five-year transition model ends in 2022-23, and the  
1045 States voted in favour of the two 11-18 colleges in January 2018 initially. So that is a five-year period and that is the kind of period of time that we would be looking at if this amendment is adopted and then becomes Resolutions.

I will give way to Deputy Merrett.

**Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, Deputy Fallaize.

I understand the transition years and I also recognise the transition model, but I do think for clarity what would help, certainly myself, is that the first non-selective cohort of Year 7 children, if the transformation is continued, those children will be by the time they enter the year for decision-making on GCSE's will be in schools that can offer a non-selective wide breadth  
1055 curriculum offer and there will not be a need for those children to move in their GCSE studies. That is my understanding of the transition model that the first cohort of Year 7s will be in their defined school with the widest breadth of curriculum offer available.

I understand we are talking about years, sir, but it is the actual children in Year 7, those children, and that is what we need to concentrate on: where will those children be going?

Thank you, sir.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, in the current reforms the transition model allows the first non-selective cohort, when they are making GCSE choices, to be in the larger colleges and to have the full range of options and opportunities.

Now, under the terms of this amendment I cannot guarantee that that would be the case, even to the extent that you could enhance opportunities generally in moving from four sites to three sites, which you could to some extent but not to the same extent as you could if you are moving to two, but I am pretty sure you would not be able to deliver that within the next two years.

So the point is that the amendment does not propose a tweak to the current reforms, it is a completely different system. It has some features of the current reforms, because all the students going in at 11 would be going into 11-18 schools, but it is a completely different system with different challenges, different implications, and it would need to be modelled and developed in the way that the current reforms have been and that would take quite some time. It took from January 2018 until September 2018 to develop a transition model for students, so it might very well be that it might take, with the election in between, until the end of this year to develop a transition model for students and to get that out to parents.

I think there are some complications in this which need to be considered. And this process, which would take some time to develop the details, is not without cost. It has cost several millions of pounds to get to this stage and it would cost another round of several millions of pounds to develop this model.

In terms of the impact on benefits, it obviously retains the benefit of 11-18 schools but on a smaller scale. We have always argued that the benefits of our model are partly to do with the 11-18 provision and partly to do with the size and scale. The approach set out in this amendment maintains the 11-18 element but compromises in terms of benefits achievable by scale. So the curriculum choice would not be as broad and the same combination of curriculum or subject options may not be provided. This would have a particular impact on areas like music, languages, drama, psychology, and media.

1090 In terms of federation and trying to make better use of students and potentially staff moving  
between sites or schools, there has been some of that under the federation model that was put  
forward by the Committee before the last one, and the results have been unimpressive to say the  
least in terms of how it has operated in practice, and actually it has resulted in poorer outcomes  
for students. So I do not think that federation has much to commend it in that sense. It may not  
be possible to run the enrichment programme that is envisaged from three sites in the same way  
that it could be from two, and the co-location of health and care services planned and provided  
1095 for with a budget that has been authorised in relation to our current reforms would certainly be  
more expensive on three sites and to some extent may not be deliverable.

I will give way to Deputy Parkinson.

1100 **Deputy Parkinson:** Sir, Deputy Fallaize appears to be assuming that the tertiary education  
elements of the current plan would be incorporated into the three 11-18 schools and I do not  
think that that follows at all.

1105 **Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, Deputy Parkinson has misunderstood, I am sorry if it was that I was not  
sufficiently clear, I was not talking about the tertiary element I was talking about the co-location  
of health and care services which our current reforms embed – so these are services which are  
provided to secondary age students, educational psychology service and other associated services  
which will be based at the 11-18 colleges. It would certainly be more expensive and to some  
extent it may not be possible to provide them over three sites.

1110 So I think in terms of the impact on timescales developing plans for a different education  
model – and just because it has 11-18 schools it is a very different model – it would take two or  
three years and it is very likely that the kind of stage that has been reached now would be reached  
just before the next election. I do not know what effect that might have on Members' views but if  
the attempt here is to try to quieten everything down and not allow it to be an election issue, to  
some extent that might be achieved in 2020 but it might reappear in 2024.

1115 However, having said all of that, and there are some complications, I do think this would be a  
better outcome than the unamended Requête which I think is the worst possible outcome. My  
instinct is to do what I did with Deputy de Lisle's amendment and vote in favour of the  
amendment but making it very clear that I would not be voting for these if these became the  
substantive Propositions, I would not be voting for them at the end of the debate. I think Deputy  
1120 McSwiggan yesterday said it is not a ploy it is preferential voting, and obviously that is what it is. I  
am not in any way deviating from my view and my Committee's view, which remains unanimous,  
that the optimum model for delivering on the important educational principles is two 11-18  
colleges operating as a single school.

1125 But I think the worst possible outcome is the Requête, which is completely without direction  
and is dressed up as pause and review but means 'Stop the current reforms, despite the fact that  
we have not got a clue what to do instead'. I think that is the worst possible outcome.

1130 I want to pick up on a couple of things that Deputy Le Tocq said. He spoke about this  
amendment as a way of taking the teaching profession with us. Now, Deputy Inder and Deputy  
Stephens referred to this in different ways when they spoke. Deputy Inder is right and clearly the  
unions are not going to, next week, say the States have done the right thing unless the States vote  
in favour of the Requête. I do not think the means the States should vote in favour of the Requête,  
I think the Requête is wholly irresponsible and the worst possible outcome. But the teaching  
unions are not going to be praising of the States unless (a) the States do exactly what the  
teaching unions want the States to do, but that is not a criticism that is just the nature or the  
1135 rationale of unions; and (b) unless the States vote in favour of the Requête.

But even moving that to one side, in terms of the medium term is this really a model which  
could carry the profession? I am *very* dubious about that. A lot of the concerns raised by teachers  
about the current reforms have come from two schools – and I am not in any way disputing any of  
the figures that Deputy Inder has read out in the States – but I am talking about where the

1140 concerns have originated from. A lot of the concerns have originated from two schools, and it is made up in two parts: one part is from the desire to retain at one particular school 11-16 provision, and at another school a desire to keep the single sixth form together. This model set out in this amendment does neither of these things.

I will give way to Deputy Inder.

1145

**Deputy Inder:** I am just intrigued, sir, I am just wondering where Deputy Fallaize has that information from, because everything I have read from the letters just clearly asks for a pause and review and I do not recognise anything he particularly says that it comes from certainly two schools. I am treading lightly because he is in the Assembly, we are in the middle of a debate, how he knows the actual detail of which schools have come forward, which ones have got more of a – I do not think I want to use the word 'bias', but how does he know what the signatures to the letter are actually thinking. How does he know that?

1150

**Deputy Fallaize:** Well, sir, with the greatest respect to Deputy Inder (*Interjection*) it is because – no, I know Deputy Inder does not, but it is because I am the President of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and he is not! (*Laughter*) (**A Member:** Yet!) Yet, yes!

1155

But despite the concerns that teachers have expressed about the current reforms, there have been discussions between teaching unions and the Committee and there is a level of understanding about what is felt by teachers in schools. Our professionals are in schools and our head teachers are leading these schools, so there is a level of understanding about what is felt by staff in these schools, which may not be revealed fully to those Members of the States who may be close to some teachers but are not Members of the Committee.

1160

So what I am saying is, I think if we went to a lot of the staff who teach sixth-form studies now and said 'You have got three choices: you can have a single sixth form, you can have a sixth form over two sites, or you can have a sixth form over three sites – I suspect a very large number of them would say, 'Our first choice is to have one sixth form; our second choice is to have two sixth forms; and our last choice is to have three sixth forms'.

1165

Any teacher who wishes to continue in 11-16 schools obviously will not be content with the model set out in this amendment. Now that, in my view, is not a reason not to approve it, but it is a reason to place a great deal of caution on the assumption that this is a model which can carry the teaching profession with it.

1170

I will give way to Deputy Le Tocq.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** I thank Deputy Fallaize for giving way.

1175

Yes, I fully accept what he has said. I mean, what I was indicating was that this may well be second or third best for some of the teaching profession, but then it is for some of us as well.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, fair point, but I suspect eventually there may very well be quite a number of them for whom our current reforms would be their second choice and these reforms set out in this amendment would be a lower choice than that.

1180

But anyway this is speculation and this is obviously – and here I do have some sympathy with the requérants – the risk of trying to agree a model, *not* as the States did in January 2018 off the back of several weeks of public debate and debate among educationalists and a report of 100 pages which was informed by educational advice, but off the back of two or three sides of A4, because that is what is before the States. And this is not an amendment to require an analysis of two or three 11-18 schools or colleges, this is an amendment which as it is set out is asking the States to agree emphatically that in the future there will be three 11-18 colleges.

1185

Two other points I want to make, sir, before sitting down. One is if this amendment was converted into States' Resolutions I think the States have to accept that we would be going, not a holding pattern because the end point would be clear, but into something of a suspended state. The transition model for students would have to be ripped up.

1190

1195 Now I think Members who are putting forward motions which scrap the current reforms, and this amendment essentially if it is carried into Resolutions would have that effect and the Requête would have that effect, I think they have to give some consideration to ... What they want to do is leave behind whatever they have left behind for this Committee to deal with, but I think they have to give some consideration to if they were asked to step up to the plate next week or next month, how are they going to go to parents and explain that where parents believed their children will be going to school in 18 months' time, how are they going to explain that they now cannot go to those schools because there will not be space for them?

1200 How are they going to go to the parents of the students at la Mare de Carteret who, 16 months ago, were advised that they would be moving to Les Beaucamps at the start of their GCSE years that now they will not be able to? Either they will have to move at another time, which we will not be able to tell them when it is, or they will have to stay at la Mare de Carteret and in what condition will they be staying at la Mare de Carteret indefinitely? Because under our transition model, under the current reforms, the last student leaves La Mare de Carteret in little over two years. That would be extended significantly if the States were to stop these reforms and adopt a different model or have an endless review of other models. So how many more years is La Mare de Carteret going to remain open in its present condition? That is a serious consideration.

1210 On top of that you would be trying to design a different transition model probably having to move the students out of Les Varendes during that period, despite the fact that you would have agreed that Les Varendes was going to be one of the three 11-18 colleges. So this would be a very difficult transition model and I will refer to that a little bit more when I lay the Committee's amendment or in general debate. But the disruption to the transition model – if anything is done other than continuing with the current reforms – and the disruption to students, is very significant and it would be unclear what alternative transition model could be put in place.

1215 The final point I want to make is that in a way it is ironic that the States are spending so long debating models of education which basically means how many schools will there be, where will they be located and what age range will each school cater for? Because when we have met with teaching unions, almost all of the concerns that they have represented to us have been about space standards in the two 11-18 colleges and the operational changes, which are not necessarily necessitate by having two 11-18 colleges but are part of the wider need to transform education, partly because at the present time our outcomes are not good enough.

1220 We are slightly above the English national average without at least some of the challenges which schools in England face. Our outcomes are lower and in many years substantially below the outcomes in comparable parts of England. We must be on a journey of improving educational outcomes and experiences for young people (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and a lot of the concerns – in addition to the concerns about space – raised by the profession are in relation to the changes which are associated with the journey of trying to improve educational outcomes.

1230 Now, please do not confuse what I am trying to say, I am not in way trying to say that any teacher is standing in the way of the necessary changes, what I am saying is that the changes are of a scale that cause, inevitably, a degree of anxiety and uncertainty.

1235 The only two choices here in relation to this issue for this Committee or a subsequent Committee are to pull away from those changes and not try to drive the changes necessary to deliver improvements in outcomes, because it is all too difficult and some people might be resistant, so shy away from them. Or, press ahead with them whether you are in a three-school model or a four-school model, or 11-18 schools or 11-16 schools, and you will then encounter the same level of anxiety and uncertainty and resistance that the current reforms have.

Overwhelmingly, the concerns representing to us by teachers –

1240 **Deputy Inder:** Point of order.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of order, Deputy Inder.

1245 **Deputy Inder:** Deputy Fallaize is the President of the Committee and I hate to see him drift into general debate because that is where he seems to be going at the moment.

1250 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I am not going to say that that is a valid point of order, Deputy Fallaize, on the basis that as I said yesterday, I think it was now, that comparing what the consequences of the current Propositions and the substituted Propositions if the amendment were carried is a permissible line to take. So please continue.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

1255 We do have an amendment before us which starts by saying 'For the Propositions substitute the following ...' so it is a bit difficult to address this amendment without referring to the Propositions. Deputy Inder is tapping his watch but with the greatest respect he need not stay (*Laughter*) and he may not be missed if he chooses not to! But I am coming towards the concluding part of what I wanted to say.

1260 So the substantial body, almost all of the concerns expressed to us by teachers in relation to the current reforms are about space standards and operational changes. We are laying an amendment which speaks to some of those concerns shortly perhaps or later in this debate. But the amendment does not address any of those things, and the debate the States have been having so far does not address any of those things.

1265 The debate has been about models: how many schools, where they should be and what the age range should be. Now I understand that the teaching unions have now said 'Let's pause the implementation of the two 11-18 colleges model', but where that comes from is concerns in the main about space standards and operational changes, and yet the amendment before us today does not do anything about space standards or operational changes. Almost none of the contributions which Members have made on the amendments so far have anything to do with space standards or operational changes.

1270 Let me explain what I mean by space standards. The space standards are a calculation of what space is required to cater for the number of students in the school with reference to their age range. That is what has caused some angst amongst some teachers, that they would like the States to adopt the space standards which previous Committees – not the Le Pelley Committee, but going back before that – put before the States multiple times, and which the States rejected because the view was that they were trying to develop schools that were very much larger than necessary. This amendment does not do anything to address the teachers concerns about space standards.

1280 Also in terms of operational changes a *very* big part of the problem in trying to roll out operational changes is not unique to the current reforms and it has to do with the way in which the States operate, because in almost every other government in the world even if there was a debate in this Assembly or equivalent about the education model – how many schools and what the configuration should be and what the age range should be – once that decision was made the relevant authority, a committee or a Minister or whoever, would go away and implement those reforms and would not do it in public and would not do it with reference to the parliament again; and would have the authority to make quite substantial changes to that model that the Assembly had voted for. Now if that was the case in our structure the current reforms would not have run into the difficulty that they have run into. The difficulty has arisen because so much of the detailed debate ends up being done in public and because those with the responsibility for implementing them do not have to authority to flex the plans as you move from conception to delivery.

1290 That problem is going to be encountered whatever school model is adopted. You will come to a point, if the three 11-18 colleges, where you meet in front of the teaching unions and they say 'Yes, but you have not changed your space standards; all you have done is you have reduced the size of what were going to be the 11-18 colleges when you were going to have two of them; because now you are going to have three and you have got fewer students. But you have adopted

1295 the same space standards so the buildings have got smaller. Well, we do not like that because where is the space for this and where is the space for that?’

Then what is going to happen is it will not be possible for the Committee with the authority for implementing the matter to say, ‘Okay, the States have made the decision, we do not want to carry on going round the houses, we do not want further years of review so we will concede on the space standards and we will give you much more of what you want’. The Committee would not be able to do that under a three-school model any better than our Committee has been able to do it under a two-school model.

I will give way in a moment, Deputy Trott I just want to make this point.

1305 If, when teaching unions really started to raise their concerns with us about space standards, I think it was about in October, bearing in mind this is a £150 million-plus capital programme and if you think of the revenue costs associated with it over 20-30 year period ... I mean, any other government in the world at that point would have said ‘Well, in order to keep the strategic programme on the road we will have to make concessions. If it costs us a bit more in terms of capital investment to secure the support of the profession, that is what we will do’. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1310 Well, of course in the way we operate it is not possible to do that because the States have authorised a budget and if you want to go beyond that budget then you have got to come back to the States, and the moment you come back to the States the States will say, ‘Oh, the whole thing is falling apart!’ And so you just do not have that level of flexibility. Trying to implement significant change which is necessary in education is very difficult whatever the model is because of the way in which we operate.

I will give way to Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** I am very grateful to my friend Deputy Fallaize for giving way.

1320 I think he makes some very valid points and he will recall that in a recent statement he delivered on behalf of the ESC I did ask him the question that was it true that the current space standards are somewhere between 25% and 40% higher than an equivalent UK school? He confirmed that was the case.

1325 And does he agree with me that that is already a *very* material premium to schools of similar pupil size elsewhere?

**Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, and certainly the – oh, I will give way to Deputy Le Clerc.

**Deputy Le Clerc:** Thank you, sir.

1330 Sir, I think it would be really useful, if Deputy Fallaize has got the information, on what the lowest and the highest peak of numbers will be coming through over the years, because the space standards I understand the concerns of people with space standards but there is going to be a pinch point when the highest number is in compared to the lowest number is in, and when the lower number are in obviously people will have more space.

1335 He talked previously about the peak in five years, and I am just concerned that if the peak is coming up in what will be 2025, under this model that is proposed with this amendment would we actually be able to meet that capacity if that is the pinch point in five years’ time?

Thank you, sir; and thank you for giving way.

**Deputy Fallaize:** I thank Deputy Le Clerc.

1340 I was going to refer to much of this when I spoke on my amendment or in general debate, but certainly under the current configuration, notwithstanding the difficult conditions to put it mildly at La Mare de Carteret, there are enough spaces to accommodate children at the maximum student population because there is across the whole estate so much surplus space. And we have known that, which is really what initially prompted the previous States to begin the journey of rationalisation.

1345

1350 The number of students per site under our model at its maximum under the current  
projections is 1,395 which is in five years. Within 10 years the numbers have dropped to below  
1,300 per site under our model. Although there have been claims of 1,500 students at each site, in  
fact within 10 years it is less than 1,300 and it never goes about 1,400.

What is important though I think is that under the current reforms by the time we reach the  
peak of student population the implementation period is over, whereas if we change course now  
and adopt a different model it is inevitable that the transition period is going to coincide with the  
peak of student population, and it is going to make it very much harder to manage.

1355 So I thank Deputy Le Clerc for that intervention and for allowing me to make that point in  
relation to this amendment

I think there is perhaps some merit in the States getting to the point in general debate where  
effectively there is a choice between continuing with the current reforms or adopting three 11-18  
schools. I think that without having as much information as I would want to have to say this with  
1360 any kind of authority about my views, instinctively I think three 11-18 schools is probably my  
second preference, but I think it is a long way behind the optimum model which remains two 11-  
18 colleges.

So I hope, sir, that has given the States some indication of the views of the officers and the  
views of the Committee in relation to this amendment but if this amendment is carried I will ask  
1365 the States to take the amendment which has been circulated in my name with Deputy Graham as  
second; and I would suggest at that point changing the terms of the amendment slightly and  
adding our amendment as effectively alternative Propositions so that the States can then have a  
general debate on the terms of this amendment effectively versus continuing with the current  
reforms.

1370 Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

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

1375 Well, it will come as no surprise to Members that I am supportive of this amendment. My views  
on the future of secondary education have been pretty consistent over the last four years since  
indeed I offered myself as a candidate for Deputy Fallaize's role, and all I can say is I thank God on  
a regular basis I did not succeed. *(Laughter)*

1380 But I firmly believe that schools are better if they include young adults at 17 and 18 years old  
and that the whole community benefits from the presence of those young adults as role models  
as a calming influence perhaps on some of the younger pupils, and I think it actually can help to  
reduce bullying and other anti-social behaviour in schools. That is not just because I went to a  
school that included a sixth form, the evidence as adduced by the Committee for Education, Sport  
& Culture is that 80% of the top-performing non-selective schools in the UK include a sixth form.  
1385 So I think the evidence is there that having a sixth form incorporated into a school benefits the  
school. It also clearly benefits the sixth form, since they get better results.

I would like to see that benefit extended to all of the Island's States' school pupils. I really  
cannot support a model that says we are going to have one 11-18 school and two 11-16 schools. I  
think that would be grossly unfair.

1390 But we do have a problem that there are not that many sixth formers in the States' sector,  
partly because we have a very successful and flourishing private sector which takes 30% or more  
of the student population, and that of course makes Guernsey very different from the situation  
that prevails in the UK. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) And with only 450 or perhaps 500 pupils in the  
States' sector sixth form, Education have come to a reasonably logical conclusion that you cannot  
1395 divide the cake up more than once or twice because you would end up with cohorts of students in  
the sixth form that were too small to allow for provision of effective options and so forth.

But that conclusion rests on the assumption that the schools, or more specifically the sixth  
forms, are going to offer the same curriculum choices. If there are 18 children in Guernsey who



1400 want to do history A-level there is no point in dividing it up into two classes of nine, and so on and so forth. That logic I think is impeccable.

Where I differ from the view of the President of the Education Committee, and indeed previous ones, is that I do not see why the sixth forms should not specialise and you could conceive of three – or potentially even more, but let's say three – 11-18 schools where the sixth form in school A has all of the natural sciences, the sixth form in school B has all of the arts, and the sixth form in school C has all the rest of the humanities.

Now in that situation the class sizes at sixth form would be exactly the same as if all of the pupils were in one school, and you would have no problem of the dilution of this relatively small cohort of students across a large number of sites.

1410 I think three schools with sixth forms is a possibility but it does depend in my view on at least a degree and probably quite a lot of specialisation at sixth-form level. I draw the inference from there that there would be some element of specialisation even in the 11-16 or at least at the GCSE levels within the schools, because if you have got the A-level teacher of Spanish in your school it is going to be a jolly sight easier to offer Spanish as a GCSE course than if you do not have the A-level teacher of Spanish in your school. So I think the logical implication is if you follow down this argument that the schools even up to GCSE level have some degree of optionality outside the core curriculum and students who want to do a particular subject, whether it be design or Spanish or even three sciences instead of combined science, would have a clear preference for one or other of the schools because of the strength of that school in the relevant area.

1420 The further extension of that argument in my mind is that if you run with that you then have, as I say, slightly different offerings on three sites and really you cannot force people to go to the school that teaches Spanish just because they live in St Martin's or because they went to a particular primary school, you have to offer choice and basically you would have selection at 11, but by the students.

1425 Now, the practical argument against that has always been that okay the bus routes are all organised now so that children from St Martin's can get to Beaucamps and I find that argument deeply unimpressive, all of the potential sites that we are talking about are situated within a mile and a half of each other. It is not impossible for the bus that goes to Beaucamps to go via Les Varendes. These are really trivial practical problems which I think we are capable of solving.

1430 So I want to say another point, my argument for getting to where I have got to, is purely based on educational outcomes and what I think would produce a better outcome, because I think actually three schools of maybe 800-900 pupils fits better into the geography and the culture of Guernsey than two schools of 1,300 pupils. I know the educational outcomes of larger schools in the UK are as good, as or perhaps even better than, schools of 800 or 900 but I think that in the Guernsey context schools of 1,300 to 1,400 pupils are going to be very unpopular; and we can see outside the massive resistance to the two-school model from the public of Guernsey and the teachers of Guernsey. I do think it behoves us to come up with some creative solution which brings with it – I will give way in a moment if I may, Deputy Merrett – the advantages of the 11-18 model, but in smaller schools.

1440 In my view because you would have a degree of specialisation and therefore federation between three schools you are in a way talking about one school on three sites. I think the benefits which people who advocate for larger schools claim for them in the UK can be replicated in a Guernsey federated school model.

I give way to Deputy Merrett.

1445 **Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, Deputy Parkinson.

I am trying desperately to follow your logic but I do have two questions in reflection of your speech. The first thing is, what would Deputy Parkinson suggest we do if two-thirds of our children want to take Spanish and it is only on one site, so who are we going to say no to and what criteria will we have? Or if all of them want to go to a particular site, how would we deal with that?

1455 But secondly, sir, what if one site offers Spanish but – and I am trying to use Deputy Parkinson's examples – another site offers chemistry, physics and biology? What if that student says, 'Actually I want to learn Spanish, but also I want to learn chemistry, biology and physics' – and that is on a different site? Are we therefore expecting students to have half their day at one site and then move to another site if they are specialist colleges? (**Two Members:** Yes.)

1460 Okay, so what we are expecting to say to 10-year-old children is, make a decision if your preference at this age is more towards sciences or languages, etc. And then if you want to have a wide choice of subjects, or a subject choice actually you really are interested in, I would argue the case that it is not easy to determine at the age of 10 or 11 – because some children at primary school would never have been taught Spanish, so how would you know at the age of 10 you want to try Spanish? But, still, we will move on from that point.

1465 Are we then expecting our children and young people to move between the campuses during the school independently, maybe a shuttle bus idea I do not know what Deputy Parkinson has in mind? Because surely one of the benefits of having equitable subject choice in each campus or in each school is that all of the children have the same choices and there is no need for either themselves or the teachers to move throughout the school day to a different campus.

1470 That is what I am a bit confused about, so maybe it is a shuttle bus idea, I do not know. But could we have some clarity on that, because I am sat here a little bit confused because whereas we could have schools that have specialisms we do not have children that know at a young age that is particularly the route they want to go down.

So, if Deputy Parkinson could just expand on that a bit because there are obviously some logistical, equitable concerns.

1475 **Deputy Parkinson:** I think the point needs to be underlined that all of these schools in this model would offer the core GCSE curriculum and therefore across the broad range of the central curriculum the schools would offer the same provision. But there is a certain amount of optionality at GCSE level and some children do want to take courses that are outside the core curriculum, which might be available on only one site. But you are going to have some practical problems whatever the arrangements are and even if all of these schools were on one site you would have timetable clashes. It might not be possible to do maths, physics and chemistry and Spanish because the classes might be taking place at the same time.

1485 The reality is there has to be a degree of flexibility. Now, I do not envisage in this three-school model that children of GCSE age would be doing very much travelling. There may be a few who have some very specific special interests which require that they attend on another site for maybe one period or two periods a week. But at the A-level, sixth-form level I accept there could be children who wants to do Spanish, physics and music and it might that they have to move around between sites.

1490 Now, the distance from Les Varendes to Beaucamps I think would be perhaps 10 minutes on a bicycle via Le Mont. I mean, these are really, really not major problems. At sixth-form level a lot of the teaching takes place in double periods. So a pupil having arrived from Les Varendes at Les Beaucamps to do his or her Spanish has perhaps a 10-minute bike ride to get there and then a double period to study, and of course quite a lot of the teaching at sixth-form level is not contact teaching and pupils have periods where they are working on their own.

1495 Again there are practical problems, I acknowledge them, but I do think these can be hugely over-exaggerated. I think it would be possible for us to come up with means of transport and provision between the sites, a circular system of buses going round or whatever, that actually allowed pupils to take the broadest possible range of curriculum choices that they can, bearing in mind there will always be some limits, because you will always have the potential of curriculum clashes.

1500 So I think those problems can be solved. I think the three 800-900 pupil schools is more culturally acceptable to the people of Guernsey.

1505 I also think, picking up one of Deputy Fallaize's points, he is really trying to have his cake and eat it. He is saying on the one hand this will involve a massive amount of rebuilding, huge capital costs and we would have to rebuild the whole Grammar School, we would have to build a sixth form at Les Beaucamps, etc. etc. And at the same time he is saying but it does nothing to address space standards. Well, if you are building all these new buildings you can do something about the space standards and the mere fact that you are putting the same number of pupils into more buildings –, buildings mostly which already exist – means, I think, that the space standard problem is likely to be much diminished or perhaps to go away.

1510

**Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy Parkinson.

The point is that the space standards are a calculation of the space necessary based on the number of students there.

1515 The constraining element in the space standards being smaller in our model than many of the teachers would wish is not the sites, we have got the space standards up to the maximum that we can basically get away with in the States, that is the problem. If the States want to be more generous with space standards then we can provide more space; (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and we could do that with two 11-18 schools or colleges in the same way you could do it with three 11-18 schools or colleges.

1520

I will tell you, the people who worked with us and worked with P&R on space standards when they went to Beaucamps, said 'This school is half empty. If you adopted the space standards of England this school would have 950 students in it'. So if this three 11-18 colleges model is adopted maybe the space standards, once they are applied, will be that the students can be accommodated at Beaucamps on its current footprint. Now, Deputy Parkinson might say, 'Well, that bears out what he is saying in terms of lower capital costs, but you try convincing the teachers that there can be 950 students in the current space at Beaucamps'. But that could well be the consequence of adopting the same space standards for the model that is set out in the amendment as those which have been applied to our amendment.

1525

1530 It is not about the size of the sites it is about the space standards, that is in the gift of the States; but successive States have not been prepared to have space standards as generous as those used when Beaucamps was built in 2010.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Well, sir, I accept that the space standards for the adapted schools would have to be developed and we are not going to do that on the floor of the Assembly. I have to say I am, relatively speaking, more of a convert to the view that the space standards should be greater than I was 10 years ago. (*Interjections and laughter*) But we are not here to design schools. What we are here to do is to design to system and I do not think you can say, as Deputy Fallaize appeared to be saying, that the consequence of the three-school system would be that space standards would be compromised. They will not, necessarily.

1535

1540 Now as I say I do not want to get involved in trying to design schools but (*Laughter*) I would say one thing about the three-school Proposition in principle that basically, although we are not designing a school system around the estate, and I want to be very, very clear that these ideas are not promoted because we happen to have four sites or more if you count some ... Essentially, what I am saying is actually the three-school model fits quite well but coincidentally within the current estate.

1545

1550 Les Beaucamps, as Deputy Fallaize has already told us, could accommodate up to 960 pupils. It might be extended to incorporate a sixth-form centre in a three-school model, but it is pretty close to the size you would want it to be already. Similarly St Sampson's High School is pretty close to the sort of size that an 800-900 pupil school would require. The one school that would need complete rebuilding assuming that it becomes the third site is the current Grammar School. On that site there is a perfectly good, perfectly serviceable and currently in use sixth-form centre which you would not need to replace.

So I am not getting involved in redesigning the estate but all I am saying is I think the three-school Proposition actually fits quite well, but in what there already is there.

1555 Deputy Fallaize has offered the States some estimates of the costs of the three-school model and I am certainly in no position to argue with his estimates, and I do not know that they are right but he may well be right. But it seems to me instinctively that a lot less construction would be required in a three-school model where essentially what you have to is replace the Grammar School and maybe modify other buildings as necessary. So that is why I am going to support this.

1560 I will stand accused, as Deputies Le Tocq and Brouard have already stood accused, of designing an education system on the floor of the Assembly that has of course has been practically traditional in the States of Guernsey. (*Laughter*) And I will wear that criticism with pride (*Laughter*) because I actually think we have got ourselves into a bit of a cul-de-sac. There may be many strong arguments in favour of Education's two 11-18 school model and I have been to the presentations and they were very impressive, and the people who support the 11-18 school model are very passionate about it and make a very well-reasoned argument and a well-reasoned case.

1565 But the reality is that it is meeting massive public resistance (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and it is meeting massive resistance from the teachers who would have to deliver the education. I am afraid that just cannot be ignored. I voted for it when it has come to the Assembly before and if we are forced into a position in this debate where it is a choice between two 11-18 schools, and two 11-16 schools and one 11-18 school I will vote for the two-school model again. But I fear that this has become an absolutely toxic debate and it behoves us to think a little bit constructively. Is there a way out of this that preserves the best of the arguments for two 11-18 schools, but deals with some of the issues about larger schools and what some people would argue as compromised sites?

1570 So I would urge Members to give this amendment serious consideration. I really, really hope that it succeeds.

Thank you.

1580

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir.

1585 It does feel like *Groundhog Day* from yesterday we are in a *déjà vu* situation because this amendment in principle is exactly the same as Deputy de Lisle's amendment, Deputy McSwiggan's amendment. Again we are making the same mistakes which Deputy Parkinson will make no apology for designing a solution on the floor of the Assembly.

1590 Whilst I have absolutely no problem with any of us having a preferred model at all – we absolutely should do, something that we lean towards, something that we feel intrinsically will be successful or fit in with our Island and its economic needs and its cultural needs – we must go through, boring as it is, the process in order to ensure that we have absolutely covered off all of the areas, and we have consulted and engaged meaningfully with the staff and engaged them to help shape the end solution. If we do not go through the process of an options appraisal through the proper channels that we ourselves have set for our Civil Service, we will never come out with a solution that we can hand-on-heart with integrity say we absolutely lifted every single stone we really did look at all the facts and figures around this.

1595 So I have absolutely no problem with looking at the model that Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Brouard have put forward in their amendment, but to do it in this way and to leap straight to adopting this model would be absolutely foolhardy and absolutely irresponsible.

1600 I know that people feel that the Requête is a blunt instrument and that it may be, but it is the only way that we will pull back the protocol of good governance into what we are doing; because at the moment we are deviating so badly out of that protocol and we are not just in danger of creating a crisis of confidence in us we are in that position at the moment with our community.

1605 They do not trust us to make a decision that it well-judged and well-informed in this particular instance.

Education has created a fractured States in this term and maybe others. Now, a fractured board in a company needs to really look at where it is at, it really needs some serious advice. In this instance if we liken it to a corporate, a Committee has gone off, we have said to them by a majority, 'Go off and have a look at that particular project idea'. They have got themselves in a little bit of a mess with it and it is our responsibility to come back and say 'Right, okay, let's look at everything in the round; let's look at it all in an objective way'. We must embrace that –

**Deputy Fallaize:** Point of correction, sir.

1615 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** The States did not send the Committee off to go and have a look at a model, the States voted by a two-thirds majority to direct the Committee to implement as soon as possible a model of secondary education based on two 11-18 colleges operating as a single school.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen to continue.

1625

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** I thank Deputy Fallaize for that interjection, because it further underlines the folly of that actual decision because to send a Committee away to implement an unproven and ill-evidenced model without the proper costings and the research behind it, really I am afraid does prove the point that we are in this situation now. I am not being critical, that is how it was. (*Laughter*) I am stating a fact. (*Interjections*) You may not like it, but I am stating a fact. It is a fact that we agreed a model which was not proven.

1630

However, we are making the same mistakes today and I really will implore Members not to vote for this amendment because we will end up in a similar position as we are now around the two-school model if we do not bring this back in an objective appraisal against other models.

1635

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Thank you, sir.

1640

I am going to begin with dispelling some rumours about Les Varendes site at the Grammar School because there have been so many conflicting stories about the condition of that building. Because of this, I contacted the project architect that designed it just to get a feel of the length of time the building was supposed to be sufficient and fit-for-purpose for.

1645

It is a steel construction, it has got a steel roof, there may be some works that will be required to it but classrooms were designed for 30 students. I know people are saying that the roof needs to be replaced but – even if you include the sixth form – 50% of it has been replaced already and that was 2016 summer holidays and 2019 summer holidays. So there is very little work and very little disruption to bring that site back on line properly and up to spec.

I will give way.

1650

**Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy Leadbeater.

1655

But I asked these questions when Deputy Leadbeater was a Member of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and I was provided with a schedule of works necessary to be carried out at Les Varendes which came to £31.9 million. So the information which I presented to the States has actually not changed, it has not been developed at all during the period that my

Committee has been in place because obviously our model does not provide for secondary education at Les Varendes. So these figures have come from the Committee of which he was a Member.

1660 **Deputy Leadbeater:** That may be the case but that does not mean to say they are accurate. *(Laughter)* Sir, I will move on.

Deputy Roffey yesterday was talking about not being swayed by public opinion and using his judgement and I agree, but when you have got 90% or whatever percentage of the education professionals telling you that this model is not going to work, if you are using sound judgement  
1665 you would take heed of that and you would take it on board.

Now, getting back to this amendment I actually quite like this model of education but as I think the point has been made by Deputy Dudley-Owen, Deputy Prow, Deputy Inder and maybe others, it is still defeating the object; and the object is to bring everybody along together which I think can only be achieved by the pause and review and a full options appraisal of different  
1670 options. I do not think we are going to get anywhere by passing this amendment today, even if it is probably my preferred option. But I think this is where we are.

I will give way.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Sir, I am grateful to Deputy Leadbeater for giving way.

1675 I just wanted to go back to his earlier point because I wonder if he has had the same experience as I have had. I have worked for many years, before becoming a Deputy, on projects where schools were upgraded and maintained and there was work done on them. Actually I have some sympathy with his point about the figure that Deputy Fallaize has quoted, because often these things are over specified.

1680 Would he agree with me that there is a history, a culture within the States especially with school maintenance that there is deliberate ploy sometimes to run sites down and then the work that is done is not the right work? The right work is not prioritised.

I have worked on La Mare de Carteret, I have worked at the old St Sampson's, and actually the work that was prioritised to me seemed ridiculous – it was cosmetic work when actually structural  
1685 work was needed like roof repairs that sort of thing, windows being replaced. The old Beaucamps School was the same actually. If that work had been done at the right time those schools would still be quite serviceable.

So there has been a history to this, and not a very happy or very truthful history, that things have been run down on purpose sometimes in order to say they need a lot of money spent on  
1690 them and they need to be replaced. Does Deputy Leadbeater agree with me on that issue?

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Sir, I thank Deputy Laurie Queripel for his interjection and I wholeheartedly agree with everything he has just said.

We can look at La Mare de Carteret, for example, and in 2016 we spent £180,000 putting a new  
1695 roof on it and it was a new roof that was designed to last for 30 years, but the building was only going to be up for a few years. I was on the Education Committee when that happened and it was something that was a decision of the former Committee and not of our Committee and it was something that I actually tried to stop at that time, but at that time I was –

I will give way to Deputy Inder.

1700 **Deputy Inder:** I am fairly sure he will remember conversations we had when he had left the Committee and I joined the Committee, that we had worryingly cynical views of the figures that were coming out based around the Grammar School; and would he also possibly remember that all of these buildings do actually have maintenance programmes?

1705 He might also remember that the Grammar School had a five-year building programme of which I think they are two-thirds through, to finish the actual roofing space. He might also remember that the main three issues were the roof, which has probably been done by now if it is

1710 not nearly completed; changing the windows from single-glazed to possibly triple-glazed; and if I remember correctly there was some main issue with the heating in the building. Those were the three main issues, most of which have probably started to be maintained, because any sensible landlord would of course be running a very sensible maintenance programme. They just do not let these lie. And I know in the Grammar School they actually have been working on these.

1715 So would he agree with me that the figure quoted to us and to Deputy Fallaize is probably a little bit 'questionable', if nothing else?

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Yes, I certainly would agree with that.

The discussions I had with the architect, going back to the Les Varendes site – I am not going to give way at the moment.

1720 We talked about several things. Look at the Prison, for example, it is a similar age, a little bit younger the air-con units have just had to be replaced there, and that is something that might have to be done at the Grammar School. The Grammar School is not operated 24/7 like the Prison, but if you equate it is slightly older –

**Deputy Merrett:** Can I have a point of order please, sir?

1725

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of order, Deputy Merrett.

**Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, sir,

1730 My concern, sir, is that we are bringing into disrepute the members of the Civil Service that are giving us figures based on credibility. If Members are then going to say – I cannot remember the terminology – the figures given to Members, the figures that Deputy Fallaize has quoted, to then say and that I cannot remember the terminology that Deputy Inder used, sir, but they have been given to us by the civil servants who we employ to give us as much accurate data as possible and I think it is disrespectful to imply that they are – I cannot remember the terminology that Deputy Inder used, but that they are deliberately misleading.

1735

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett can you explain to me which Rule of Procedure you say Deputy Leadbeater has broken?

1740 **Deputy Merrett:** Point of order?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** That is why I am looking at Rule 17(10) which says a point of order may be raised only for the purpose of drawing attention to a breach of a Rule of Procedure, which is why I am asking which Rule you are saying Deputy Leadbeater has broken.

1745

**Deputy Merrett:** I apologise, sir, if I have used the wrong Rule. My concern was bringing – I think I have explained my concern, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater to continue, please.

1750

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Thank you, sir.

1755 Yes, I do agree with Deputy Inder and Deputy Laurie Queripel and what they were saying about costs of some of these things. I think some of these figures are pulled out of the air sometimes. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It would take a lot of money to accurately cost these things and often probably officers do not have time, so they will put a best guess on something and that becomes that figure and it stays at that.

As Deputy Inder says maybe you could upgrade the glazing units, there may be things like that but the main structure of the building is fit for purpose. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) This is the point I am making (*Interjection*)

1760        Regardless of that, getting back to the amendment, and I think on this amendment, the educational option on this is a good one, but I still cannot support it because we need to pause and review just as the Requête says, and do a full and proper options appraisal and take the educationalists and the public along with us.

Thank you, sir.

1765

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

**Deputy Green:** Sir, thank you very much. I shall be brief.

1770        This amendment is strongly tempting. It is a pragmatic compromise and I like the idea of three 11-18 schools. I have already voted twice in this debate for pragmatic compromises which have both lost. So I can definitely see the merit of this and I think as Deputy le Tocq mentioned when he opened this debate the idea of three 11-18 schools in a hard federation I think can work; and I agree with an awful lot of the good sense that Deputy Parkinson talked about in this context as well.

1775        But it is not without problems and we know from some of the feedback, certainly some of the feedback I have had about this from teaching staff, that the idea of splitting the sixth form three ways is widely seen as problematic.

1780        But I also think there is merit in the argument that we have heard again and again in this debate, which is that by seeking to prescribe a model on the floor of this Assembly we do not know where that is actually going to lead us. Trying to design something in the context in which we find ourselves, where the biggest allegation being made against the States is that we have not conducted proper consultation and that we have not engaged effectively with stakeholders – to basically impose this model, notwithstanding its obvious merits, and its strongly tempting to vote for it nonetheless, that will probably not end well.

1785        So I am thinking very seriously about supporting this amendment but something holds me back and it is that argument about (*Interjection*) the folly of potentially designing something on the floor of the Assembly that will in the end get us no further forward.

1790        So I think it is a difficult one, it is a pragmatic compromise. I have already supported two pragmatic compromises so far both of those have lost, but I am sorely tempted to support this one again.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

**Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, sir.

1795        This amendment, if it was a letter and it said 'Dear Members of Education, Sport & Culture, would you consider the following as part of if the Requête is successful because this is an option which is worth considering?' If it was a letter being sent to Education, Sport & Culture I would support it. But it is not, it is a dictating one again designing on the floor of the Assembly what this States believes should be the right option. That is not what we are being asked to do.

1800        We are being asked by the union and I listened to the union this morning on the radio – I am happy to give way to Deputy Le Tocq.

1805        **Deputy Le Tocq:** Yes, I fully accept some of what Deputy Lowe is saying and others have said that this is in a sense deciding something here that we should be instructing the Committee to do. But when we do that, we never agree with the Committee when it comes back. Deputy Lowe was one of those that supported the Torode amendment, which was the one that was laid at the last minute on the floor of this Assembly to get rid of the plans in 2001 and build a sixth-form centre. So she has got skin in the game I am afraid.

1810        **Deputy Lowe:** Thank you.



It does not take away the fact that on Deputy Le Tocq's amendment, sir, through you, it says very clearly

To agree [at] the earliest date practicable, secondary and post-16 education shall be organised as follows ...

1815 That is not going out to consultation; that is directing Education, Sport & Culture to do it. That is fine if you want to convince 20 Members in this Assembly to go down this route of dictating it, and it will not even be the 20 because Deputy Fallaize has been very open he will support this and when it becomes a substantive Proposition he will vote against it, so the one-school two sites still sits there. So it is a bit of a farce and it is fake I think to actually support something in the full knowledge that you are going to throw it out when it is a substantive Proposition.

1820 So for me this is actually again dictating on the floor of the States exactly what we have asked as selected Members not to do; to take your staff with you.

1825 Listening to the unions this morning and it is interesting isn't it, because I have heard things said about unions this morning – suddenly the unions, that is it, that is right. I can remember when the unions came out in November and said that they did not support what was actually happening, there was no doubt some Members in here and indeed outside who actually pooh-poohed it a bit – that is the unions, that is the unions. The bombshell came when the letters arrived with over 95% of the teachers own names on it saying that actually they do not support the one-school two sites in its current format and how it will work, because they do not support it. Then we had the other schools actually wrote as well.

1830 So as I said yesterday, and I do not want to repeat it all, but we are talking of a few members of staff here that are not happy we are talking of over 90% of the staff. Working with them, going forward and listening to the unions this morning who have that very strong backing of the teachers, actually saying please do not design it on the floor of the Assembly again, this is why we are here now in this situation because –

1835 **Deputy Dorey:** Point of correction.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Dorey.

1840 **Deputy Dorey:** Sir, the figures for Beaucamps, and this 90% is consistently being repeated, is that it is only 52.4% of these staff who said they supported the letter from the St Sampson staff, because a whole lot of them did not vote, there is 70% of those who voted but there is a whole other group who did not vote, so you could only say 52.4% supported it not 90%.

1845 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe to continue.

**Deputy Lowe:** It was over 90% of St Sampson's.

1850 I mean, as a Member of Education, Sport & Culture it is entirely a matter for you and then for all individual Members in here to either listen to the people that are under your remit or not, that is entirely a matter for you. Personally I am very comfortable with the information that we have had given to us as letters and of the numbers that we have had provided. It is not for me to go back and challenge that because I just take it in all good faith that it is right.

1855 So Deputy Le Tocq said this was a compromise we are going round in circles. Well, we are only going round in circles because P&R keep coming up with more amendments. Instead of going round and round in circles let's just support the Requête, get on with it, and allow Education, Sport & Culture –

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, point of correction.

1860 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** To clarify it is not a P&R amendment.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe to continue.

1865 **Deputy Lowe:** Two Members of P&R have produced this amendment. So, yes, we are going round in circles. (*Interjection*)

By producing amendments like this and amendments coming up at the eleventh hour, that is exactly what happened when it was coming to this States to build La Mare – a last-minute amendment by Deputy St Pier to go from four schools to three schools, if you look at it this is what actually started it many years ago. And then we had the one-school, two-site thing. It is just always on the floor of the Assembly that this sort of thing happens and it is not good. It is not good practice; it is not for us to design an education system on the floor of the Assembly.

1870  
1875 So for me listening, as I said before, the potential of a strike action I think needs to be taken seriously. It was said in here yesterday, it has been repeated on the radio this morning, so it is not just hearsay amongst ourselves. I heard it myself this morning on the radio and I think we need to take heed of that, I really do.

Now, Deputy Merrett was asking questions of Deputy Parkinson. I mean, talk about minutiae and designing it on the floor of Assembly, that is exactly what we should not be doing. We should not be asking questions of the floor of the Assembly: how it is going to work; who is going to go to what school; what lessons are going to be in the school; will they have to be transferred if there are too many? That is not the way to design a school here.

1880  
1885 So, sir, I ask that this amendment is actually rejected and that we stay focused on what is before us today, because to support an amendment and then to throw it out at the substantive Proposition – I will come to you – right at the very end, I do not think is very good practice and I certainly would not want to be part of that –

I will give way to Deputy Tooley.

**Deputy Tooley:** I thank Deputy Lowe for giving way.

1890 I am just a little bit concerned at the inference that because we hear it on the radio it must be true. (*Laughter*) Both last night at 5.35 p.m. and this morning at quarter to seven the BBC ran a retraction of something they had put on the radio the day before and that morning about me which was *not* true. So just because we have heard it on the radio does not mean it is true.

Thank you.

1895 **Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, Deputy Tooley, but you are talking about yourself. This gentleman was live on the radio so it was not a reporter it was actually the gentleman himself speaking live on the radio.

I therefore ask Members to reject this amendment.

1900 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States we will now adjourn until 2.30 p.m.

When we come back this afternoon can I just remind Members not to address one another directly, please?

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.32 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

**Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education –  
Debate continued**

1905 **The Greffier:** Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – continuation of debate on amendment 7.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

1910 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you sir.  
I still intend to refrain from saying most of the things I want to say about education models and the right way forward, until later on, when we get into the meat of the debate. But there are a couple of things I do need to say at this stage. In a moment I will get into what this amendment should be about, which is the pros and cons of three 11-18 colleges operating as one school. But during the course of debate on this particular amendment, there have been some very odd things  
1915 said and I want to just highlight some of them.

Deputy Prow, earlier on, urged us to reject this amendment and vote for the Requête unamended for two reasons, because he thought the majority of teachers thought the two-school model was just unworkable. I do not agree that is true and I will come to that in a minute, but that was one of his reasons. Then he, joined by Deputy Smithies later on, said the best way to deal with  
1920 this idea, from Deputy Le Tocq, is that if you vote through the Requête unamended it can be considered at that stage.

It is all very odd, because actually the Requête unamended leaves the two-school model absolutely front and centre of the considerations. It is the one model that absolutely has to come forward for consideration, with some others for comparators. By contrast it absolutely excludes  
1925 the model that has been put forward in this amendment by Deputy Le Tocq because, and I quote from Proposition 2:

... must include a comprehensive comparison of the structure and implementation of the 1 school on 2 sites plan with other viable models of non-selective educational delivery in Guernsey previously presented to and considered by the Committee ...

Now, I can tell Members that this is not an option that has previously been presented to and considered by the Committee. I am not here to advocate on behalf of three 11-18 schools, but do not think that, if you vote through the Requête unamended it can be given consideration as part  
1930 of that process. It is specifically outwith the process that will follow.

I also want to say a word about unions. It seems that at times this morning, and maybe yesterday, that we want to outsource the Government of Guernsey to unions. I think we already do far too much of that with the employer groups and I do not want to certainly go down the route of doing it with unions as well.

1935 Of course everybody wants to talk to stakeholders. Of course everybody wants to address their concerns where possible. But unions do not have a veto. Almost every big educational reform in the UK over the last 40 years has been done in the teeth of opposition from the unions. Every time an Education Minister has gone to a union conference, where there is any kind of reform going on, they are howled at.

1940 There would have been none of those reforms in the UK if the government of Britain had said 'We cannot do anything if the unions do not agree.' And yet many of those reforms – not all of them have been wise – but by and large education since the 1970s has moved forward and become far better in the UK. So, sorry, I am not anti-union. I am not usually accused of coming with that political stripe at all. But I do think they have a role and their role is not to have a veto  
1945 over the policies of Government. We even went as far this morning ...

Sorry, I think this debate is going to go on for days and I do not intend to give way. If I have said something incorrect, then of course anybody can raise a point of correction. We were even told by Deputy Lowe this morning that we really consider doing a policy U-turn because of the

1950 effect of strike action by unions. My goodness, if that is going to be our stance in all areas of policy in the future, you cannot make changes to the Dairy, you cannot make changes –  
No, I told you, I am not giving way to anybody.

**Deputy Lowe:** It is a point of correction.

1955 **Deputy Roffey:** Okay, well you should say that.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Lowe.

1960 **Deputy Lowe:** I did not say do a U-turn at all. I actually said a 'pause and reflect'. They may come back with one school, two sites.

1965 **Deputy Roffey:** I will look up Hansard, but the indication is quite clear, we should be taking very seriously this threat of strike action and the implication was, therefore, we should not press ahead with the approved policy of this Assembly and I think that is a really dangerous precedent to set. If we start going down that route then Guernsey will be really going to hell in a handcart.

1970 Deputy Inder was rejoicing just what he had heard a Mr Wayne Bates say on the radio this morning, that if the Requête is passed unamended, the unions will immediately sit down with us, explain where they think we can move forward and how it is better. As if that has not been happening. We became aware of the concerns of some of the teachers back in October and we have had a whole series of meetings with the unions, sometimes just Members of ESC, sometimes jointly with P&R, because of the funding implications and then, after a while, the politicians got out of their hair and let our senior staff get on with talking with the unions.

1975 There was a huge list of what the teachers' concerns were, or the members of the unions – not every teacher is, but by and large they are. We have worked through that, systematically trying where possible, where reasonable, to actually address those concerns. Now the unions are quite clear, they are urging you to support the Requête because we have not gone far enough in meeting their demands. Fine.

But those demands, certainly those that are related to the States –

1980 **Deputy Inder:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Inder.

1985 **Deputy Inder:** According to the union letter of 25th February, it does not mention the word 'demands' at all. Deputy Roffey might be misinterpreting the message. I will read it out for clarity. What they say is:

That ESC had not made sufficient strides to address their concerns about the implementation of the 'one school, two site model' for them to have confidence in the plans that are being progressed so that educational outcomes would be improved;

There is nothing in that message, on 25th February, that says anything about union demands. Thank you, sir.

1990 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey to continue.

1995 **Deputy Roffey:** No, but that is a very useful quote, because it highlights the word 'implementation', rather than the concerns over the model itself. (**Deputy Inder:** It is not demands.) That is something that I am going to be coming on to in just a second.

I have to say, if we had conceded every single request, then, if that is a nicer word than demand, the cost to this Assembly and the taxpayer would have been ginormous. Okay, it would

have given us an easier ride; we might not have been here today discussing this. But would it have been responsible Government? I do not believe that it would have been. But where we could, we did.

2000        Actually, there were a lot of different concerns, but they mainly revolved around two operational issues and the size of the schools. The two operational issues were enrichment, where it was quite clear that the teachers were not convinced that that was a good thing to do. My first stakeholders in this respect are the young people themselves. Thirty per cent – and there is no politically correct way of saying this – it is the poorest, by and large, 30% of youngsters in this Island do not get the access to the sporting activities, the musical activities, the drama activities

2005        that most children in this Island do.

          One of the reasons we are doing this, and actually re-investing £1 million out of the savings out of the consolidation of the two schools, back into enrichment, which by the way brought a lot more teachers on board, that was the outline programme business plan that was sold and accepted, one of the reasons we have had to make sure that every child in this Island enjoyed that opportunity.

2010

          I am sorry if I did not just give in to that request, back away, and say, 'We are not going to do that then.' But it is actually very important and if you think back it was an important reason why this Assembly backed these reforms, because they thought that was a very good thing.

2015        There were also huge concerns over the organisation of lunchtimes. Now I have to say, people have said we have not listened to the experts. Deputy Inder was saying, 'I am not a teacher, so I need teachers more expert than me,' The real experts in organising school days efficiently are school leaders. So I say back to Members that say, 'you are not listening to the teachers', you are not either listening to the school leaders about the best way to organise the school day and sometimes it will not be universally popular amongst the staff. Sorry.

2020

          But, by far the biggest suite of concerns that were brought up in those meetings was the desire to see more space. I have already said that would be very expensive but if that is a real thing that they want addressed, frankly they are far better off holding off, going for our amendment, which will at least make sure we do not spend the money on delay but actually put it in where it would be really useful in providing extra facilities.

2025

          Sir, I do not doubt that there is widespread and quite deep concern, anxiety and agitation amongst the teaching staff, but I do not believe that it is actually, or those being expressed as such, outright opposition to the two-school model. There are three reasons I have for saying that. The first one is the timing of it. We agreed that more than two years ago. If that concept was something that worried them, they would have been agitating an awful lot earlier than now, as opposed to the implementation and the organisation of the school day and the amount of the size of the schools.

2030

          Secondly, because actually quite a lot of numbers, this is a sad thing to say, quite a few teachers have contacted me to say that they support what they are doing, but actually they feel really intimidated about saying so. I have said to them, 'But you tell your pupils do not give into peer pressure.' That is the last thing you should do. They said, 'Yes, I know, you are right, but it is just really awkward at the moment.'

2035

          I do not doubt that the majority have concerns but I do not think it is quite as black and white as being portrayed. I have another reason for saying that, because of our meeting with unions. Although there was no Chatham House rules, I am not going to go into exactly what was said, but the one picture that was made absolutely clear was it is not actually the model, this Requête is a vehicle for addressing some of our concerns about its implementation and trying to force P&R to open their wallets a bit more so we get the facilities that we want, going forward. That is the sort of message that we were getting.

2040

2045        Public opinion is another matter and I will revert to that in just a few minutes. But first of all I want to come on to the substance of this amendment. I have to say that three 11-18 schools would be very sub-optimal. I think Deputy Le Tocq himself has accepted that. Of course it could be done. Of course the Varendes site, which by the way we have had no ideological wish to get rid

2050 of, it was an absolutely impartial, dispassionate assessment of actually about nine sites – the four existing schools and five other places – done by professionals with a scoring chart to come out with the best one. The Varendes just did not happen to come out on it. There was nothing vindictive about it whatsoever.

2055 But if we did use it, we could have Brock College to go with Victor Hugo College and de Saumarez College, of course we could. The sixth forms would be too small by and large. Could they be made to work? Yes, there are other successful 11-18 schools about this size. Fewer of them, but they are larger size. Choice would be a bit more restricted. The core A-level subjects could be done in every college, teachers would probably have to move between the sites, there would have to be a federation. It would probably not be ideal, and you would have probably a slight restriction, even with the ‘peripetatic’ ... Oh, the A-level teachers that move a bit! (*Laughter*)  
 2060 ... going around. There would still probably be slightly less choice than there would be in the two-school model.

Equally important is that the 11-16 elements would really be rather too small. Let’s not think of this peak in 2025, let’s think about the longer-term forecasts. For the two-school model, we are talking about 1,150 in each school, 11-18. So obviously it is going to be under 800, when you are  
 2065 talking about three schools. But that is 11-18. By the time you have taken out the sixth-formers, if you can still call them that, years 12 and 13, I think I am meant to call them now, but that is what they are, sixth-formers, you are down to about 600 size for the 11-16 element.

It is sub-optimal in the long-term, I have to say. It will probably mean less ability to set or set deeply or set in as many subjects and it will probably mean slightly restricted combinations of  
 2070 subject choices. But can it be done? Of course it can be done. It will be more expensive. If the people of Guernsey *really* want small schools rather than average size schools and they want to pay more for it, of course they can do that. Nobody is saying no. But do not expect so much money to be left over to spend on health care or other things.

But the real problem I see with this amendment is that it takes us back to a position even  
 2075 earlier in the process than we were 25 months ago, when the States signed off the two 11-18 schools – or one school in two 11-18 colleges. So they were talking about a delay of two or three years, probably three years. If it was a delay when we were about to start implementing the two 11-18 schools, that would be a problem, but if it was a delay when you were part way through doing it, it creates all sorts of problems for the first stakeholder here and the first stakeholder is  
 2080 not the States and it is not the teachers, it is the pupils, and for the pupils that are already going through the system this will be a major problem.

So I think it is a valiant attempt to find a compromise, a valiant attempt to appease – although I doubt it would – the section of our community that are angry about the current proposals. But I am torn between whether to vote for this amendment and, no political gains, I say now if I vote  
 2085 for this amendment and it passes, I will vote for the next amendment to try and push it out again because it is better, or to vote for it because it is a bit better than the *awful* proposals in the Requête, unamended, which will send us back into the wilderness almost. Or whether to say, ‘Actually, let’s just play it straight, let’s just go for what I really want and see what comes of it’.

But why are all these attempts to placate, all these amendments to placate to say, ‘Sorry, we  
 2090 got it wrong, the Island is angry, we need to do something about it’ – why are they coming forward? I think they are because of a false impression. I am not convinced that the people of Guernsey are by and large against what we are proposing to do. Certainly, claims like ‘This is the biggest level of opposition that Guernsey have ever seen’, are stuff and nonsense. I mean, it is not in the top 10!

2095 Fort George, a bit before my day, but I have heard about it, I have read about it. The thing to sign – the petition – was twice the size of this one; back in the day when you could not do it online and had to actually go and write it out physically with a biro and when the population was an awful lot smaller than it is now. So it was absolutely much larger.

2100 We were talking about pensions yesterday. When the stamp became compulsory, when it was not a voluntary thing to actually take out an Old Age Pension but you were made to, the Island

was almost going back to our French roots – we were going to have revolution on the streets and things being blocked.

2105 I remember as a teenager, there were not so many cars in Guernsey in those days, but just about every car had ‘Say no to Beau Sejour’ written across the top. It was early days, so they were only made of paper, but there were stickers everywhere. The Island was furious, and Deputy Brown lost his seat as a result. Sorry, I am not trying to draw any inferences at all, but he did.

2110 It is hard to say poor old Conseiller Chilcott, isn’t it ..., Conseiller Chilcott and Conseiller Morgan, when they are going around trying to sell compulsory health insurance for secondary health care. Even though people, when they went into hospital, were being bankrupted by having a minor operation and they wanted to do something about it, it was, ‘My health, my choice’. It was being chanted and in meeting after meeting they were being shouted down. That was real opposition, I tell you, compared with what we have seen in the last few weeks this is probably more angry – I think that is probably social media – but it certainly is not anything on the same scale.

2115 Then there was abortion. I brought in a *Press* in today, I will pass it around afterwards. This was just one of a series of public meetings. It was an absolutely packed school hall, people leaning in from the side, the *Press* estimated at 500 and the only reason it was only 500 is because a load of people could not get in. Deputy Lowe said that is different because on that stage there were people writing to us on both sides. Has she not noticed, sir, that is exactly what has been happening on these?

2120 And, actually, the majority of them that are in favour are coming, I think, from people with children in the system. They are very articulate. They are saying, ‘What is going to happen to my child, please tell me?’ I cannot give them an answer, certainly not if the *Requête* goes through unamended and actually certainly not under this particular, I am afraid – although it is a valiant attempt more certainty, but I still cannot answer that question if this amendment goes through.

2125 Really I have seen more ribbons, they were blue, and I have seen bigger marches and I have seen bigger protests outside the States. There are probably 5,000, 10,000, maybe 12,000 or 15,000 people in this Island very angry. They are and that feels enormous. But I genuinely believe the majority are saying – if we go out here and pass this *Requête* or pass this amendment – they are going to say, ‘Goodness, the States of indecision have done that again. What has happened to our kids in the system? I really do despair’.

2130 You always hear more from the antis than you do from the pros. People do not march through the streets saying, ‘I am broadly in favour of Government policy!’ But they do when they get angry. So I do think we need to put this in place. Angry? Yes. Sizeable? Yes. Overwhelming? No. I think the question for us today is: is Guernsey governable? Because if we send people away with this *Requête* as stated, or even with this amendment, when things come back there will be an awful lot of angry people.

2140 We will therefore say, ‘Cannot do it, there are angry people there’, and we will be going around this mulberry bush forever. For goodness’ sake, I thought we had the courage of our convictions twice on this and actually, when we get onto the next amendment, I will tell you why we did, because it is actually a darned good system that delivers really good improvements for our children. But this is not the time to do it. What I will say is it is time to actually get a decision over the next couple of days and not go back to the drawing board.

2145 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

2150 I am just going to pick a few points, to start with, from Deputy Roffey’s speech: why did the teachers not complain earlier issue. I think he will agree with me the nature of the Guernseyman seems to be that we wait to the eleventh hour to express our concerns and that has been certainly what I have found over the last few years of the States. It is always at the very end that we actually then eventually come out and express exactly what we want.

2155 Deputy Roffey says if we pass this amendment it will take us back two years. I am not too sure how long it will take us if the pause and review goes through. But I do not think he is quite right because I do not think, if we carry on with the two-school model, it is more a question of when it is going to crash, not if.

So I think even if you walk away today and we end up with a one-school, two-site model, the original, which has been to the States twice, I do not think it will survive much past September this year. That is my thought.

2160 He may well be right that it may take a bit of time to work up proposals for a one school and three colleges, it will be quicker than waiting until September or October or November to then get the pencil out; or even again if the pause and review is successful, we will start then in this debating Chamber going through all the different permutations of which schools we can have.

2165 I think Deputy McSwiggan made a very interesting comment yesterday and it resonated with me. It was we all need our comfort blankets at certain times and some of us need more comfort blankets than others; and some of them, especially the ones who sit on the fences, seem to have some very big comfort blankets underneath their posteriors.

**Deputy McSwiggan:** Point of correction, sir.

2170

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy McSwiggan.

**Deputy McSwiggan:** I would like to disown that comment. I am fairly sure I never said it. It may well be right, but I do not think it was mine!

2175

**Deputy Brouard:** I am pretty sure it was yours about comfort blankets. We all use comfort blankets from time to time. I think the comfort blanket of, 'Actually I am not too sure what to do now and therefore let's send us around the circle again and do the pause and review,' is an easy one to do. It pushes the can down the road. It does not really get us anywhere further forward.

2180 I will eventually vote for that because I do not think that the two-site, one-school model is sustainable. I just do not think the size of those schools for Guernsey is appropriate at this time, or at least for the next few years. It may be in 20 years' or 30 years' time, things may be different then. But I do not think Guernsey is ready for two very large schools. Certainly, the teachers are saying they are not ready for it. The residents around the area are saying that they are not ready for it. I do not think our society is ready for that.

2185 I have learned a few things over my time in the States. Not a great deal, but I have learned a few things, and one of them has been that the school has to be 11-18. That is it. It has to be 11-18 and that has to be so because I am advised that attracts the best quality teachers who can then teach across a breadth of subjects and also it means that the children in those schools can aspire to go to the sixth form and it gives equal provision in each of the colleges, and that is where I probably disagreed with Deputy de Lisle yesterday with his idea of three schools, but one of them having the sixth form.

2190 I am working on the provision of a 'Langlois Law' for some of the things that Deputy Langlois says, because he comes up with some very good tables and charts and you get to a stage where we are not going to have one college on one site. That is not going to happen, I am pretty sure. I do not think we can survive with one school on two sites. I do not think, I think we have moved from four schools or four colleges, so therefore you are then drawn, there is nowhere else to go, except three colleges one school.

2200 Then what does that school look like and you follow the matrix really. It then comes down to do you want to have the school in unequal parts? Do you want them equal? When you say actually you want them all to be fair and offer the broadest curriculum they can but with equality, you then have to make it an 11-18; and once you have done that you are now looking for three sites to put your schools and suddenly, lo and behold, you end up with – you can go for other



2205 places – I would venture to suggest you are at the Varendes, you are at Beaucamps and you are at St Sampson’s High. So that is where we are and it almost falls, almost by ‘Langlois Law’, into place.

I have moved over time. I have not got as far as a two-school model yet. Perhaps my grandchildren might do but I certainly have not. But I have moved. I did originally, like my colleague next to me want to have La Mare rebuilt. I have lost that debate. I appreciate that. So I have moved and I will now happily put my hand to a three-school model.

2210 But there also has to be one school and I do appreciate that it has to be one school on different sites, and I think you need to have someone with the ability, and I think this was the point that Deputy Parkinson brought out this morning and my colleague Deputy Le Tocq, you need to have somebody in charge of that school who can move teachers around, make sure the curriculum works between the three schools and that it works for the pupils as well.

2215 Now there are compromises. You cannot be in all places at all times and you might be doing physics, maths and chemistry, as we said earlier, but if the Spanish is at the same time as the chemistry, unless you are Hermione Grainger from Hogwarts, you are just not going to be able to do it. And that has always been the case. I hate it when people go back to their school days, but it was the same in my school days. I had to do something called economics because geography clashed on the timetable and I could not do geography.

2220 From my point of view, for our children’s education, the main thing we seem to forget sometimes is we need to get the core subjects through. It is the core subjects that we need to get people reading, writing and arithmetic, both at primary and also to be able to access the curriculum in the secondary school as well. So as long as each of the schools, which they can do, under the Le Tocq model, we can have the main core curriculum available on those three schools.

2225 Some people say it is not for us to design the school. Who is it then? Do we do referendums? What more information could you possibly want, and this goes back to the comfort blanket? How many more times do you want to look at the different piles of paper? How many more reviews do you want? How many more consultants?

2230 You will still have that conundrum. You cannot fix every single part to make it perfect for everyone, whether that is the unions, the teachers, the caretaker, the length of grass in the field, the amount of flooding or whether Mrs Le Page’s cat is likely to be able to cross the road easily. There is a myriad amount of different issues that you could take into account. But we are not going to be able to please everybody all the time.

2235 This is where we are going to end up, is my view. You could have that belief that you would have this goal of a one-school, two-site model. I think that is as far as it will get. I do not think we will ever get there. We will spend a lot of time arguing it if we end up – which is fine – with the pause and review, eventually we will end up there.

2240 What we are saying is take some control. You know all the answers. You know all the questions, start to put it together. And when you do that, using the Langlois model, you come up to: you cannot have four schools, you cannot have two, you cannot really have two-and-a-half so you end up at three. Once you have decided that you are going to have three it becomes pretty simple that those three have to be 11-18 schools.

2245 It has got to be doable as well. Again, we could have many fantasies and dreams but if they are not going to have any chance of reality. If the person you are talking to just does not want it, they just do not want it. So we have to be cognisant that at the moment the Island does not want one-school, two-sites.

2250 I personally do not think it is right for the Island. I am more in favour of smaller schools. These are not small schools, these are quite nice, reasonable-sized schools. An 850-950 size school is a very reasonable school. At least you have got a chance to compete against somebody. I mean every time you have a football match, it will be Brock against Saumarez or whatever is it – oh, what is it next week? Oh, it is Saumarez against Brock (**A Member:** Rangers and Celtic.) At least you would have three of them to be able to choose from.

2255 One thing I just want to touch on is Proposition 5 and I know our amendment was not read out, but I just want to read the amendment through, Proposition 5 says:

To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to return –

I know, it is dreaded, is it not?

– to the States before the end of 2020 with costings for secondary and post-16 education organised in accordance with Proposition 2 –

– which is the three-school model

– and those extant resolutions of the States that are not rescinded by Proposition 1.

2260 So do not think this is a *fait accompli*. I would like to think it was, but it is not. You will have the chance of having your comfort blanket again and nothing will happen more than a lot of planning and work. But you will still have the option to sign it off, if you are still here later this year. It is not as though we are abandoning it and if they find that there are absolutely terrible things that they just could not possibly solve, no doubt that will come out in the report that Education, Sport & Culture bring back to us. I will give way to the President of Sport & Culture ... Education.

2265 **Deputy Fallaize:** Actually, we could quite just keep it at that! I thank Deputy Brouard for that.

2270 I accept that what he is saying is correct in the sequence of events, what would unfold next if the amendment became Resolutions, but could he just advise, this is a genuine question and I would be interested in his answer, what he thinks the Committee should do with the transitional arrangements for students in the meantime while that work was going on? Or perhaps best not to describe them in that way, as transitional arrangements, but the admission arrangements for students entering secondary schools? Because at the moment the admission arrangements from this September and going forward are known – the movements of the school, the students, between the sites are known, although only about 10% or 12% of the students are having to move site.

2275 But during this period while details are being worked up, and we know that that could take 18 months or longer, based on working up previous models, what does Deputy Brouard imagine should be communicated to parents about the admission of their children to secondary school?

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you. A very interesting one.

2280 First of all, I have not got the data to know exactly where every student is going from September and I am sure Education does. How much variance will have to happen if you have a three-school model compared to a two-school model I do not have that information. It may be very simple, it may be quite complex. That is something that I would leave for Education to bring forward.

2285 All the children will be going to a school. We have enough schools and we have enough buildings and we have enough teachers. You could either carry on with your existing model that you are planning for but my personal view is we are not going to end up – some people may wish to and I appreciate the States have voted twice for it – but I do not think we are going to end up with one-school, two sites. So I would start to be planning now how we can make the best of one school and three sites.

2290 I think from a Guernsey perspective the size of schools at 850-930 would be acceptable. They are also reasonably spread across the Island from the point of view of catchment area. The three schools also puts a lot of the issues with regard to traffic and moving children around in a much easier position, because you do not have the high concentrations that we will have if we have the two-college issue. I will give way.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Nobody is standing, Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, yes I was. It was kind of me. I do not think that, given the concentration of where these schools are, it will make much difference to the traffic at all.

2300

**Deputy Brouard:** That may well be your opinion but unfortunately I have a different opinion. I think having three schools about a mile and a half apart, each of them, because you are not dropping off 1,300 pupils outside of St Sampson's, you are not dropping off 1,300 pupils outside of Beaucamps, you will be now looking at about 850 at each of the three sites. That amount can make a tremendous amount of difference, because it is that extra piece that then clogs everything up. I will give way to Deputy Merrett.

2305

**Deputy Merrett:** Thank you Deputy Brouard.

So as we are onto traffic again, I do not quite understand why we are, but we are. This is where we are. If there were siblings and these three different colleges had three different offerings and I decided I needed to take one sibling to one school and one to another, arguably there would be more traffic because I am doing a journey three times to three different schools, or potentially two different schools.

2310

So I think the key point Deputy Brouard was making was about concentration of traffic, meaning trying to get a huge or a large number of students to a particular place at a particular time. I think that was the argument Deputy Brouard was trying to make, it was on concentration of the timing of the movement of students.

2315

I actually do believe that in debate we should be able to question Members and I did ask Deputy Parkinson, he said potentially they would need to move between the sites during the day. So there would still be movement of traffic, it just will not be as concentrated. I think, for clarity, that was what Deputy Brouard was trying to say?

2320

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you very much. Yes, the concentration will not be as great at nine o'clock or whenever the children now go to school.

2325

I think I have said quite enough. *(Laughter)* I urge you to seriously consider this amendment. My fear is that we will end up here, but after a lot more angst and pain. But if it does not succeed, then I will probably end up voting for the pause and review.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

2330

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, thank you.

One of my colleagues said in his speech yesterday they were depressed. I was sorry to hear that. In contrast to that, I can honestly say I am certainly not depressed today. In fact, I am absolutely ecstatic. So much so in fact I am wearing my smiley face tie!

2335

The reason that I am feeling so ecstatic is because of this amendment that is in front of us today. I am delighted to see this amendment in front of us today. I applaud Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Brouard for laying it and I have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting it, even though I am a signatory on the Requête.

I went along to a presentation that was staged by the Committee, along with education professionals, last Friday. It was an excellent presentation. I just want to put on record my thanks to those professionals, for allowing me to stay on for another one-and-a-half hours after that two-hour presentation. **(A Member: Lines!)** *(Laughter)*

2340

But I appreciated that, sir, because that meant that I could ask the questions I had not been able to ask in the presentation. But what it meant for them was that they only half an hour to grab a quick sandwich before the next presentation, so I really am very grateful to them for staying. In that one-and-a-half hours, one of the questions I asked was, 'Can you tell me your views on our introducing a one-school, three-college model here in the Island, as opposed to a one-school, two-college model?'

2345

2350 Now there were several reasons given to me why the professionals felt that a one-school, three-college model would not be the best model for the Island. Deputy Fallaize focused on several of those earlier on, when he spoken on this amendment. It was because of all those reasons explained to me I did not pursue an amendment seeking to introduce the one-school, three-college model here in the Island, which is why I am delighted to see it in front of us today.

2355 So why do I think the one-school, three-college model is the best model for Guernsey? Well, the answer to that is I have several concerns about the one-school, two-college model, and I simply do not see those problems arising if we move to a one-school, three-college model. I honestly do not think that the one-school, two-college model is going to be the best model for our children, for their parents, for their teachers, for our environment, for our infrastructure or for our community.

2360 So I am looking at this holistically, because I believe we should look at every issue holistically. At this point, sir, I think it is important to say that I have lost count of the amount of times I have heard politicians say the sky will fall in and the world will come to an end if we go down this route. The reality is the sky does not fall in. It is not going to fall in and the world is not going to come to an end, despite our being told that is what is going to happen.

2365 I am an avid reader of the *Guernsey Press*. It is the only way I can keep up with everything that is happening in local politics! (*Laughter*) On the front page of the *Press*, published on 24th February, readers were told that delaying the implementation of the one school across two colleges model will cost taxpayers up to £11 million. That was a claim made in the financial impact assessment compiled by ESC.

2370 In response to that claim, I put on record I do not care how much it costs. What I do care about is doing what I think is right for the children of the Island and for our community. The waste debate went on for 20 years and cost the taxpayer £20 million. That is democracy. That is politics. So why is this issue any different to the waste debate, which dragged on for 20 years and cost the taxpayer £20 million?

2375 All my colleagues know I am a poet. I have been writing and reciting poetry for 60 years now, while I have been a member of the Poetry Group for 40 years and I have been a facilitator for Guernsey Poetry Group for 12 years and the poem I am about to recite was published in the *Guernsey Press* recently. It was written by Pam Simon and it captures the whole issue perfectly, in my view, which is why I would like to recite it, in support of this amendment and in opposition to the two-school model. It was headed *Two-School Model* and it went like this:

2380

Two school model at first sounds quite good  
But what are the effects on the neighbourhood?  
Already busy are the roads before nine  
Commuters rushing to reach work on time.  
Walking, or cycling is a solution suggested  
But this would take place on roads already congested.  
In places, footpaths are not very wide,  
Allowing no room for people to walk side by side.  
Smaller roads have no pathways at all,  
Pupil-filled buses nearly scraping the wall.  
Motorbikes, pushbikes and scooters, too  
Joining other vehicles in the queue.  
Pedestrians, dog walkers and mothers with prams,  
Following behind Finlays, Freddie's and Sams.  
No influence here, but wisdom comes with age,  
Please stop and think before moving to the next stage.

Sir, the power of poetry should never be underestimated. Anyone who wants to underestimate the power of poetry does so at their peril.

2385 As we all know, sir, the teachers in our community are divided on this. Some are for, some against. It is up to us, the politicians, to listen to both sides of the argument and to make a judgement call, come the time to vote. We make that judgement call in the knowledge that we are going to upset a lot of people, whilst at the same time pleasing a lot of people. I know, sir,

2390 that we will all make that judgement call in the sincere belief that what we are voting for is the best option for our community and I think it is important to state the obvious here for a moment, and remind everyone when the vast majority of this Assembly voted in favour of the one-school, two colleges model they did so without having all the details in front of them; and on that point I will say again that I deprecate wholeheartedly the behaviour and the approach adopted by some members of our community who have been very abusive towards the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture. I deprecate that wholeheartedly. There is no need for that, it is totally unacceptable.

2395 I just want to focus for a moment on how divided our teachers and our community are on this one-school, two-college model, and again I am going to refer to recent articles from the *Guernsey Press*. In November last year there was an article in the *Press* headed, 'The majority of teachers have no confidence in education proposals – damning survey results on secondary transformation'.

2400 The article reported that 73.3% of members were not confident that plans for the Beaucamps School would provide a school that is fit for purpose; 64.8% of members were not confident that plans for St Sampson's High School would provide a school that is fit for purpose; 65.7% were not confident that quality of educational opportunities in the two colleges would be equal; and 84.8% were not confident that the learning experience for students would be improved after the transformation was complete.

2405 Two months later, a headline on the front of the *Press* read, 'Don't delay reforms, say school leaders'. That front-page story was reporting on a letter that had been written by nine school leaders here in the Bailiwick. The reality is, even the professionals are divided on this issue and we are told we have to listen to the professionals. You will listen to one side or you will listen to the other or you will listen to both and you will make a judgement call, surely?

2410 There was an article in the *Press* last December, which was a prime example of the divide out in our community. The article was headed, 'Beaucamps traffic views split even between husband and wife'. The article itself relayed a story of a husband and wife living just a stone's throw away from the Beaucamps School, who disagreed with one another that any additional traffic on the roads around the school would cause a problem.

2415 So, as I said earlier, it is up to the politicians who will make the judgement call after hearing all of that from both sides. There were times during the build-up to this debate, and during the debate itself, actually, when I was reminded of a song that was a worldwide hit for a singer named Nilsson, in the 1960's. That song was called *Everybody's Talkin'* and the lines from one of the verses in the song go as follows:

Everybody's talking at me  
I don't hear a word they're saying  
Only the echoes of my mind

Well, sir, the echoes of *my* mind tell me the same thing over and again, which is the one-school, two-college model is not the best model for our children, for our parents, for our teachers, for our environment and infrastructure or the community.

2425 Every child has a dream and these dreams need to be encouraged, pursued and supported by parents and teachers alike. When I was at school, I was a rather timid child, almost frightened of my own shadow. My parents did the very best they could to encourage my creative side but they could only do so much because money was always tight. I do not know how they managed to do it, but they bought me my first guitar when I was eight years old. They lived to regret it, whilst I struggled to learn to play it! (*Laughter*) Playing the same songs over and again. But that was a major event in my life because it set me on the path to a life of music and colour.

2430 What I really needed as a next step was for a teacher to pick up on my creativity and to support and encourage me and I was incredibly fortunate, when I started at Vauvert Secondary Modern School, there were two teachers there who did just that – Mr Paul Gradwell, who was the art teacher, and Mr James Lalla], who was the music teacher. They spent hours with me on a one-

2435 to-one basis, encouraging me, guiding me and supporting me. It is because they did that I came out of my shell and my confidence grew as a result of it.

Now, I say that because I honestly cannot see how any child is going to be able to receive that kind of support, those kinds of one-to-ones in a large school. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I just cannot see it. That is my view. And yet that sort of encouragement is exactly what every child needs in their formative years. When a teacher gives a child that sort of time, on a one-to-one basis, that child then has a lot of respect for that teacher and that teacher has a lot of respect for the child. They want the child to be good at whatever they are pursuing, and the child wants to be good for the teacher, as well as for themselves. It becomes an extremely healthy, two-way exchange. I cannot see that exchange happening, I cannot see how it is going to happen in larger schools, which is why I support the three-college model.

2445 I want to just focus for a few moments on several things. I want to look at this whole park and stride issue, as proposed for the two-college model. If we just look at the proposed park and stride from Victoria Avenue to St Sampson's High School, the striding will be done on a muddy, unsafe, unlit, unprotected path. How on earth –

2450 **Deputy Fallaize:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

2455 **Deputy Fallaize:** I am afraid that the striding will be done on a path that is being substantially improved and will not bear any resemblance to the description which Deputy Lester Queripel has just provided for it. That may be its current state but we recognise that if we want to encourage more students to use it, it needs to be substantially improved and that is included in the plans and the costs.

2460 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel to continue, please.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Thank you, sir. I thank Deputy Fallaize for that but through you, sir, I would like to ask him, is it going to be lit? Is it going to be covered? And is it going to be a hard surface that does not break down in all sorts of weathers? I am willing to give way to him, sir.

2465 **Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, I can tell him that, certainly, it is not going to be covered, and I think he probably assumed that anyway. It is over a reasonable length of land so it is not going to be covered. It is going to be laid to a hard surface and it is going to be perfectly adequate, more than adequate for students to use.

2470 Bearing in mind that many students who walk to school are walking on quite narrow pavements along busy roads, many of them would be better off even using the path in its current form but certainly in the improved form it will take under our plans. There may be things to get concerned about in relation to the current reforms, but Deputy Queripel should rest assured that is not one of them.

2475 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I still wonder in relation to safety of children: is it going to be policed? Is it going to be monitored? Who is going to monitor the striding along this path on a dark winter's morning or a dark winter's evening? Who is going to ensure the safety of the children? Who is going to ensure they do not get assaulted? Who is going to ensure, primarily, their safety? I am willing to give way to Deputy Fallaize if he would like me to give way and answer that question.

2485 **Deputy Inder:** Point of order, sir. I was criticised yesterday for having a chat in between speeches with Deputy Fallaize and I think this is leaning towards a conversation between two Members.

2490 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Inder. Once again, it is not clear to me which Rule of Procedure you are saying is being breached here, because there was no direct reference. Can I just say in relation to the give-way Rule that it is not really for a Member to invite somebody else to invoke it; it is for the Member who wishes to interject into the debate to be able to stand in their place and see if the Member speaking will give way. So please can I encourage people not to invite somebody to make a contribution in that way?

Deputy Lester Queripel to continue.

2495 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I hear what you say and I respect that. The last thing I want to say – (*Laughter*) oh, sorry, sir.

2500 **Deputy Fallaize:** I just thought we could round it off, but we will not do this again. I do think it is worth nailing this, actually. Deputy Queripel I think is saying some things which some other people have said in relation to children walking to and from school. Lots of children walk to and from school now. We do not provide chaperones for them to get from their front door to their school.

2505 These are secondary school students and, whether they are walking along roads or whether they are walking along paths and by and large the assumption we make is that if they encounter anybody, an adult or people on their way to work, or other students, by and large these people are not going to be preoccupied with wanting to assault them or cause them any harm.

2510 I do not know what kind of world Deputy Lester Queripel lives in but, generally speaking, children are able to get themselves to school reasonably safely. Just because they may be walking through a path from Pitronnerie Road area into what will be Victor Hugo College does not mean that they are going to be in any more danger than if they were walking along a busy road on a narrow pavement, probably much less danger.

2515 So I respect his opposition to the reforms and I am sure he is going to elaborate on some better reasons for his views, but this is really a set of non-reasons for having concerns about the safety of children. They are secondary school children. They can get themselves to school safely and I do not think we need to be overly concerned with that.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, Deputy Fallaize employed the word 'better'. Of course, better is a subjective word. What is better to somebody is not necessarily better to somebody else.

2520 I *am* concerned about children's safety and I can foresee a lot of problems arising with this park and stride scheme. I am a practical person by nature and I have an abundance of concerns about the lack of focus that has been given to the practicalities relating to the one-school, two-college model. I do not have those concerns about the one-school, three-college model.

2525 Just touching on the traffic issue, traffic to and from two colleges will be condensed into roads immediately surrounding those two colleges and even further out than that. That problem will not occur if we introduce a three-college model because traffic and journeys to and from colleges will be dispersed on to more roads and will not be condensed on to just a few roads. So my concern is we are going to have to introduce a lot more one-ways if we carry on with the two-college model. That is why I say the two-college model is not suitable for our infrastructure or our environment.

2530 I did ask the question at this three-and-a-half-hour presentation, which I have referred to before, with one and a half hours just me and the professionals, which I greatly appreciated. I did ask the question is there going to be a problem retaining teachers? And I was told that would not be a problem at all. So there is no problem retaining teachers, which is a great comfort.

As far as I can see, Deputy Parkinson focused on this earlier this morning when he spoke on this amendment, we will not need to extend any of the three current schools named in this

2535 amendment. Whereas, as we already know if we carry on with a two-college model, the  
Beaucamps and St Sampson's will both have to be extended considerably, which will cause no end  
of disruption to the education of our children, whilst all of the work is taking place. How can you  
learn on a building site? No one has really convinced me –

I give way to Deputy McSwiggan, sir.

2540

**Deputy McSwiggan:** Thank you.

Sir, I spent half of my primary school education and then half of my secondary school  
education in Portakabins because my schools at the time were building sites. I would not hold  
myself up as an example of educational excellence, but I think I was alright at the end of it!

2545

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** I thank Deputy McSwiggan for that interjection, but I have still got  
major concerns about children being taught ...

Sorry sir, I give way to Deputy Dorey. The more I get interrupted the longer my speech is going  
to take! (*Laughter*)

2550

**Deputy Dorey:** I thank you for giving way. I would just add that the current Beaucamps School  
was built while the existing school was in operation on the same site. It is perfectly possible to  
build a new school at the same site as an existing school, but what is important is that you have  
enough time and you can make use of the holidays to do the work that is noisy. That is partly why  
we need to start this project as soon as possible and have sufficient time to do it.

2555

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, Deputy Dorey says it is perfectly possible for work to be done.  
Yes, sure, it is perfectly possible for work to be done. Builders build under extremely difficult  
conditions in all types of weathers, but I cannot see how that is going to be beneficial or helpful. I  
cannot see it being anything but disruptive to the children. The building will be going on just  
yards away; there will be a lot of noise and a lot of disruption. I have major concerns about that.

2560

Just moving briefly back to the issue of traffic and children, while travelling to and from school,  
you have to be mindful of the impact on people who not only live close to the schools, but those  
who live on roads which will inevitably, as far as I can see, eventually have to be made one-way.  
That concerns me – more congestion, more pollution; whereas with the one-school, three-college  
model you will not have anything like that amount of congestion or pollution.

2565

Moving towards the end of my speech, I ask for a recorded vote, please, when we go to the  
vote. And in summary, after giving the matter a considerable amount of thought, having  
considered all of the reasons explained to me why a one-school, three-college model is not the  
right model for Guernsey, I have come to the conclusion that none of the problems detailed in  
those reasons is insurmountable. Whereas the concerns I have in relation to the one-school, two-  
college model are and in my view if we continue with the one-school, two-college model, we will  
be left tinkering with and having to deal with those problems for ever and a day. All the time we  
are doing that, the education of our children is suffering and will never be the standard of  
education they need and they deserve.

2575

In closing, sir, I am going to recite the last three lines of a poem from Yeats. Yeats is one of my  
favourite poets and the title of this poem is *He Wishes for the Cloths of Heaven*. I have done this  
before in education debates and the reason I have done this is because, as I said earlier, every  
child has a dream and I think we should do everything we possibly can to help our children to  
realise their dreams. The last three lines of the poem read as follows:

2580

But I, being poor, have only my dreams;  
I have spread my dreams under your feet;  
Tread softly because you tread on my dreams.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.



**Deputy Soulsby:** Thank you, sir.

2585 I think of all the speeches today on this amendment, the best one has been that of Deputy Stephens. I thought it was really thoughtful and well-considered. I am not sure if I agree with her conclusion, but I did think it was the best speech. She referenced change and transformation and how difficult it is and I thought on that I might like to remind Members what I said in the debate on the policy letter of the previous Committee, when we had the policy letter and the alternative that was brought to the Assembly at the same time.

I said:

Transformation will only be a success if it has the people behind it. You cannot get everyone behind it, but at least sufficient to make it happen and my real concern is that should the policy letter be passed, the Committee are going to have an uphill battle in getting people to that point. We know teachers are concerned. We know industry is concerned and others and that does not bode well.

2590 Now that was about the previous Committee's policy letter and it is interesting that two of the requérants were on that Committee at the time. So it is interesting that they are now saying, 'Let's review all the models again'. But then which ones? It cannot be theirs, because theirs was defeated. We have agreed that. It cannot be Deputy de Lisle's because we decided we do not want that either. It cannot be Deputy St Pier's because we defeated that one today; and if this is defeated not Deputy Le Tocq's. So that does not leave us with very much left, does it?

2595 As I said in the debate on Deputy de Lisle's amendment, my biggest concern is the uncertainty that the Requête brings and the impact on children. Of course, deciding any new model today will lead to delay I suppose, but it really does provide more certainty than the Requête because the requérants have argued that we should not be deciding a model today, but just having some big review. But a big review on what?

2600 Deputy Smithies is saying we should not be deciding – and he did say this, and I wrote it down because I do not think it is quite what he meant – but Deputy Smithies said we should not be deciding on a model in this Assembly. I do not know how he thinks any decision will be made without actually having a decision made in this Assembly. Whatever we do, we might want to put it off to another time, but at some point we are going to have to decide on a model and stick to it.

2605 But whatever. It will be *Groundhog Day*, and Deputy Dudley-Owen mentioned *Groundhog Day*, but I actually think it will be the *Groundhog Day* to beat all *Groundhog Days*. I do not think Punxsutawney Phil will ever come out of his burrow at this rate. (*Interjection*) So I am attracted to this amendment, but I have to say Deputy Parkinson did a very good job of putting me off it! (*Laughter*) Just the idea of having specific and specialised sixth forms. That would not have worked for me. I did history, maths, geography and pure maths. I do not think that would fit into one pigeon hole.

2615 None of my children did A-levels that would have meant that they would have just gone to one sixth-form college. So how do you work that out, where they are going to go? So, yes, we might have got ourselves into a *cul-de-sac*, which Deputy Parkinson said, but I am really concerned that we are actually going to find ourselves going around and round a roundabout, the way we are dealing with this at the moment.

2620 But Deputy Brouard says, 'How much information do you want?' This is it, we have got a solution here; that is fantastic, but this is not about information. The reason why we are here now is not about information, we have got bags and bags of information on loads of different models. For me it is about communication and engagement, which is why I was so surprised to listen to Deputy Lester Queripel, who so wanted this new model because we have got this new model and it is better than the two-school model, but where has been the communication?

2625 One of the first things Deputy Lester Queripel talked about is the poor communication in the States of Guernsey and we have had absolutely no communication with anybody about this model at all. So I have concerns. The teachers, the main things that they –

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, point of correction.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Lester Queripel.

2630

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I have had communication with the professionals, so it is just not right to say there has been no communication. I spoke to the professionals who did not want it.

2635

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I think the point is there has been no communication about the model in this amendment. Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** That is correct, sir. We have not spoken to all the different teachers on the Island. There has not been a poll of teachers to say they want this model at all.

2640

So the biggest concern to me, we know, I went to the presentation where we had all the unions in a room, which was very useful, and they certainly made it clear. They said they did not want that solution there and then, so I do not know how we could support any alternative. I think this amendment really runs roughshod over their concerns. If it had said 'Let us compare the two 11-18 sites with three 11-18 sites', I think I actually could have supported it. It would have given more certainty than the Requête, but also the chance of proper engagement. But at the moment all this is doing is saying, 'Right, three schools, that is it'. We will be going nowhere. So, for that reason, I cannot support this amendment.

2645

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

2650

**Deputy Meerveld:** Thank you sir.

I see in this amendment a desperate attempt to present a solution, any solution to the education debacle. I share the Assembly's desire to reach a definitive conclusion, but we have to accept we are where we are today due to our own decisions. When I was first elected, I joined the previous Education Committee and we were presented with an extant Resolution of the previous States to develop and present a proposal for the development of a three-school, non-selective model.

2655

At that time, there was still much angst over the decision to abandon selection. So that Committee, in November 2016, brought back to the States various propositions, which included a return to a four-school selective model, or to endorse the extant Resolution of a three-school, non-selective model.

2660

The States' decision was to endorse that policy and that group of Deputies, made up of three people that supported selection and two who had not, diligently worked up a proposal that was well-balanced, had plenty of challenge in it, that was designed to address what they had been instructed to deliver. This States then made the decision to adopt a plan, which is now apparent was developed on the back of an envelope, without the practical implementation being taken into consideration.

2665

If that had not been the case, if we had continued and if we had actually endorsed the plan of the previous Committee and proceeded with it, La Mare de Carteret secondary school would now be nearing completion and next year the development of La Mare de Carteret primary school would be starting. This debate would not be happening.

2670

So we are here today having this debate again, *Groundhog Day*, because of the decisions this States has made. With the best will in the world, I believe it is too late for this Assembly to undertake a proper review and find a solution and we now have to pass the baton on to the next States, the next Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and the next Assembly, the people who will be ultimately responsible for implementing and financing the transformation of our education system.

2675

I will not be supporting this amendment, for the same reasons I did not support the de Lisle amendment. Not because I did not see some merits in the proposal but because we are again ignoring good governance.

2680 Deputy Soulsby asked where do we go if we are debating on this Assembly floor the P&R amendment from Deputies Trott and St Pier, the de Lisle amendment, the Le Tocq amendment and we discarded each one of those models?

2685 But we are not really considering those models. The pause and review is trying to take us back to where we should be, looking at models properly, analytically, side by side with all the details shared and in full consultation and engagement with stakeholders.

So I will not be supporting this amendment, for those reasons; despite the fact that I can see if the pause and review proceeds, the Gavin St Pier, the Le Tocq and the de Lisle amendments being models that would be in the mix to be considered.

2690 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld, it is *Deputy* St Pier, please.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Sorry, Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Point of correction, sir.

2695

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you.

2700 I am afraid they would not be considered, under the terms of the Requête which Deputy Meerveld has signed and is putting before the States, because the wording of the Requête is very clear. In its prayer it says 'an analysis of models previously presented'. Well this model, three 11-18 schools, has not been previously presented to the States or to a Committee. So I am afraid that the Requête does not include that model, so I am afraid that is just an incorrect statement.

2705 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld to continue.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Okay, I will accept that.

2710 But going back to Deputy Fallaize and something he stated earlier, that any government in the world would not ... and he went on to give reasons not to support the Requête. However, I would counter that with any other government in the world would not flaunt their own rules and guidelines for managing major projects, especially ones as significant as transforming an education system.

2715 If we do not support the original Propositions in the Requête, we will continue to flaunt our own rules and guidelines. To prove this, I turn to the Green Book and within it the guide to developing the project business case.

I give way to Deputy Smithies.

**Deputy Smithies:** Would Deputy Meerveld not agree with me that now that we have had this debate, these models *have* been presented to the States?

2720

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Just a minute, I am going to interrupt there, because Proposition 2 on the Requête talks about 'presented to and considered by the Committee'. It is not the States. So, Deputy Meerveld.

2725 **Deputy Smithies:** Fair enough.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Thank you, sir.

2730 Going back to the Guide to Developing Project Business Cases, which is part of the Green Book set of rules and guidelines for managing and developing projects of this type, 'Final Selection of the Preferred Options'; under that title in this guide, it says:

Other factors may also affect the selection of the preferred option; in particular, any unvalued costs, risks and non-monetised benefits

– in this case education outcomes. It goes on to say:

In these circumstances it is essential to involve stakeholders in the decision-making process about whether any additional cost is a price worth paying.

It also says:

The final choice of the preferred option lies with senior management and their stakeholders, drawing on professional advice.

2735 So where was the input from the teachers, support staff, Douzaines, parents and pupils when the two-school model was designed as an option, or when it was presented and adopted on the floor of this Assembly? I also heard Wayne Bates, the national negotiator for Guernsey's largest teaching union, in his interview on the radio this morning. As Deputy Inder has mentioned, he stated the unions were not consulted when the three-school was adopted by the previous Assembly in March 2016, following an amendment by Deputy St Pier. Nor were they consulted when the current Committee suggested this two-school model. So we are obviously not following our own rules and guidelines.

2740

It also goes on to say in here:

Successful delivery arrangements.

At least one workshop is recommended for the completion of the management case section of the OBC – *[outline business case]*, so that the key stakeholders are engaged early on, and can challenge and assist to shape the direction of the project.

Under their heading 'Finalised project management arrangements and plans', it states:

The latest version of the project plan should be attached to the FBC [full business case]. This must reflect the implementation timescales agreed with the service provider for the delivery of the negotiated services and be signed off by the stakeholders and customers (end users) for the services.

2745 But this means that under our own guidelines, not only should the outline business case and the selection of options should include a workshop to make sure that the stakeholders are involved, but also that a final business case should be signed off by teachers, support staff and all other stakeholders, Douzaines, parents. There has to be some form of consultation to get that buy-in from the key stakeholders. If no one else, it must be the teachers, and presumably their unions, which obviously we can hardly say we have got that on the current two-school model.

2750

What this makes clear is that the States has repeatedly ignored its own rules and guidelines on developing major projects by designing our future education system on the floor of this Assembly, which I think is the point Deputy Smithies was trying to make earlier, rather than as the Requête requires doing so in proper consultation with stakeholders.

2755

Deputy Fallaize keeps citing the degree of anxiety for pupils and parents if the transition model is changed as justification for proceeding with this two-school model, while failing to acknowledge the degree of anxiety being caused by his attempts to railroad through the two-school model, and that many of those people could be parents or pupils impacted by his proposed transition model.

2760

Deputy Fallaize also describes supporting the Requête as wholly irresponsible, although all it does is bring us back to pursuing the process that our own rules and guidelines dictate. I believe that it is wholly irresponsible for this States to have adopted a plan for transforming our education system on the back of an envelope, and then for it to have the implementation of that plan to be initiated before working out the details on how to deliver it. I would describe that as wholly irresponsible and the fact that this irresponsible approach was also followed was amply illustrated by the lack of implementation details available as recently as the debate in September.

2765 Finally, children should be at the heart of our considerations, but we have an obligation not only to the current students, we have an obligation to future generations and we are being asked to decide on a policy which will affect not just the young people entering our secondary school system at 11 years old now, but young people who will be in their 60s when these schools reach the end of their design life.

2770 So it is not just the young people of today we need to consider, but also their children and their grandchildren. The question we have to ask ourselves is: do we think we are doing the right thing for all of them if we bulldoze through the two-school model, or should we pause and review to ensure we are doing the right thing for them?

Thank you, sir.

2775

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

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

2780 Just to answer a few points which have been made recently in the debate. Children walk now along green lanes to get to school. There are not police waiting in those green lanes. They are not covered; most of them are not lit. The traffic impact assessments, if I recall correctly, did not produce any new one-ways. Most of the new one-ways were introduced when the existing St Sampson's School was built.

2785 I think Deputy Meerveld said about the back of an envelope. The four of us – Deputy Fallaize, Deputy Graham, Deputy Tooley and myself – it was an over 100-page report that was produced, which was considered by the Assembly. I do not call that the back of an envelope.

2790 I would just add that I think that there has been a lot of words spoken about professionals working in the education sector, but when you are designing an education model, the people should do that, professional education model designers, those are the people who should design it. When you are designing a house you use an architect, you do not use the people who live in the house. (*Laughter*) They put their input into it but the design is done by professional designers. That is what we are doing with education.

2795 I would also like to go on. There have been many people who have referred to the opinion of unions and teachers but the other key group, which I think only Deputy Roffey and Deputy Queripel mentioned, is the education leaders; and the letter, which we had on 14th January which was signed by all nine education leaders, I would just like to refer to a couple of paragraphs on that, and it is under, 'The impact of delay'.

Following the removal of selection it became imperative and is now increasingly urgent that the secondary estate is consolidated into fewer schools. This is primarily to ensure we can offer all students the same breadth of curriculum for their GCSE years. Simply, we cannot offer equal GCSE curriculum in a non-selective cohort across four sites without requiring significantly more teachers to deliver it.

2800 Now, Education has been constantly criticised about expenditure and the need for us to reduce expenditure, by P&R. We are committed to doing that. One of the ways we are going to do that is delivering this model. So I am actually disappointed that two Members of P&R, who have been constantly telling us to reduce expenditure are actually bringing forward this amendment, which will actually increase expenditure.

I also read from this letter:

Guernsey cannot continue to be paralysed by indecision while seeking the Holy Grail of a model for secondary and post-16 education which can gain unanimous support, gives everybody exactly what they want, and at a price that the States and taxpayers are willing to pay: that particular model simply doesn't exist. We must do the best we can, with what we can afford, to benefit as many students as possible, and do so as soon as possible

I think those are very wise words from all of our education leaders.

2805 I would also like to add about the number of meetings that there has been with various groups. So to date there have been 25 public or parent meeting drop-ins; 92 meetings with

various groups of teachers and support staff; and 18 meetings with various groups of students. I think the message that people have said that we have not been speaking to them is not correct. We have had an extensive number of meetings as can be seen by these figures.

2810 If this amendment is passed, we will have to come back to the Assembly with a cost and it is not going to be done by the end of 2020 as the amendment says. The information we have had from our professionals is that it will take 18 months. But we are asked to make a decision with no report, unlike we had in January 2018, no comparison of models and no estimate of capital or running costs.

2815 Again, if you look at the amendment that we have got with us today and you look at the Deputy de Lisle amendment, there are some similarities but there is one key, which is just a copy, and that is the Rule 4.3 paragraph. That is exactly the same – sorry, I apologise – the Deputy de Lisle and Deputy Le Pelley amendment.

2820 So they have not made any effort to get the actual costs. They have used a previous model which, as I have pointed out, was incorrectly used by Deputy de Lisle in his amendment. This model has not been considered by a previous Committee. If Members remember there was a workshop – when I have finished, I will – which was done I think in January 2017, where the previous Education Committee put forward six different models and Members had to put their points about them and those were basically considered by the previous Committee. This was not included in it.

2825 I will give way.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Sir, my thanks to Deputy Dorey for giving way.

2830 I just needed a bit of time to think about a point he made a bit earlier in his speech. He said that extensive meetings have taken place with the unions and with the teachers and professionals. Does that tell him something, bearing in mind then that there is still great unrest amongst the teachers and amongst the professionals, even though all these meetings have taken place. Can he see these issues being resolved any time soon, bearing in mind that all that work and all that consultation and all that engagement has been done and yet there is still significant unrest amongst the professionals?

2840 **Deputy Dorey:** I do not want to go into another amendment, which we are not discussing, but I think that is covered by the next amendment hopefully that we will be debating where, yes, we fully consider we have more work to do and we perhaps should have had more meetings earlier on. But I am just saying that it is not like we have not had meetings. There have been an awful lot of meetings but obviously we need more meetings.

2845 Ultimately I think, and as I said in a point I made before, only 50% of the Beaucamps staff were in support of the St Sampson's letter. It is interesting that that is the site which is under most pressure in terms of external space. But you can never get unanimous support for anything. Yes we need to do more work and try to gain more support, but we are not going to get unanimous support and you never do, and that is what we never do in this Assembly. It is just like that letter from the head teachers saying you are never going to get that Holy Grail of everybody supporting it. I think what is key is that you use professional education model designers, because if you do not use those professionals, yes you will make mistakes.

2850 The other thing about this amendment, and it is the same point I made yesterday and I do not apologise for repeating it because it is a different debate, is that the proposals rescind the La Mare Primary School Proposition and there is new proposition about developing La Mare Primary. Again, it is a very poor amendment and it is a poor process in terms of dropping this in at the last minute. For the Assembly to agree a specific model millions will be needed to develop the plans, business cases, etc. and the delay will be for two or three years. There is no detail, no report.

2855 I would just like to speak about the size of the three 11-18 schools which they propose. What is important is at the current situation the peak will be, if you had two colleges and one school, it would be just under 1,400 pupils. If we have three, it will be 930 pupils, average. But if you look

2860 ahead, and these figures have been based on statistical units and their predictions of future  
school populations, by 2049 there will be under 1,200 pupils at the two 11-18 colleges and one  
school.

If you recall, when the Grammar School was at its peak, it was just under 1,100 pupils. So there  
is not much difference. People say these schools will be massively different but it is only just a  
2865 little bit bigger than the Grammar School as it was at its peak a few years ago. By that time, if you  
have three 11-18 colleges and one school, you will have under 800 pupils at those schools.

Again, if you look at the sixth forms, they will be under 150 pupils within those sixth forms. If  
you look at currently, as was mentioned I think by Deputy Graham earlier, there are 198 pupils at  
the combined Elizabeth College and Ladies' College sites. I know from my two children who  
2870 passed their 11-plus, neither of them could do their first choice in subject choice at A-level with  
that size of sixth form because the options were not available. If we are going to have such small  
sixth forms we are going to restrict the options available to pupils, or we have to have pupils  
moving between schools.

People said there are one-and-a-half miles between the schools. I looked up on Google Maps  
and actually if you go from Beaucamps to St Sampson's School it is three-and-a-half miles, it is  
2875 not one-and-a-half miles.

But one of the things that is important about what we were trying to put forward is improved  
pastoral care. One of the parts of that is what is called 'vertical tutor groups', which will involve  
pupils from Year 7 to Year 13 and one of the bases of that is that you create a community at that  
school, but if those Year 12 and 13 pupils then move to another school because they cannot do  
2880 their A-level choices at that particular college and they have to move to another one, you will  
break that vertical tutor group, that mentor, which those pupils have been with as they moved up  
the school. It will break the community and so that is one of the key important things in trying to  
create two 11-18 colleges, that we create that community, we have those vertical tutor groups and  
we have those mentors within the school which the pupils can then link with during the whole of  
2885 their career at their school.

As I said, it is going to take 18 months, that is what the estimate from staff is to develop  
sufficient detail to bring a report back to the States as was brought back in September 2019,  
which we debated recently.

2890 So, for all those reasons, I cannot support this amendment. I urge Members to reject this  
amendment, which I believe has been poorly put together and has some serious errors in it.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett.

2895 **Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, sir.

I did wish to speak earlier in debate, but I am actually pleased I did not now because a lot of  
Members have already taken off so many different queries that I had with this amendment. I am  
seeking to a certain degree because there seems to be a lot of things stated that appear to be  
fact, but it is just opinion, or it is 'infactual' how far a school is from another.

2900 There have been insinuations, but I think it has now been clarified, about if this model could be  
considered under the existing Requête, so I am pleased a lot of those have been sorted out and  
blown out of the water. But also earlier today we had at a meeting on 13th February that issues I  
think the Deputy said, were insurmountable, but actually I wrote down in *verbatim* what was said  
and what was said that issues *appear* to be insurmountable. This was a meeting that ESC was not  
2905 invited to – all Deputies were invited but not ESC. So if that is not side-lining of the Committee, I  
really do not know what is.

But if opinions have moved away from this *appears* to be insurmountable to they *are*  
insurmountable, then at least I hope they polled their Members on this because sometimes I think  
we hear things and it is very easy to say that old adage of we hear what we want to hear. There

2910 were so many nuances in this. We have had a lot of correspondence and a lot of it has been quite conflicting.

Deputy Dorey mentioned how many meetings there had been, but it is irrelevant how many meetings there are. It is not about quantity, it is about quality and it is about listening as well as hearing.

2915 Deputy Lester Queripel said why is this different from the waste debate, if we are going to change direction? I put it to the Assembly, in the waste debate we had a hole in which we could throw in our rubbish. These are children. Yes we potentially have, or not have depending on differences in the Assembly, we may have places to send out children in the interim but I am really uncomfortable with comparing this to a waste debate.

2920 Some of what Deputy Meerveld said I think with the project business case, there might be a little bit of disconnect between this Assembly being politicians deciding policy, then how about policy and the process that then supports that, developing and delivering that policy? We are politicians, we debate the policy and how that is then delivered is a process and there is a difference there.

2925 I am going to end, sir, and I have said this before but not on public record. Basically it is another saying that says this: 'I cannot change the direction of the wind, but I can adjust my sails to always reach my destination'. And that is why this amendment is so appealing because this amendment potentially will get me to the same destination of 11-18 schools. But why am I changing my sails? Have I actually got a hurricane, as some Members would like to think, and I have no choice about changing my sails? or am I in a storm? Or is it just raining? Why am I going to change my sails?

2930 My consideration is that on this fictional boat, which I may or may not need to change my sails on, I would have children on this boat and quite frankly they could be grown up by the time we even reach the destination. I am not sure if I have enough life jackets on board this boat for all of the children, but what I do think potentially is that this amendment is a life raft to get off that boat, to get into this life raft – because that way we may actually be able to move on with delivering a non-selective model for secondary education for our children and young people. So that is *incredibly* tempting.

2935 But when Deputy Le Tocq sums up I would really like to understand if he believes, or why he believes, that if this policy is sent on the way and goes through the process, as quite rightly outlined by Deputy Meerveld, what does he believe that we might not have again either a hurricane, storm or it is just raining, and we may again say, 'Actually, now we have taken further consideration,' or 'Now we have had some lobbying,' or 'Now we have had communication or engagement with teachers' – actually now we have decided that three 11-18s is not going to work either.

2945 So we could be back here. So this sailing boat is not only going to change tack and essentially change sail, it may never get to a destination to actually land. It may be going around and around for a very long time. So if Deputy Le Tocq, when he sums up, could tell me why he honestly believes, and I believe this amendment has been laid with good intent and potentially it may be where our final destination may be, but I do not know because I do not have a crystal ball. But why does Deputy Le Tocq believe that this model of secondary education, will not come into conflict or the perceived conflict the existing one has?

2950 Further, I am concerned about these children and young people on this boat and I do not understand quite where these children will be going in the interim. That is my major concern and I understand the concerns from other Deputies regarding future generations. But actually we have Year 7 *now*. They are the first non-selective cohort. They are here, they are now.

2955 What I do not want to happen, because I do not have a crystal ball, and I feel very passionately about this, is that we say, when this current Year 7 cohort gets through to GCSEs and we get the result and go, 'Actually, look at that – educational outcomes were not there after all, we should have stayed with selection'.

2960



But that is because we have not given that cohort the equity of provision, the opportunity to have a wide GCSE choice and the opportunity to have buildings and teachers – all the things that sold us on a non-selective model, all the things that we have really wanted for that cohort, or future cohorts, may not be in place if we agree to this amendment today, sir.

2965 So I hope I have been quite clear to Deputy Le Tocq as to the expectation in answering to debate and I really do hope that we can drop anchor on this sail boat quite soon.  
Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Graham.

2970

**Deputy Graham:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

This amendment places a couple of temptations in front of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, and principally they are that they offer the prospect of preserving the concept of secondary education in schools that have their integral sixth forms, in other words 11-18 schools, albeit not in the optimum form as we see it. But a very good prospect to hold out to us.

2975

Secondly, I think the calculation is that with the support of the Committee, this amendment would have a very good chance of being supported in the Assembly here today, thereby really killing off the prospect of an unamended Requête, which in our view would be calamitous. So there are these temptations, but they are temptations that I think we are finding it relatively easy to resist because Deputy Roffey earlier on covered, more than adequately, the problems with the model itself and also the circumstances in which it is being put before us.

2980

In my view, the problems are essentially that the model itself, although it would offer clarity as to what any reconfiguration of the transition models should be aimed at, it does itself impose an unacceptable delay. People talk about holding patterns and so on, we are actually talking about huge disruptions to the almost immediate future of several hundred students who think they know where they are going over the next two or three years. So that is really a major difficulty that I think the Committee could not tolerate.

2985

The second is, I think it would open us up to the accusation, which has falsely been made against us so far, about our own model. All this talk about it being designed on the floor of the Assembly is a falsehood, I can put it no more charitably than that – but I will return to this when we get around to debating the Committee's amendment, probably on Monday, and perhaps the general debate on Monday. But I do give the Assembly advance warning, I am not going to be charitable about those who have been spreading these falsehoods quite deliberately.

2990

Back to the confines of the amendment: I think the amendment does serve a purpose because it does actually highlight one of the dilemmas at the centre of matching an 11-18 system to Guernsey's population. I do remember back in the early days of the gang of four, when we were really essentially starting off by saying there must be an alternative to the model being proposed by the then Committee. We were united on one thing that it should be, based on the evidence we had seen, a model that had at its heart schools that have their own integral sixth forms, because the evidenced was unequivocal that these schools offer a far better educational experience to students than anything else on offer to us here.

3000

The problem was matching that to how it would look in Guernsey and the awkward thing was, and it is best to be honest here and frank, because the gang of four and then joined by Deputy Roffey subsequently, were not always totally unanimous on where the balance lay in this dilemma. And the dilemma was this: given the rather distorted population of students here in Guernsey – distorted by the fact that traditionally around about 30% of our young students go into the three private colleges – given that, the number of States' students it leaves is an awkward number.

3005

It is a number that is marginally greater than we can comfortably put into two 11-18 schools. And when I say comfortably, I mean comfortably probably for Guernsey and certainly comfortably in terms of the degree of angst that it might raise. But on the other hand the number of students available is marginally too few to do 11-18 in three schools in the most effective and economical

3010

way possible, particularly in terms of breadth of curriculum. It is an awkward number with which to conjure.

3015 I have to say, on the Committee I was probably more gung-ho about keeping the three 11-18 option alive, if not necessarily kicking, for a little bit longer so that perhaps in hindsight, if along the way we could have evaluated the relative merits of the 11-18 in two colleges, or 11-18 in three but we were pressed for time and we never did that. That is why this amendment, the model behind it, has never been properly researched.

3020 But it is not as if – and some of my colleagues were harsher on the smaller school option, than I am – when you look around for evidence there is no doubt about it the most successful and the majority of the most successful English comprehensive schools were incidentally outperforming Guernsey education as a whole, including the private colleges by some margin.

3025 When you look at the whole, the last time I looked at it was about 18 months ago, where the top 100 performing English comprehensive schools, 18 of them were smaller than 100 students. (Interjection) Sorry, what did I say? I meant 1,000, yes! Whoever is writing up *Hansard*, could they please note! Smaller than 1,000-strong, with sixth forms at the commensurate size.

3030 Now, they were in the top 100 schools and were doing extremely well. So there was not anything inherently insurmountable in having sixth forms that were only about 150 to 160 strong. Or course most of these schools were doing very well, even though they were not able to benefit from the sort of federated basis. In other words they were not making the best of collaboration with nearby schools.

3035 The evidence is it can be done, so it is not exactly an experiment. We have only got to look down the road, up the road, to Elizabeth College and Ladies' College where we heard earlier on in the debate, I think historically Elizabeth College has normally had somewhere around about 110-130 students in the sixth form and the Ladies' College has usually less than 100. The up-to-date figures, as I mentioned this morning, are 198 between the two.

3040 I do not know whether they call themselves federated or not and I do not know the degree to which the teachers teaching the sixth form in Elizabeth College also contribute to teaching 11-16 in the Ladies' College. I suspect probably not a lot, but I do not know so I am not really going to speculate.

I will give way to Deputy Smithies.

**Deputy Smithies:** I thank Deputy Graham for giving way.

3045 May I attempt a second attempt at this problem on which I was shot down last time? Would Deputy Graham agree that, from what he has said, he would consider that this model we are discussing at the moment has actually been presented to Education as a potential model? The fact that it has been discussed, as he has indicated *in* Committee, would that fit into the definition in the Requête of a model previously presented to the Education Committee?

3050 **Deputy Graham:** I welcome the opportunity to clarify that. That model has never been discussed in Committee. It was a matter for discussion when we were still the gang of four before, as we were known, with varying degrees of affection at the time! It was only ever discussed informally.

I will give way to Deputy Parkinson.

3055 **Deputy Parkinson:** Sir, following on from Deputy Graham's response to that question, would he confirm the understanding transmitted to us by his President that if this amendment is defeated, that model will be off the table and will never be considered?

3060 **Deputy Graham:** It depends how this whole debate ends. If, for example, the current amendment is not successful and we are left with, effectively, a decision between the Requête as amended by the Committee's amendment, or the Requête unamended that would dictate really the outcome of that. All I can say is that either this Committee or our successor, in as far as the

3065 Requête is concerned, would not be obliged to look at this model and would have to interpret really the intention behind the Requête. But the intention actually does not really matter too much, does it? It is what it says in the Requête. No Committee, either this one or a successor, would be bound to consider this model by the terms of the Requête.

3070 There may be other devices that could persuade it to find a way around that. I do not know, it is not for me to say. I think what I would say is that if it was a committee of which I was in membership, I do not think I would be straining too many sinews to divert the attention of getting on with the transition with the model that is currently underway.

How this amendment will go down, it is so unresearched and so 'unconsulted' on –

I will give way, but at some stage this old boy really has to get a bit of momentum going! But I will give way to Deputy Laurie Queripel.

3075

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Sir, I thank Deputy Graham for giving way.

Bearing in mind what he said, would he advise the requérants to bring an amendment to say that the model we are debating at the moment, the three 11-18 schools, should be added to the Requête?

3080

**Deputy Graham:** I am not sure that is a fair question really because I cannot elect to speak on behalf of the Committee on that, because we would have to have consultation on that. I have to say I would anticipate that some of those who are sympathetic to the 11-18 configuration might well be tempted more by that than they are by this very clear direction, without any say-so, to get on and implement the model that is relatively almost unresearched.

3085

Although, as I have said, it is not a model without evidence elsewhere. Anybody who wanted to imply that it was a totally reckless dive into the unknown would I think be over-egging the pudding. How this would go down with the unions, for example, and the teachers is anybody's guess. The very fact that it has not been consulted on before, we would have to guess, but I would anticipate they would say that this is no better, or perhaps even worse, than the two times 11-18 model, because I think that is the way they would see it. They talk in terms of splitting up the sixth form into three, or into two. I wish they would look at it as saying: 'We are going to create two new schools, each with its own sixth form'. Or three new schools, each with their own sixth form. They do not look at it like that and who am I to blame them for it?

3090

3095 But I would say to them: what is the alternative? Because if our preoccupation was to keep the sixth form as it is – what are the alternatives? I spoke rather disparagingly this morning of what I would call the comprehensive grammar school model, where you have a pretend 11-16 school at Les Varendes and two others at Baubigny and Les Beaucamps. That is one way of preserving it, but I think that would find it very difficult to get any traction either in the Assembly or out in the public. It may be popular amongst a certain sector of the teaching fraternity.

3100

Other options for not splitting the sixth forms would be the model that was resoundingly rejected or certainly it was not brought to the States in that form by the previous Committee. I do not think the options for keeping the sixth form as it is really stack up. One of the options of course is a stand-alone sixth form college but the evidence elsewhere is that we would need at least twice the number of students we have for A-level to make that sustainable.

3105

Then the only other way really to keep it going would be to make it into a tertiary college, which came before the States with the last Committee, back in 2017, which was resoundingly rejected. So I would say to the teachers' union, if they do not like this particular concept, I think they are running out of options for keeping the sixth form as a self-contained unit anyway. But that is for another debate, probably. *(Laughter)* Sorry, for later on in this debate.

3110

Mr Deputy Bailiff, I have taken longer than I intended. The Committee's view on this is that, despite the temptations, we cannot really sign up to an amendment which would by force prolong the transition period, would require a rewrite of the transition itself and also would be, to a certain extent, a leap into the uncertain. And for that reason I believe the Committee is pretty solid in saying they are going to vote against this.

3115

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

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

3120 It is quite true that so much has been said and maybe we are labouring this debate too much, because I have come to the view now, after an uncertain period over lunch, that this amendment is not going to win. I am sure of that. But I just wanted to raise first a quick point, which is a side issue really, but nevertheless has been raised in debate by Deputy Lester Queripel.

3125 I am a past president of Living Streets and a Committee Member, and Living Streets has had a great involvement and ownership in a manner of speaking of the classic school path from the Pitronnerie Bowl area, or ex-Bowl area, to St Sampson's School. It has been in existence for a decade. It has been always safe and I think it is not germane to this debate because it will continue to be used, even if St Sampson's and its associated school remained on the present site. I should also say Living Streets volunteers have done a lot of work in maintaining the path, although I have not been one of them I must admit.

3130 Moving on, one thing that surprised me a little bit is Deputy Le Tocq opened his main speech, and a few others have echoed the view that there is not a lot to choose between this amendment and the previous one that Deputy de Lisle and Deputy Le Pelley prepared, and in the event seconded by Deputy McSwiggan, which I was a bit sympathetic to. Actually I think there are at least two really significant differences that have to be repeated. Somebody said, more than one  
3135 somebody actually, that Deputy de Lisle's amendment incorporated a sixth-form centre or college in one of the 11-16 schools or adjacent to it. It did not. It envisaged the sixth-form centre continuing at Les Varendes and the three new schools being at the Beaucamps, St Sampson's and La Mare de Carteret.

3140 This amendment is distinctly different in at least two ways. One way is that it makes it clear, if it is prescriptive, that there is no rebuild of La Mare de Carteret. That is very clear on 2(a) of this amendment: one school, three-college model, encompassing three colleges which shall be federated as one school and will be based at St Sampson's, Les Beaucamps and Les Varendes.

3145 The other obvious difference is that the sixth form is part of all three colleges. Now, Deputy Parkinson had a lot of interesting ideas that certainly have been tried and tested in other places, about specialist schools, about focussing one school more of a scientific and another with a linguistic element. I have always supported those ideas and have sympathy with them myself.

3150 But we come back to the fundamental problem of this amendment. It is prescriptive on an unknown model. Indeed there has already been one senior figure in Education who on social media has said, 'Leave this well alone'. I suspect if I put this amendment, seconded by one of my buddies, it would have got very short shrift.

3155 Deputy Meerveld perhaps overstated the back of a cigarette packet argument for Deputy Fallaize's two-school model, that the States approved. Because as Deputy Graham pointed out, it was 100 pages and the then Education, Sport & Culture Committee agreed to give them thousands and thousands of pounds to complete it.

**Deputy Meerveld:** I thank Deputy Gollop for giving way.

3160 The previous Committee's three-school model was worked up with fully approved plans, full curriculum model, full teacher transition model, full student transition model. The background information before and behind that policy letter would have run to thousands of pages. I think the stack would probably have been taller than I am. When I say the back of an envelope, I have produced reports of 20, 30, 40 pages myself almost overnight, whereas the work required to give a comprehensive plan that gives the full detail is far larger.

3165 **Deputy Gollop:** I thank Deputy Meerveld because of course he knows I went to one or two of these meetings, because I was not on Education, Sport & Culture at that time, or of course, a requérant, but there were meetings with senior figures from Education behind the scenes, even when the past Education, Sport & Culture Committee were in office. I will not go into that, though.

3170 The point I am trying to make is we have had one model which Deputy Meerveld is spot-on about, that had two years of Committee work with thousands of pages of business case and others. Then we have got the two-school model that Deputy Fallaize and his Committee have been working on, with those really huge traffic impact assessments and everything else. That is two, for a start.

3175 Now, this really is on the back of a fag packet, if not my own, because it came out of nowhere yesterday evening and my obvious questions to it are: have they factored in the bussing, although students of 17-plus, although arguably they should use travel planning, might not use buses, they might have their own transport? That is a side issue. Have they considered the transportation from one site to another with three sixth forms? Have they considered the building cost? Have they considered the space? Have they considered the impact upon teaching recruitment and on human resources cost, and on the view of the unions and the view of teachers, generally? And of the view of parents, of the breadth of the curriculum that can be accommodated in one area?

3180 Deputy Parkinson made a fascinating point. He said why would you have two classes studying history, of nine pupils, when you have one of 18? I can think of two reasons you might. The first would be that there were two different styles of history choice between lecturers. The other reason of course as Deputy Soulsby implied, is you may well have clashes. You cannot do pure maths and history at the same time, so you would have to have a second history set, which indeed used to go on with sets even in my day.

3185 There are *many* issues of this of scheduling, of career structuring, of traffic impact assessment, of costs, of the loss of the sixth-form centre, and of the utilisation of the site because Les Varendes already has an excellent purpose-built sixth-form centre. The other two schools do not. I cannot see how it is responsible for the States to adopt this model after 24 hours' notice, when we are already displeased with two other models that have been worked up by Education, Sport & Culture committees at great length.

3190 So for those reasons, and the fact that I actually prefer the de Lisle model from yesterday, because I think a stand-alone sixth-form college and a rebuild of La Mare would provide more space. I am interested in the space argument and I think we have not done enough on that.

3195 I will stand –

**Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, Deputy Gollop.

3200 I was just wondering if the de Lisle amendment was preferred yesterday, all the questions that Deputy Gollop has put to Deputy Le Tocq, I cannot recall him putting them to Deputy de Lisle. So I understand the concerns Deputy Gollop has with this amendment, I am just a bit confused as to why Deputy Gollop was perhaps more content with Deputy de Lisle's amendment with a model that has not been worked up than he is with this model that has not been worked up?

3205 **Deputy Gollop:** Because Deputy de Lisle's model was at least known about for a week before we got into the debate and was more similar perhaps than this model, which introduces a whole new concept of a federated school on three sites with three sixth forms, and how that would work. In any case, rather than labour any more than that point, I did not in the end vote for the Deputy de Lisle amendment and I am not voting for this.

3210

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

3215 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, I think this is a very good amendment, brought by two experienced politicians in good faith in an attempt to break the logjam and I commend them for it. I almost could hear the desperation and exasperation in Deputy Le Tocq's voice when he was opening this amendment and, sir, for one I do not blame him.

But I think, and I do not mean this as a criticism, it falls foul of the point that has been made in the previous speech, the speech just made by Deputy Gollop, in that we do not have enough information to be able to come to a conclusion. It may well be, and I know not, wherein whenever,

3220 that is where the States ends up. That may well be. But it would be after research about traffic matters, union matters and the like. Because I also agree with Deputy Soulsby, it was a very good speech by Deputy Stephens in her usual calm, understated manner, that public opinion and union opinion changes like that. They are all in favour of this today; they are all against it tomorrow.

3225 There is no guarantee if this model and this amendment were successful that it would find any more favour. Indeed Deputy Graham also alluded to that in his speech.

Sir, I do not want to be too legalistic but Deputy Roffey was the first to flag this up earlier this afternoon and other speakers have mentioned it during the course of the afternoon. If the Requête is eventually successful, clearly this is a model that ought to come into the frame and be properly considered.

3230 As I understand it, as a matter of fact, the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture is not like, in the old days, sometimes you had a Committee *for* Education that went on from one States to the other, this is a brand-new creation from the 1st May 2016. So the way that the Requête is currently constructed, it says, and I read purported Proposition 2:

To direct the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture to prepare a report before the end of the term of the current States, that must include a comprehensive comparison of the structure and implementation of the 1 school on 2 sites plan with other viable models of non-selective educational delivery in Guernsey –

– and in my own copy I have put brackets around these words –

– previously presented to and considered by the Committee –

3235 – close brackets –

for consideration by ...

3240 Now, that does not actually mean that consideration of the Committee as it is currently populated, i.e. Deputy Fallaize and his colleagues – it will go back to 1st May 2016. As I understand it, if I am wrong I will be corrected, the model that is proposed by Deputies Le Tocq and Brouard has not been considered by the Committee from 1st May 2016. So on the current wording – I am not giving way – of the Requête, this would not be possible –

**Deputy Meerveld:** Point of correction, sir.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Then I will sit down.

3245

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Meerveld.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Thank you, sir.

3250 I believe that the model, as proposed, with three schools with a sixth form attached, was presented to the previous Committee. I would have to check those facts, but I believe it was (*Interjections*) one of the ones considered and dismissed by our Committee.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache to continue, please.

3255 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Thank you, sir.

I think the worst thing we would all want, after however many days of debate, when we come to a conclusion in relation to this, is to find that this could not be considered if the Requête was unamended.

3260 So it is not for me. I am not one of the requérants, but if I were one of the requérants and I wanted any viable model – whatever that phrase might mean, and we have not heard a definition of what it means yet – to be considered before the end of this States, then I would take out the

words that I have put in my own copy in brackets. I would do that so it gives the widest possible consideration.

3265 I also commend Deputy Brehaut for picking up on what was an intentional comment by me yesterday, because, in my own mind, I might be the last person standing in the whole of the Island and in this Assembly who still has not quite given up in relation to the issue of selection. So he picked up correctly in relation to that. But that may be a part for later in the debate.

3270 Now, I have heard so many passionate speeches but no-one in this Assembly has got the monopoly on the best interests of the children of this Bailiwick. We are all equally, every single Member of this Assembly, including our colleague Deputy Le Pelley and we wish him well – we have all got the best intentions for the children of the Bailiwick, both now and for the future.

3275 I was one of those, I think Deputy Roffey said, about half the Members of the States went to the presentation. I was one of that half and I went last Saturday afternoon and I thought it was a thoroughly excellent presentation. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It was presented in a non-biased way, factually and informative, and I will take that into consideration when in the latter part, probably Monday, I think the Deputy Bailiff have said we may even sit on Tuesday, I know not. But anyway, whenever we conclude this debate that will be part of my consideration.

3280 And to say that it has been put on the back of a fag packet, I think is insulting, because it has not been put on the back of a packet. There has been a massive amount of work done by civil servants, by educational leaders and by the five Members of the Education –

**Deputy Meerveld:** Point of correction sir.

3285 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Is it a correction of imposition?

**Deputy Meerveld:** No, it is a correction.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld, point of correction.

3290 **Deputy Meerveld:** Yes, sir.

I was talking to when it was first presented in the latter part of 2017, not what has been presented more recently with, as you say, the massive amount of Civil Service work.

Thank you, sir.

3295 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache to continue, please.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Thank you very much, sir.

3300 Well, we are considering matters now, are we not? Now we have when we consider it, a welter of information. Whether we have got enough, whether we do not have as much, that is a matter ... But I accept what Deputy Meerveld unreservedly has just said, that the amount of work that has been put into this is considerable and commendable. Whether we agree with it or not, at the end of the day we must freely make that concession.

3305 In connection with all of this, despite my sincerely meant words of commendation to Deputies Le Tocq and Brouard, I cannot go along with the amendment, simply because I *think* – I emphasise that verb – this is where we may end up in whenever it is. But we have got to know. We have got to be certain. We have been around this track so many times.

3310 What was his name, the man who broke the four-minute mile? Roger Bannister. He must have run 100 miles to get we are today and we have not really got very far, and we are not going to get very far today. That is a criticism of us, collectively, and it is a criticism of our predecessors in the earlier States. We have not dealt with this topic, which is one of the most important topics we have had, as we should.

I always enjoy Deputy Lester Queripel's speeches and I enjoyed his speech today, but the times are a-coming. We must be able to make a decision. Where I disagree with him to a degree, money

3315 is not everything but we were told last Saturday, those of us who went to that presentation, and  
we have been told publicly since, that if the proposals put forward by the Committee are in due  
course not approved, then the cost could be anywhere between £2 million and £11 million. I  
actually think that is probably a conservative sum and it may be more. But I accept what they say.

Now, whether it is £2 million or whether it is £5 million or whether it is £11 million, it is a vast  
amount of money. So it will again factor into my consideration, whenever it is I make a decision.  
3320 As I say, we do not have enough information and one thing I found in relation to unions, whether  
they are education unions or whether they are unions of a different type, is that the wind blows  
them one way one day, and another way another day. So I am not overly influenced by them.

Of course I care about the teachers, of course I do, because they have got to work in a system  
that works; but ultimately their considerations are very much secondary to the considerations of  
3325 the welfare of the students that will be going through the system. And frankly if I come to a  
decision in my mind, and I have not come to that decision yet, I will be frank. If I come to that  
decision and it is one that the teachers disagree with, well they would have to disagree with me.  
They disagreed with me over selection and they were wrong. So they may be disagreeing with me  
again! (*Laughter*)

3330 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy McSwiggan.

**Deputy McSwiggan:** Sir, over lunch I had a conversation with someone that was very similar  
to the speech that Deputy Graham has just made. It has taken me a while to compose myself  
3335 enough to be able to make this speech because, at first, I was weeping like a spoilt child who had  
just dropped her fudge. Of course, we all learn not to accept candy from strange men and maybe  
I should have been a little wiser.

I think I still need to say what I have to say about this amendment from the start. When I  
offered to second Deputy de Lisle's amendment yesterday, I said that my main motivation for  
3340 doing so was that the Requête itself, unamended, presents us with an abyss. I do not want to be  
staring into an abyss, uncertain whether enough of us are going to be brave enough not to make  
the jump, brave enough to pull us back from the edge.

For me, this amendment offers at least a plank over the abyss. It is far from the best choice out  
there. It plays a very distant second fiddle to the proposals that the Committee are already  
3345 implementing, but it is a country-mile better than the alternative that we would be left with.

I have to declare a little bit of an interest here because my aunt, literally, wrote the book on it.  
She wrote an excellent history of education in Guernsey and I would happily draw, it might be the  
wrong the message from me, she probably will not be too pleased with me for citing it, but the  
lesson that I draw from it, besides anything else is that Guernsey's approach to education and  
3350 probably approach to education of all governments everywhere, has been one of evolution; and if  
this amendment were to be the only thing that survived from this debate it would be an evolution  
in Guernsey's education system.

It would not be as good as what we have had in sight and maybe will have had snatched away  
from us, if the Committee's proposals do not go through; but it is a sight better than what we  
3355 have now and it is a great sight better than what the Requête would leave us with. So, that is the  
quandary in that case. It is all but impossible to sell up something that is second-best and second-  
best by a long way to what is already on the table, and knowing that the success of this might  
snatch away the opportunity to pursue that. But we do really face the worst set of choices this  
week.

3360 I cannot find fault with the amendment in the way that some others have, for being so late to  
the party and having had so little time to consider it, because again as we said in yesterday's  
debate, actually there is a great deal of information out there already about what school model,  
so it is not like we are coming to this whole debate uneducated, uninformed, and what I always  
anticipated, that this debate as a whole would be, is that it would involve us trying to patch



3365 together some kind of alliance from different perspectives across the States to get a result that is better than what the Requête condemns us too.

I always expected that amendments would come into play in the course of this debate and that we would have to be on our mettle, prepared and ready to deal with those. I cannot find fault with this amendment for that reason. I can actually find fault with it for not being good enough,  
3370 relative to what we might have, and I can certainly find fault with it for offering the kind of life raft that Deputy Merrett spoke about. That it might erode the support for what we already have if it is successful.

I think part of the reason why I feel I have to support this because of the certainty that it offers, relative to the Requête; but I also have to make a plea to other States' Members, the amendment  
3375 that comes out of this offers us another debate. It offers us an opportunity to make a positive choice for the best model of education which is ESC's two-school model, two-college model. And I think that maybe we would be in a different place, if all we had was this amendment and then the final Propositions offering us a choice, really offering that brinkmanship, do we have to protect this or lose everything? Whereas ESC's amendment, the one that comes after this, is the  
3380 canary in the mine for the ongoing success of the two-school model, but the trouble is that we do not know if that canary is alive or not until after we have got out of this debate, and if we throw this away on the way to getting there and it was too late to resuscitate the canary, I do not know what that leaves us with.

I give way to Deputy Fallaize.

3385

**Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy McSwiggan for giving way.

Of course, actually it is not, because at that point we would still be debating amendments. We would have general debate left and it would be possible for other amendments to be laid. Deputy Ferbrache has already sort of trailed one which might appear, I do not know whether it will,  
3390 depending on the outcome of this one, possibly. It would prolong the debate, obviously, but I do not think that the options are closed in quite the way that Deputy McSwiggan describes, if this amendment is defeated.

**Deputy McSwiggan:** Possibly not, but I think what Deputy Ferbrache is offering was a permutation on the Requête, which did not particularly promise to be any better than the Requête itself. I suspect we are going to have the weekend to think about these things and work through the ramifications.

3395

Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy McSwiggan. I accept that Deputy Ferbrache was offering that but obviously Deputy Ferbrache is only one Member of the States. It would be open to other Members to offer other options.

3400

**Deputy McSwiggan:** Okay, that is fair enough. If that is the case then I am not sure that we can see an argument against this amendment, the contrary may almost be true. It is an almost impossible choice. It is maddening to hear supporters of the Requête say, 'This is where I think we will end up but let's take more time to get there.' Particularly if they are also saying, 'But we do not need to worry too much about the unions, because they will blow hot one day and cold the next.'

3405

I think I am going to need more help in the closing speeches on this debate and in the summing up, I guess. But I just cannot face the idea of walking out of here with the complete uncertainty that the Requête provides us with, and I suppose that is where I have to go ...

3410

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

3415 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, it is Friday, it is five o'clock and whilst this is certainly not *Crackerjack*, I do think we are probably at a stage in this very long debate where a little bit of light relief would not go amiss. So I have taken some guidance from my friend Lester Queripel and I have captured – you are quite right, sir, Deputy Lester Queripel – and I have captured my thoughts so far in rhyme.

3420 Sir, there is a nice chap named Deputy Queripel, Lester; who occasionally entertains like the Assembly's jester; he said no to two schools, yes to three; is that the end of it? – there's no certainty'

There is another nice fellow, Deputy Meerveld, Carl; who never delivers a speech with a snarl; he is very keen to support the Requête –

3425 **Deputy Tooley:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Tooley, point of correction. You are interrupting the flow!

**Deputy Tooley:** I am pretty sure I have seen Deputy Meerveld deliver speeches with a snarl!

3430

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Trott to continue.

**Deputy Trott:** – who never delivers a speech with a snarl; he is very keen to support the Requête in the hope and belief that his views will be met'

3435 We have an able gent named Peter, Deputy Roffey; who has decided to disregard teachers' views as toffee; he is passionate about the two-school choice, believing that the majority have not shown their voice'.

And lastly and importantly, 'there is Deputy Fallaize, Matt; who is desperate to ensure his ideas do not fall flat; in the knowledge that in a few months, there is an election; will today's deliberations result in rejection?'

3440

Now, sir, I have done a rhyme, or rather a verse, about Deputy Ferbrache, but I need to take legal advice before I deliver it! (*Laughter*)

**The Deputy Bailiff:** And the relevance to the debate on the amendment?

3445

**Deputy Trott:** None that I can – (*Laughter*)

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

3450 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Thank you sir.

In my previous career I was often greeted by such a warm-up act! (*Laughter*)

**A Member:** I hope it was better!

3455 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** I have, like Deputy McSwiggan, found this debate incredibly difficult. Not because it is a divisive subject, we know that, we have been through these debates before. But because the options we are being asked to think about are: (a) impossible in the Requête; and (b) when you stop and actually start to listen to what people are actually saying they are concerned with, if you start to actually engage meaningfully you start to get to the root of the problem.

3460

Now, when this Requête was laid, and I realise I am not talking yet on the amendment and if I could get the preamble over, a group of my colleagues and I felt so strongly that there just was no direction from the Requête, but there was clearly a palpable need to do something. We got together and started to look at how we could amend the Requête.

3465 Now, the amendment does bring a model that was not considered by any Committee. I know this, because in preparation to do an amendment I started to look at all of the information that

was going to be required. Every single Committee and every single option that they have looked at, because that is what the Requête said, options previously presented to Committees. So I have shared my analysis with other Deputies. There were nine models considered in levels of detail. Not just talked about but actually considered in enough detail.

3470

Three of the models were worked up to policy stage with a planning application, curriculum modelling, transition modelling and financial modelling. Six models have been worked up with an options appraisal included in a policy letter. Five models were considered by multiple committees. Nine models were rejected by committees at one time and only one model has been agreed by the States. And agreed twice.

3475

So, when I looked at that – and I accept that the three-school model that Deputy Brouard and Deputy Le Tocq are bringing as a possible end to this solution – when you look at how this entire debate has gone, each of those models when there were considered at Committee were rejected for different reasons. Each of those models, the models that were brought before us or the States at any time, were rejected by the States for reasons.

3480

Now it is very interesting, when you start to examine the reasons that these were rejected and how that impacts the next Committee or the next States' decision, there has been an evolution of thought. We are not going back to square one. We are no longer able to look at nine different models.

3485

So, when the four-school model came to the States, it was rejected because it was more expensive than the selective model. The movement of pupils and teachers over one site would equate to lost teaching and learning time. The pastoral care was uncertain when teachers were moving between sites or when pupils were moving between sites. That was a concern. It could not prove that there would be better outcomes than the selective model because there were no models to compare it against.

3490

I think that is a very important point. If we are working as a corporate government, you need to be able to show and be accountable. Yes, we have made the case for change and these are going to be the outcomes, these are the benefits. If we are not able to compare it to some other model, there is no way to build the case to actually say there are going to be better outcomes in that selected model. We can surmise, but if there are no other models to look at it is very difficult to build that case.

3495

Other reasons why it was rejected. It did not resolve the question of the grant aid at colleges. That was back in 2016. The pupil-to-teacher ratio was 12:1. That was too expensive, without savings across the whole educational model; and the capital rebuild of La Mare de Carteret, a 600-pupil school, was not value for money when compared to the 960 rebuild, and the space standards of the rebuild were disputed between the then T&R and the Education Department.

3500

One of the schools would have been an 11-18 school. Pupils at the 11-18 school would have had the advantage of a lower pupil-to-teacher ratio and bigger staff teams. Teachers could teach across the 11-18 range and would give unfair advantage over the 11-16 schools. This is not me making those arguments, these are the reasons why that model was rejected.

3505

But what is interesting is when you then go to the three-school model, some of those issues were resolved. The grant-aided colleges, we have had the debate and there was certainty on that, so that was no longer a reason to reject it. It was less expensive than the base case. Pupils and teachers did not need to move around any more to access lessons, which they would have in the one-school, four-sites model.

3510

A review of the grant-aided colleges had been done but the pupil-to-teacher ratio was increased to 15:1. That was not based on better educational outcomes, that was based on revenue savings. I think that is a very important thing to see. The rebuild of La Mare de Carteret was now making use of the 960 plan, with less generous space standards.

3515

Now, if you go back to the Billet in March 2016 there is a letter of comment from T&R. There are also space standards. It has been an issue for a long time. It is not something that, as a Deputy starting in 2016, I was fully aware of all of these issues. I know them now.

3520 So the three-school model was rejected by the States because the post-16 arrangements were considered *unworkable*, beyond salvageable. It is interesting to note that the three-school model was in some form looked at by the Committee in 2012-2016. Some iteration of it, but not quite what Deputy Meerveld thought up.

3525 It is interesting also to note that Deputy Meerveld has said that there was full curriculum planning. However, there was not full curriculum planning for the post-16 college because what became clear through the debate and why it was unworkable was there were too many questions that were unanswered. If there were questions that were unanswered, that means that the curriculum modelling was not complete.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Point of correction, sir.

3530 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Meerveld.

**Deputy Meerveld:** As previously stated, the policy letter presented by the Committee in January, published 10th November 2017, clearly stated that they were going to come back with a policy letter on the post-16 development. Therefore no curriculum model would have been developed at all for that section of the education system.

3535 Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel to continue.

3540 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** That was not a point of correction, but there we go –

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, it is not your job to say whether or not another Member makes a valid point of correction. If I want to rule it out of order, I will. (**Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** I apologise, sir.)

3545 What I will say, if people want to hear from me, which I am sure you do not but you are going to now, is can people think whether it is really going to assist in the debate to jump up and make a point of correction, when we are hoping to get towards the end of this debate? Because it will not probably make the blindest bit of difference as far as I can work out. (*Laughter*)

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel to continue, please.

3550 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Thank you, sir.

Each time an option has been looked at and evolved through the process, we have ended up amending and pushing and pulling everywhere. But what has been missing is the focus on the educational outcomes. That is why it is important to listen to what the teachers are saying.

3555 Yes, they are concerned about educational outcomes. If you look at the programme business case, you can see very clearly how that is mapped. If teachers are having those concerns, it is about the delivery and how the bits and pieces are fitting together within the system. If there are models in the UK that you can compare it to, then those models are there. I am veering off, away from the amendment. Sorry.

3560 My point about the amendment is it does bring a model that was not previously looked at by the Committee. It was, however, thought up, or considered, pre- getting to the two-school models. The evolution of options that were left behind, or that would be left behind, there were nine models that had been considered by different Committees. If I was to do an amendment, and there is an amendment which seeks to look at making sure that we do not, by going back and starting to look at everything again, affect the development and the going forward of the Guernsey Institute and La Mare de Carteret primary school.

3565 If we are not going to affect the Guernsey Institute it does suddenly limit the options that are left. There are only two options that have previously been considered and they were considered in quite some detail. A stand-alone sixth form option was considered in detail at Committee level by

3570 the 2012-2016 Committee *and* by the 2016-2018 Committee. It was included as an option in the policy letter in 2016 and can be found in detail.

The reasons it was rejected were that it was a higher capital cost and it was less flexible than the four-school model, that is the 2012-16 Committee. At the time they were looking at changing Les Beaucamps High School into a 16-19 stand-alone sixth form and they looked into it in quite a bit of detail and they looked at the size of Beaucamps which was bigger than a sixth form and the size of the classrooms were for 11-16 classes and not a sixth form, so it was not good use of the space. It was too big for the sixth form and the stand-alone sixth-form numbers are too small to offer a broad curriculum. It is hard to recruit as it would require part-time teachers and the pastoral care with part-time teachers and enrichment would have been limited and expensive. Those are the reasons. They do not just disappear because we are going back to the drawing board.

3580 The other option, along with the three 11-18 models, would be the two 11-16s and the one 11-18. Now we went into quite a lot of detail in the debate yesterday, so I am not going to give all the reasons why that was rejected. But the point is, these have all been looked at and found to have critical flaws.

3585 The only model that got to the stage where we agreed at the States has been the two-school model and has been built up with an enormous amount of detail and I dispute any of the allegations that there has not been enough detail and it has not been thought through. That is just simply untrue.

3590 The amendment we are asking for does provide surety, but it just throws the two-school model out. Without knowing any of the educational benefits, without knowing any of the mitigations that will need to be put in place to get the same standard of delivery in the two-school model, we know that an incredible amount of work has been done by those professionals to get to the point where we can actually see; and again it is for Members of P&R, who are responsible for interrogating the business case, I am concerned that they have not interrogated the business case – the programme business case, the outline business case – to the degree that they would be able to see all of these benefits and options.

3595 I, as a Member, have not had privy to the outline business case which was presented to the P&R and ESC, that obviously contains commercially sensitive information. But, as Deputy Fallaize has reminded us, the full programme business case will be, along with the assurance, the professional who looks at it ... I am searching for words. Yes, the independent assessor, or reviewer, their report on it will be published as well to show you that there is value for money.

3600 And a lot of the business case is built around improving educational outcomes and, in order to build that business case, they have to be able to show and demonstrate that it is possible to do. So it is nonsense that it is not possible to do. It would be potentially possible for three 11-18 schools. But the decision that we are making on this amendment now would be: do we stop all of the fantastic work before we even know that magic three-school model is going to be better? We stop everything, spend an enormous amount of money putting the brakes on something, when we do not really know that it is going to be that much better, but it just makes us feel a bit better? I cannot stress enough that that is not the way to make decisions, just because it will make us feel a bit better.

3605 So, oh, another piece of paper. Oh, powerless working, right. Oh, there, computer.

I just wanted to pick up on something that Deputy Gollop said about how he preferred the space standards, and reiterate what Deputy Fallaize said the other day, and it is something I did not quite come to terms with. I do not like reading long, complicated analyses of space and I do not want to just compare numbers. I want to know that the educational benefits are going to be better. That is what I want to know.

3610 The space standards is a bit of a *non-sequitur*. In my analysis, those who were in the States in March 2016 will probably remember the report that looked at the two options of the La Mare de Carteret rebuild, building it at 600 or building it at 960. The independent valuer did say that the 600 was too generous and that the 900 was a little bit less generous and if you do go in and look

at the size of the canteen, for a 900, they did not make it any bigger, so they would need to use the sports hall as well, a lot of the space issues that are perceived space issues, would have been the same issues in the 960 school.

3625 I have a faint echo in my mind that Deputy Fallaize did actually raise that during the debate on the alternative model. It passed me by then. It has stuck around in my head and now I have found it.

It is true that the unions have written to us. I have written them a response. I just felt a need to debate their response to them, but needed to outline why I was unable to amend the Requête into something workable. Basically, it boils down to all of their models have been looked at before and the only one that was viable is the two-school model.

3630 Now, there was a point, back in January 2017 when this ... the Requête is asking for things to be worked up way beyond what they should. What you do is you look at options and look at all the different values and build them up and discuss them with educationalists.

3635 Now, in January 2017, we had the Deputies' workshop, which quite a few of us ... It was a very difficult time in the Assembly, I will hold my hands up. The motion of no confidence had just been, there was a lot of tension and it was not a very pleasant place to be; and I apologise to some of the Members who felt that somehow they were being ganged up on and did not feel that there was a way to go forward.

3640 But what did not happen then is if, at that point, they had had this meaningful engagement with the educationalists, then we would not be in this position. In fact Deputy de Sausmarez at the time, and I remember because we discussed it and she shared what she had written to the then Committee ... I will not go into it. But to stop now and either just throw it away with the bath water, with something .... That we know there are educational benefits.

3645 If you cannot even trust your own processes to be able to build up a business case that demonstrates those educational benefits – all the work that you can see going into these programme cases and the assurance reviews and all of that. If we cannot trust our own processes to get there then what is the point of having all these governance rules?

3650 My point is yes, there is attraction for the three 11-18 schools. Yes, but like myself and other colleagues, who have reached out and spoken directly to as many of the people that we could – we sent emails, a lot of people have asked for confidentiality when speaking to us because there was a very toxic atmosphere that has been created around this, absolutely, and what has come out was the concern with the splitting of the sixth form into two. (*Interjections*)

You can chunter all you like, Deputy Inder –

3655 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, you do not address another Member directly, please.

**Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** I take that on board. Heckling. Right.

3660 So, the splitting of the sixth form is causing a lot of the uncertainty with the providers of that part of the Education estate. So I very much doubt that they will be happy with the idea of splitting it into three.

I give way to Deputy Le Tocq.

3665 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Sir, I thank Deputy Hansmann Rouxel for giving way.

Absolutely, sir, she is right there. If they are not happy with two, they are not going to be happy with three. But we have already made it clear that this Assembly does not accept a separate sixth form – it may be different people, but will not accept a sixth form attached to one of the schools. This is my point. It may not be the first choice for many people but in my own experience it is the second or third choice and that is why I have been willing to propose it.

3670 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** I take that on board, Deputy Le Tocq. But it does put a slight mockery to acquiescing to the concerns of those teachers who are very vocal about the splitting

of the sixth forms in order to then go explore a model that splits the sixth form in three. That is my point.

3675

If you are actually genuinely responding to concerns then that is not the way to go. We can stop the process and go and look at all those nine models again, but we know already the fail points, and in fact there is a lot of financial modelling done on them as well, so we know that they are more expensive. We know that the two-school model is cheaper to run but they are taking the savings and re-investing them and proving that those investments are made for educational benefits.

3680

I cannot read the business case and then turn around to people and say, 'No, no, there is not enough information'. It is just a nonsense, really.

I do understand Deputy Yerby's point. Apologies, Deputy McSwiggan. I completely take her point about the genuine concern of leaving the spectre of what is not a viable thing to ask for – going back to the drawing board when we should have done the work in January 2017, and meaningfully engaged the educationalists, who no doubt would have come to a point where their differences and their different needs if there was some collective way of them seeing their differences met, instead of one group saying, 'We need this', and another group saying, 'Yes, that fits in with our need' and completely ignoring another group's need.

3690

I cannot vote for the amendment, even though I do see the logic of it, but it does not make sense at this stage to leap off what is a very clear programme of work in order to just pursue something that enough logic shows will be more expensive and less valuable and will also not satisfy one of the key concerns that is happening at the moment.

3695

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, it has just gone 5.30 p.m. It is my view, but it will be your decision, that it would be desirable to reach a conclusion on this amendment by those who wish to speak speaking, and then Deputy Le Tocq being able to reply on the amendment.

So I am going to propose to you that we continue sitting but only until after the vote on this amendment has been taken, in which case we will then adjourn until 9.30 a.m. on Monday morning. Those in favour; those against?

3700

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, that is remarkable! Thank you very much. *(Laughter)*  
Deputy Tooley.

3705

**Deputy Tooley:** Thank you, sir.

I am afraid I cannot promise to be quite as brief as I usually am, because I am going to try and respond to some of the things that have been raised in debate, but I will do my utmost not to waffle because I am not a great waffler. Well, I would not say I am a great waffler, but anyway.

Various things have been raised and so I am just going to try and go through them and work through some of my notes. Deputy Inder pointed out that three unions have written letters supporting the Requête and that is absolutely true. But what they have not done is agree on anything, other than what they do not want. We cannot walk out of here not knowing what we want to be building for education. Obviously we can walk out tonight, but we cannot walk out of here at the end of this debate, not knowing what we want to build for education.

3710

Deputy Stephens said in her speech, which I agreed with so much of, and actually it is something that Deputy Le Tocq has just pretty much repeated, but this might not be first, best or second-best or even third best, but it is a compromise we can potentially work on. Well, if compromise requires us to settle for second best at a higher cost, we should surely be questioning the wisdom of it.

3715

This amendment is another example of that type of policy on the fly that so many people here have quite rightly condemned. Deputy Prow suggested that the business case was not complete.

3720

Well, we are exactly where we are meant to be in terms of the progression of business cases. This is the point we should be at, at this point.

3725 There has been extensive stakeholder engagement, possibly they have only just realised the extent of the changes that will happen, but this engagement is happening. And Deputy Brehaut is quite right, this is not pause and reflect, it is indeed disrupt and delay and that is the worst of all outcomes.

3730 Deputy Dudley-Owen asked questions about the ESC, as employers, should have met with the unions. Well, there have been at least 42 meetings involving union reps since September 2018, reps for teachers, support staff and so on. Those meetings have taken place, at least 42, and actually Deputy Fallaize has even attended training sessions for new union reps. That is the level of involvement the ESC have had with unions.

3735 **Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful for Deputy Tooley. I did not pass it.

**Deputy Tooley:** I was not told there was a test! Actually, sir, that was shared with me by the unions, who wanted to make it clear that there has been engagement between ESC and the unions. I am trying to go through my notes rather than use all of them, so we are not kept too long listening to me talk. Sorry.

3740 Talk about numbers in the colleges. Deputy Parkinson talked about the benefits of his model of three schools and I can see some benefits to that. I can see a lovely idea that, if you are great at science, this is where the science teachers would be, and it would be an exemplar model for teaching science. It would be great. The arts, you know, you would go to school and that was the A-level subject.

3745 What about the trickle-down effect of that? What about the children who are good at science but who are in the school perhaps because it is the closest to their home and the *really* fantastic science teachers are at a different school, because that is seen as being the school for science. I do not think this would be such a good idea and actually timetable clashes are much less likely under a one-school, two-college model than a three.

3750 Deputy Leadbeater talked about the labour on the site and actually Deputy Queripel went on to talk about going to school in a building site. Well, the extensions and models that have been designed and developed for the Beaucamps and St Sampson's sites are based on using land that the pupils do not actually physically use for their lessons at the moment.

3755 By contrast, the work that would need to take place at the Grammar School, which this amendment throws back into the mix, is work that is right in the very centre of the school. It would be the repurposing of areas like the swimming pool, which the classrooms surround. So actually if there is one school that probably would be turned into a building site that would make lessons difficult, it is the Grammar School. But this amendment brings that into scope, which it is not in the two-school model as it stands.

3760 Ah, Deputy Queripel. Deputy Queripel quotes *Everybody's Talkin'*. It is interesting, because those lyrics are about somebody who wants to head off into the ocean and not come back. That is not where I am on education, I want to be here doing stuff and actually making a difference.

In fact, what we want to say is a Fleetwood Mac lyric:

Don't stop thinking about tomorrow  
... it'll soon be here  
It'll be here better than before  
Yesterday's gone, yesterday's gone

3765 Just because some might prefer to chant, 'We don't need no education', that does not mean they are right, either.

We are talking about drop and stride, not park and stride; and there is a difference. There is an enormous difference between places where we drop children off and places where we park our car and we sit and wait and take up parking spaces. They are not the same thing.



3770 He asked whether these walkways would be covered. We could sell umbrellas; do you think that might solve that covered issue? No, we are not planning that walkways would be covered. They would be lit where required. (*Interjection*) To my knowledge police do not currently monitor children going to school and we should remember that we are talking about secondary school children, many of whom because of removal of selection will be walking with their cohort from their primary schools, with their friends and with their siblings, because they will not be spaced across sites and schools.

3775 When I went to school, almost everybody walked and there was safety in numbers. Because actually if you are one of two pupils walking along a dusky lane to get to school, that might not be so safe. But if you are one of a couple of hundred walking along that path more trodden, it immediately becomes a far more pedestrian-friendly zone. It immediately becomes a far safer place for young people.

3780 Let's not forget that in the third year of secondary, in Year 9, our students turn 14. At that point we as a jurisdiction consider that they are old enough at the moment, by law – and we do not all agree – (*Laughter*) to be capable of driving motorised vehicles on our roads, but there is this notion that they should not be allowed to walk to school on their own. Surely that is a ridiculous notion?

3785 Pollution is the same in any school model, if mode shifts do not occur. Attitudes towards a three-school model are actually likely to be counter to some of the Active Travel initiatives promoted because, if parents believe traffic will be lighter, then they will think it is okay to drive. There is an argument for it being more costly to implement Active Travel across three sites, as it could require more engagement, more often, due to less complacent attitudes. And the number of drop and stride sites would need to be at least the same in either model.

3790 There were accusations that the model was originally drawn up on the back on an envelope: well, I cannot find my notes on how much it cost to produce the printed-out hard-copy versions of the alternative model. I wish I could. I cannot find them. Believe me, I wish it had been produced on the back of an envelope because, counter to a lot of what is out there in the public domain, the now ESC, the then gang of four, if that is what you want to call it, were never given any money to develop that. The cost of producing that model came out of the pockets of some of the four of us that developed that and it was not the back-of-an-envelope thing. As I say, I really wish it was.

3795 If the Requête were amended to include consideration of this three 11-18 school model, it would considerably add to the time it would take to come back with answers. So adding that in adds to the delay that the Requête causes anyway, if anybody is thinking about amending the Requête to include that consideration.

3800 I can see that is a valid consideration, to add that in on top of the models previously considered, but that would considerably add to the time because it has never been looked at in any real detail. Deputy Hansmann Rouxel has given a great critique of the models that have been looked at previously, so I will not go through all of that.

3805 A life raft is only needed if you are on a ship which is sinking. What we have here is not a ship which is sinking, what we have here is a ship setting out to a place which is better than we were, which will give its passengers better advantages than they have at present, and a lot of people running around saying, 'Not sure I like it. Not sure I want to go. Perhaps we should get on the lifeboats and leave.' Well, lifeboats are not as secure a place as a ship you are already travelling on to a better destination, so I would suggest avoiding climbing on to them when you do not need to.

3810 Deputy Lester Queripel once again has, as he said, more often than once quoted Yeats in Education discussions and you would think that he would have learned by now that, when he does that, I quote it back at him. This is my favourite poem too. It was read at my wedding and he is quite right, that poem does end: 'I have spread my dreams under your feet; Tread softly because you tread upon my dreams'.

3820 But it begins:

Had I the heavens' embroidered cloths,  
Enwrought with golden and silver light,  
The blue and the dim and the dark cloths  
Of night and light and the half light,  
I would spread the cloths under your feet:

3825 *Those* are the cloths that we aim to spread beneath the feet of our students. The richly embroidered cloth that you get when you have a knowledge and skills-rich curriculum, delivered in a way, which is efficient and allows for proper differentiation in the size of groups you have, which allows you to see forward to what you could attain if you put the work in, which allows that build.

3830 That is the offer that is currently on the table and I am perfectly happy for someone who is poor to spread their dreams before people. But we are not spreading pie-in-the-sky dreams. The evidence is there. There is reality that the proposals that are on the table will offer to young people a knowledge, and skills-rich curriculum, an opportunity which they have not, for the most part, previously had. Please do not grab at a life raft that is not necessary.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I now turn to the proposer of amendment 7, Deputy Le Tocq, to reply to the debate.

3835 Deputy Le Tocq, please.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Right, sir, did Deputy Dudley-Owen speak already in the debate?

3840 **The Deputy Bailiff:** She did. She spoke this morning. That was quite a long time ago.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** It is a long time ago, sir, and I intend to be brief.

3845 I opened debate on this amendment by saying it gave me no great pleasure to be laying this amendment and it still does not give me much great pleasure. There was really only one question that was not answered in some other form during the debate and it was from Deputy Merrett, and she asked me why I should believe, I think she used the analogy of a hurricane or a storm, would not face proposals that our Propositions in this amendment, if they become the substantive Propositions, in the same way that the current proposals to this Assembly, as voted on by a majority on two occasions, are currently facing.

3850 I have to answer to her to say I do not know, it is a political judgement. It is simply that, because that is where we are. It is making a political judgement. But I do so on the basis that this Assembly has certainly, if it sticks to the courage that it has had so far and there is clear evidence that is certainly not going to do that the best system, the fairest system for educating our young people in Guernsey in the secondary schools, is providing equality of opportunity through schools that offer 11-18 education, and linked to that obviously the Guernsey Institute proposals as well.

3855 I said at the start I was seeking, by laying this amendment, to take the best aspects of that, which we have agreed upon in this Assembly, and which certainly sections of our society and of the current teaching staff we have agree with as well, and putting that together in a way that addresses some of the serious concerns that have been raised, particularly from members of the public, not so much perhaps from the teaching profession, but members of the public about the size of the schools and the fact there are only two of them.

3865 So yes it is a compromise, as I said, and repeating what I said before it may not well be the solution that any one of these factions would have chosen as a first solution; but I am making the political judgement that on the basis of the information we have, and we have huge amounts of information, that this would be a solution that we could (1) get to work – yes it would cost more, absolutely, and yes there would be less choice in terms of the breadth of the curriculum but choice has become a sort of modern god to certain people, particularly in the education realm. I for one think it is worth compromising on those issues, that particular issue.

3870 If Little Johnny cannot choose to do nuclear physics, Japanese and retail therapy, then I do not think it is the end of the world. That is my own opinion. But I think the fact that we would have core subjects that will be taught well, we could attract good teachers, we would have specialities – which for some may mean some need for flexibility. But I think with three we would be able to do that on three sites in a way that in some ways could not be done so easily on two sites.

3875 So I am trying to address those things in a way that we could rally round and support. And I will pick up, sir, having addressed that issue I hope to Deputy Merrett's satisfaction, as far as I am able, to just pick up on some of the issues that others have said, and I will start with Deputy Ferbrache.

3880 Deputy Ferbrache alluded to not having enough information. That is probably the first time I have heard Deputy Ferbrache suggest that we should wait until we have more information and detail. Certainly, we have seen more information on this, in fact this whole debate was turning into the sort of detail that sometimes I find myself getting bored with in Committees. They are not the sorts of details that we should be disagreeing over.

3885 In terms of saying this is a brand-new model that has not been considered before well, yes, at the highest level that is true, but we have enough detail to know that it is going to, (1) cost a bit more. We are talking about elements of cost there, they would be significant, whichever model we choose, but they will be insignificant overall in terms of the directions we are going in, because we know these sites fairly well and we know, from even what Deputy Fallaize has said, there would be trade-offs in one area and another in terms of capital costs and certainly in terms of the revenue costs. And that is an issue we are going to have to face whatever, depending on what the curriculum looks like and depending on what we want in terms of offering our young people.

3890 I am not sure that waiting to have any more detailed information will put us in a better position to make the sort of decision that Deputy Ferbrache and a few others have suggested that it would. It is not a Nirvana. Because the issue that I see that we have at the moment is one of, I think it was Chesterton who said, 'You cannot grow a beard in a moment of passion'.

3895 It is one of wanting to have to strongly do something but yet the issue at stake is outside of our control and that is really what it is. We need to have some calm, some patience and if I might say so, sir, some courage. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It is our right and it is a prerogative of Members, if they want to change their minds on issues, they are able to do so. I do not know or cannot judge the motivations for doing that, but I do believe that leadership requires some courage. It requires wisdom as well and it requires a steady hand.

3900 I will use the term 'salvage'. I am trying to salvage something out of what I believe the current proposals that we have on the table, that this Assembly has twice voted by a sizeable majority on, trying to salvage something out of that. The salvageable bits are the 11-18 schools. The things that I am nodding to in terms of the concerns in this amendment to the Requête are to do with the number of sites.

3905 In Proposition 5, and to pick up again on some comments that others have made, it would be for the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, and I will read it out:

... to return to the States before the end of 2020 with costings for secondary and post-16 education organised in accordance with Proposition 2 and those extant resolutions of the States that are not rescinded by Proposition 1.

3910 Now, that is where the Committee will need to engage, right from the start, with all the stakeholders, in the full realisation that they are not going to get over a majority of teachers, or indeed a majority of the public, to support and rally round these things. But I believe with a starting point that is better than they are currently on. And that is why this is a compromise.

So I encourage Members to support this because if we do not then I think we are in a very dangerous position. And if the Requête ends up going through in the way that it currently is, there is total uncertainty.

3915 I mean, one thing that we can tell from the views that have been expressed to us by the public and by teachers is that they seem to be, whilst they cannot be for something they are very

strongly against continuing with the one-school, two-college model. This amendment gives certainty on that. It will not continue.

3920 So the Requête does not do that. It keeps it there and wants it there for some future date because apparently we will have more courage and more information and be able to make that decision. You have more faith than I do if you believe that that day will come. We will be faced with maybe different faces, maybe different people out there. But it will be the same problems, because our community is split on this issue and in my experience it always has been so. So it comes down to courage.

3925 To pick up on what Deputy McSwiggan said earlier, and she actually articulated most of how I feel at the moment in terms of reasons I would say to vote for this. That is that we have created an environment which becomes very difficult to manage and for us, as leaders to take our Island with us and take us forward, we need something that will help bring us all together. It is not revolution, it is evolution. In my mind, Guernsey has always survived well with an evolutionary attitude to things. This is an evolution.

3930 Perhaps for some, the proposals that we have accepted under our current policy of this Assembly, that ESC and P&R are enacting on the basis of our empowerment by this Assembly. Perhaps for some, that has suddenly seemed a leap too far. I believe if we do not amend the Requête it will not be a standing still, it will be a slipping back, a step backwards. This amendment gives this Assembly an opportunity to take a step forward, an evolution. And I encourage  
3935 Members to support it.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, we go to the vote, and there has been a request for a recorded vote already, so that is what we will do, on Amendment 7, proposed by Deputy Le Tocq, seconded by Deputy Brouard. Greffier.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 11, Contre 25, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Brouard  
Deputy McSwiggan  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Le Tocq

**CONTRE**

Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel  
Deputy Graham  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon  
Deputy Le Pelley

3940

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, while we are waiting for those votes to be counted and I can announce it, let me just deal with a couple of matters of general procedure. If you want to leave papers, other belongings, in this room over the weekend, you are free to do so because obviously nobody else will be having access to it before 9.30 a.m. on Monday morning.

3945 A couple of Members at least have referred to *Groundhog Day*. I have a vague recollection of the film, watched it more than once, even! (*Laughter*) On the same day. And the main character, played by Bill Murray of course wakes up and it is the same day that he repeats, time and time again. But perhaps the moral is that by repeating things, he improves his skills and in the end he becomes a nicer person. That is my memory of *Groundhog Day*.

3950 Now, there voted *Pour* on amendment 7, 11 Members; *Contre* 25; 3 absentees – and therefore I declare the amendment lost.

When we resume on Monday morning, I will turn next to amendment 5, to be proposed by Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Graham, which will be a further 'delete all the Propositions and substitute therefore ...'

3955 I hope you all have a restful weekend and come back, not renewed for many, many more hours of debate but with a view as to where this debate is heading and I hope you have some rest and forget about education at least for 48-odd hours.

Thank you. We will close the Meeting.

*The Assembly adjourned at 6.02 p.m.*